

CRUSADE IMAGES IN EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY BRITISH HISTORIES

The Institute of Economics and Social Sciences
of
Bilkent University

by

ZEYNEP KOCABIYIKOĞLU ÇEÇEN

In Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF ARTS

in

THE DEPARTMENT OF
HISTORY
BİLKENT UNIVERSITY
ANKARA

September 2005

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in History.

Asst. Prof. C.D.A. Leighton
Supervisor

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in History.

Asst. Prof. David E. Thornton
Examining Committee Member

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in History.

Asst. Prof. Nur Bilge Criss
Examining Committee Member

Approval of the Institute of Economics and Social Sciences

Prof Dr. Erdal Erel
Director

ABSTRACT

CRUSADE IMAGES IN EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY BRITISH HISTORIES

Kocabıyıkoglu een, Zeynep

M.A., Department of History

Supervisor: Asst. Prof. C.D.A. Leighton

September 2005

This thesis attempts to investigate how eighteenth-century British histories dealt with the theme of the medieval crusade. Since the nineteenth century produced so much more material in historical writing, as well as in imaginative literature, art, travel writing, etc, on the theme, the eighteenth-century interest in the crusades has been little considered. In this thesis, major histories from the period, even if not exclusively concerned with the crusades or even the middle ages, are examined for their treatment of the theme. The selected histories were remarkable enough in their own period to be mentioned in modern secondary sources, which also indicate that most of them were popularly read. Even though their interpretations of the crusades suggest that the eighteenth century was not one of any great importance in the history of crusade historiography, this material is by no means without interest. It reflects the religious and political ideologies of the period well. In its treatment of religion, it speaks both of the English confessional *ancien rgime* and the Enlightenment. In its treatment of the heroes of the crusades, it speaks of both proto-nationalism and the cult of chivalry, which appealed to the aristocratic ethos of the *ancien rgime* elite, the governors of the Hanoverian Empire. Thus, this thesis may be considered to have contributed to crusade historiography, but more importantly, to have offered comment on aspects of the political, religious, social and intellectual life of the century.

ÖZET

ONSEKİZİNCİ YÜZYIL İNGİLİZ TARİH YAZIMLARINDA HAÇLI SEFERLERİ İMAJI

Kocabıyıkoglu Çeçen, Zeynep

Master, Tarih Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Yrd. Doç. C.D.A. Leighton

Eylül 2005

Bu tez onsekizinci yüzyılda yazılmış olan tarih eserlerinin ortaçağdaki haçlı seferleri temasına nasıl yaklaştıklarını incelemektedir. Ondokuzuncu yüzyıl hem tarih yazımı hem de diğer alanlarda (edebiyat, sanat, gezi yazısı, vb) haçlı seferleri temasıyla ilgili daha çok eser verirken, onsekizinci yüzyıl haçlı seferlerine ilgi açısından genelde incelenmeyi gerektirmemiştir. Bu tezde, onsekizinci yüzyıl tarih yazımları haçlı seferlerini ve hatta ortaçağı bile tek başına konu olarak almamalarına rağmen, haçlı seferlerini nasıl yorumladıkları açısından inceleneceklerdir. Seçilen tarih eserlerinin ikincil kaynaklarda bahsedilecek kadar dikkat çekici olması çoğunlukla popüler eserler olmalarına da işaret etmektedir. Her ne kadar haçlı seferleri hakkındaki yorumların incelenmesi sonucu onsekizinci yüzyılın haçlı seferleri tarihçiliğinde çok önemli bir yer tutmadığını gösterse de sonuçta bunlar kesinlikle ilgi çekicidir çünkü dönemin dini ve politik ideolojilerini iyi bir şekilde yansıtmaktadır. Dini incelerken hem İngilteredeki dinine bağlı eski rejim ve Aydınlanma çağından bahseder, haçlı seferi kahramanlarını incelerken ise hem erken milliyetçilik hem de Hanover imparatorluğunu yöneten aristokrat kültürün şövalyelik tutkusunu inceler. Böyleyken, bu tez haçlı seferleri tarihçiliği incelenmesine katkıda bulunmakta ve daha önemlisi bu yüzyıldaki politik, dini, sosyal ve entellektüel yaşayışa dair bir yorum sunmaktadır.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to my thesis supervisor Dr. Cadoc Douglas A. Leighton for his guidance and contribution throughout this study, as well as to Dr. Paul Latimer and Dr. David E. Thornton of the European History Department for their support and guidance. I would also like to thank all my professors in the History Department for sharing their knowledge and providing me with the necessary skills and background in history without which I could not even have taken up the task of writing this thesis. I would also like to express my warmest feelings for my beloved husband Fırat for his enduring love and support during this lengthy process of writing, for my sister Ayşe who has always been there for me despite the difficult time she has also gone through this year, and for the Kocabıyıkoglu and Çeçen families for their support and love. Last but not the least, I would like to thank İlknur for her friendship throughout all these years at this department.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
ÖZET	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER I: NINETEENTH CENTURY: THE CENTURY OF CRUSADES..	8
The Eighteenth Century.....	28
CHAPTER II: THE MEDIEVAL CHURCH AND CHRISTIANITY.....	35
CHAPTER III: THE CRUSADE HERO: RICHARD.....	66
CONCLUSION	101
BIBLIOGRAPHY	103

INTRODUCTION

This thesis is aimed at examining the attitudes of eighteenth-century British historians towards medieval crusades, on which there exists a scarcity of secondary material. Although the literature concerning the crusades as historical material is large, as indicated by general studies, such as those of Elizabeth Siberry, Jonathan Riley-Smith, Aziz Atiya, T.S.R. Boase, J.L. La Monte or Edward Peters,¹ it does not include a great deal about eighteenth-century authors. It is the nineteenth century and its aftermath which is primarily of interest to those historians writing about crusade literature or historiography. There is considerable attention given to medieval chroniclers, but no more than a brief acknowledgement of the period in-between the chroniclers and the nineteenth-century historians.

Although the objectives of study changed through time, the crusades as a historical theme have remained popular ever since the middle ages. It was first medieval piety, then Renaissance chivalry, Reformation zeal, and finally eighteenth-century religious scepticism and nineteenth-century romanticism that triggered different interpretations of the crusades.² However, the glow of the nineteenth century had an overshadowing effect on the previous centuries. As John Simons suggests for the medieval centuries in general, the nineteenth-century interpretations were “so spectacular

¹ Jonathan Riley Smith, ed. *Oxford Illustrated History of the Crusades*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995); Elizabeth Siberry, *The New Crusaders: images of the crusades in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries* (Aldershot, England: Ashgate, 2000); Karen Armstrong, *Holy War* (London: Macmillan, 1988); Aziz S. Atiya, *The Crusade: Historiography and bibliography* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1962); T.S.R. Boase, “Recent Developments in crusading historiography” *History*, 22 (1937): 110-25; J.L. La Monte, “Some Problems in Crusading Historiography” *Speculum*, 15 (1940): 56-75; Edward Peters, “The Firanj are Coming — Again” *Orbis* (Winter 2004), <http://www.fpri.org/orbis/4801/peters.firanj.html/>.

² La Monte, “Crusading Historiography”, 59.

that they have obscured the continuous presence of medievalism as a discourse in English cultural life since the Renaissance.”³ How and why the crusades were so popular and significant in the nineteenth century is the subject matter of my first chapter, which I have included for the purpose of placing what I intend to argue about the eighteenth century in historical context. Depending on the view point, the nineteenth-century outlook can either be regarded as having been prepared by the eighteenth century, or contrasted with it in purpose of defining its distinctiveness.

When I attempted to examine eighteenth century historians’ work in order to find crusade interpretations, I was faced with some difficulties. First of all, the eighteenth century lacked the focus of later centuries which treated the theme of medieval crusades in separate historical works. The authors, if they wrote about the expeditions at all, mentioned them only as part of larger works of history, which usually encompassed the whole or an extensive period of their national history. Most of the histories under examination here are examples of these kinds of multi-volume works. The authors of the earlier part of the century, James Tyrrell, Laurence Echard and Paul Rapin de Thoyras, all chose to tackle the history of England as a whole, while each one of them began at a different point. Tyrrell started with the earliest ages; Rapin took it back to the Vikings; and Echard to the Romans.⁴ David Scott in 1727 wrote a great history of Scotland.⁵ Thomas Carte and Hugh Clarendon tried to encompass everything from the earliest

³ John Simons, “Medievalism as Cultural Process in Pre-industrial Popular Literature” in *Medievalism in England*, ed. Leslie J. Workman (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1992), 6.

⁴ James Tyrrell, *The General History of England both Ecclesiastical and Civil from the earliest accounts of time, to the reign of his present majesty, King William III*, Vol 2 (London: W. Rogers, 1700); Laurence Echard, *The History of England: from the first entrance of Julius Caesar and the Romans, to the end of the reign of King James the first, containing the space of 1678 years*, 2nd ed (London: Jacob Tonson, 1718); Paul Rapin de Thoyras, *The History of England, as well ecclesiastical as civil*, tr. N. Tindal, Vol 2 and 3 (London: James and John Knapton, 1728).

⁵ David Scott, *The History of Scotland: containing all the historical transactions of that nation, from the year of the world 3619 to the year of Christ 1726* (Westminister: J. Cluer and A. Campbell, 1727).

times.⁶ Dr. William Howell, writing in the same decade as Clarendon, Oliver Goldsmith and Robert Henry in the next decade, followed Echard's footsteps and traced the beginnings of the English history to Julius Caesar.⁷ Although Thomas Salmon may be said to have put a special emphasis on the high middle ages as he began his history with the Norman conquest (signifying a continuity in English history from the conquest until the revolution of 1689),⁸ among the historians, only Joseph Berington stands out as the author of medieval histories. His *History of the Lives of Abeillard and Heloisa* and *History of the Reign of Henry II, and Richard and John, his sons* together encompass the period from the late eleventh to the early thirteenth centuries.⁹

The works of these aforementioned historians were selected both because they covered the period of the crusades (roughly put between 1096 and 1291), and also because their authors were significant enough to have been mentioned in the secondary sources on eighteenth-century British history writing. David Allan, J.A.I. Champion, Conkin and Stromberg, John Kenyon, Arthur Marwick, Karen O'Brien, Daniel R. Woolf's, Ernest Bresiach, Rosemary Sweet and Leslie J. Workman¹⁰ have all mentioned

⁶ Thomas Carte, *A General History of England*. Vol 1 and 2 (London: J. Hodges, 1747); Hugh Clarendon, *A New and Authentic History of England: from the remotest period of intelligence to the close of the year 1767* (London: J.Cooke, 1768).

⁷ Dr. William Howell, *The Ancient and Present State of England: being a compendious history of all its monarchs from the Julius Caesar, to the accession of his present majesty George III* (London: T. Osborne, 1766); Oliver Goldsmith, *An Abridgement of the History of England from the Invasion of Julius Caesar to the Death of George II* (London: B.Law, 1774); Robert Henry, *The History of Great Britain from the Invasion of it by Romans under Julius Caesar: written on a new plan*. Vol 3 and 4 (London: T.Cadell, 1777).

⁸ Thomas Salmon, *A Review of the History of England: containing the titles and pretensions of our several kings, and the most remarkable transactions and occurrences in each reign, from the Conquest to the Revolution*, Vol 1 (London: Charles Rivington, 1724).

⁹ Joseph Berington, *History of the Lives of Abeillard and Heloisa: comprising a period of eighty-four years, from 1079 to 1163, with their genuine letters from the collection of Amboise*, 2nd ed (London: G.G.J. & J. Robinson, 1788); *History of the Reign of Henry II, and Richard and John, his sons, (from 1154-1216)* (London: G.G.J. & J. Robinson, 1790).

¹⁰ David Allan, *Virtue, Learning and the Scottish Enlightenment* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1993); J. A. I Champion, *The Pillars of Priestcraft Shaken: the Church of England and its enemies, 1660-1730* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992); Paul Keith Conkin and Roland N. Stromberg,

at least one of these historians, though with no special attention towards the parts of their histories about the crusades. Although the fact that the majority of my historians were of Whig political tendency may be taken as a flaw in this dissertation, I might reply that the eighteenth century was after all a period of Whig ascendancy.

What I intend is an analysis of thought about the medieval crusades, among historians who wrote on the period, or at least a part of the period, encompassing the crusades. Among the historians, James Tyrrell, Laurence Echard and Paul Rapin de Thoyras were impossible to ignore due to the popularity of their histories. Thomas Salmon, not such a popular historian, was heavily dependent on these early century authors. Thomas Carte's history, though an extensive one, did not deal with crusades much except for Richard's. In late century, there were not so many prominent historians who dealt with the subject, except maybe for Joseph Berington. Robert Henry was not very significant; David Scott wrote mainly about Scotland; and William Howell wrote briefly on each reign, without any particular attention to the crusades. Oliver Goldsmith, famed as a poet, took up history writing only as a means of earning his living. Therefore, the bulk of the quotations to be examined are from Tyrrell, Echard, Rapin and Berington, with occasional interventions from others including such prominent Enlightenment writers as Gibbon, Hume and Robertson, and the Gothicism Horace Walpole.

Heritage and Challenge: the history and theory of history (Arlington Heights, Ill: Forum Press, 1989); John Phillips Kenyon, *The History Men: the historical profession in England since the Renaissance* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1993); Arthur Marwick, *The Nature of History* (Houndmills: Macmillan, 1991); Karen O'Brien, *Narratives of Enlightenment: cosmopolitan history from Voltaire to Gibbon* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997); Daniel R. Woolf, *Reading History in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000) Ernst Breisach, *Historiography: Ancient, Medieval & Modern* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994); Rosemary Sweet, *Antiquaries: The Discovery of the Past in Eighteenth Century Britain* (Hambledon & London Ltd ,2004); Leslie J.Workman, ed., *Medievalism in England* (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1992); Leslie J.Workman and Kathleen Verduin, eds., *Medievalism in England II*, (Cambridge: Brewer, 1996).

The greatest obstacle in deriving crusade interpretations from histories not exclusively written on crusades was to try to ascertain the general attitude of the authors from often scant pieces of information that might not usually make any sense. Crusades, for the eighteenth-century authors, might not have had much significance and have been neglected in the narrative. It was not the crusades as a whole, but the histories of individual crusades that attracted the attention of the history writers. While the first and the second crusades, not enjoying the involvement of any English monarch, did not receive extensive treatment by the historians, the third crusade, involving Richard the Lionheart was usually narrated at great length. Even Edward I's crusade in late thirteenth century was given a substantial place in these histories, despite its brevity and lack of success. Thus, the eighteenth-century authors, keen on recounting histories of their nation, focused on the monarchs and the events of their reigns, rather than examining significant historical events.

I attempt to present the historians' views on crusades in a meaningful and comprehensible way. Having read the parts of the histories in question, I note two concerns: religious and heroic. I deal with these concerns separately as they seem to have been independent of each other, and arising from different influences. Thus, I place the crusade interpretations under two headings, with subheadings, each indicating an aspect of the wider subject. As it is impossible to analyse the works without providing a background, I have incorporated the religious, political, intellectual and social trends of the eighteenth century, in order to identify the different influences affecting the interpretations.

The first chapter is intended as an introduction to crusade interpretations and to distinguish the eighteenth century from what comes after. An analysis of the subsequent century is given to provide the eighteenth century with a contrast, and to put eighteenth-century interpretations into a context of different or similar treatments of the same material. The chapter seeks to explain the greatly increased interest in the crusades in the nineteenth century, covering extensive ground, from social habits, travel, literature, art to politics. It also examines the influences on crusade histories, which are considered chiefly as two in early century: romanticism and the Catholic revival. Although greater emphasis is put on the first part of the century to establish a continuity (or a discontinuity) with the preceding century, the later century developments of nationalism and the increased availability of sources, are also mentioned as adding to the preoccupation with medieval histories and thus indirectly to that with crusade interpretations.

The second chapter, turning to the previous century, is about the eighteenth-century historians' interpretations of "The Medieval Church and Christianity" during the period of the crusades. This chapter is placed before "The Crusade Heroes: Richard, Saladin, Phillippe and Edward," primarily for two reasons. First of all, religion was a basic ingredient of the crusades. As a cult of the medieval church, they were accomplished by the efforts of the church both to legitimize knightly activities and to serve its purposes. Moreover, as much as it had been in the medieval period, religion was still a very decisive element in the political, intellectual and social background of the eighteenth century which had a direct influence on the views of the authors of different backgrounds on the role of the medieval church and Christianity in the crusades. Bearing in mind that the Enlightenment was born out of a theological debate, religion was a more

central issue in the eighteenth century than the nature of heroes or definitions of kingship. Thus, I suggest that religion was the decisive element in distinguishing the eighteenth-century crusade interpretations from those in any other century.

On the other hand, the material on crusade heroes is much more extensive than that on the church and Christianity with an emphasis on Richard the Lionheart that was too remarkable to ignore. He came to be the central figure, as the greatest English hero in the crusades. To historians of the eighteenth century, he was so important that they could not possibly stop praising his heroism in the crusade, as much as they attacked his kingship. Saladin Eyyoubi, Phillippe Augustus, Edward I, were all peripheral to Richard's image. While "Richard of the legend" was defined through contrasts and comparisons with his contemporaries Saladin and Phillippe, Edward, nearly a century later, existed as a crusading hero only due to the prospects of creating a new Richard out of him.

Following the organization provided above, the objective of this study is to present the contribution of eighteenth-century historians to crusade historiography, of which we have little knowledge through the secondary sources; and in doing that, to try to determine the influences in the interpretations of the historians, which may or may not have been related to the tendencies in the century.

CHAPTER I

Nineteenth Century: the century of the crusades

Two entries made under the word *crusade* in the *Encyclopedia Britannica* explain the difference in the eighteenth and nineteenth-century outlooks on the crusades. In contrast to the 1778 entry describing the expeditions as “the effects of the most absurd superstition,” the 1842 entry spoke of “an imposing spectacle.”¹¹ Edward Peters, in his

¹¹ Siberry, *New Crusaders*, 28.

article “The Firanj are Coming,” identifies the nineteenth century as “the beginning of European revisionist historiography on the crusades,” in addition to a turn away from the Enlightenment views (of Voltaire, Hume, Robertson, Diderot and Gibbon) that are taken to characterise the eighteenth-century European thought.¹²

Michaud, the most celebrated nineteenth century historian of the crusades, believed that the crusades “supplied abundance of edifying matter to the statesman, the philosopher, the poet, the novelist and the citizen,”¹³ perhaps not feeling the need to emphasise their use to the historian. Thus, before going on with the crusades as material to the historian, and the influences and trends that made them an interest, it is desirable to provide a brief introduction to the crusades as material to others. Reversing the order of Michaud, we may start with “the citizen.” Partly as an extension of the love of the Gothic in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and partly as interplay of the rising western interest in the east presumed to have begun with Napoleon’s Egyptian campaign, from the early decades of the latter century, the notion of crusade was an object of fashion in European society.¹⁴ This fashion manifested itself in various ways, such as travels to the east in the footsteps of a crusading ancestor, accompanied with performance of knighting ceremonies on the spot, etc. There were other ways of commemorating and showing off crusading ancestors. Heraldic devices with crusading insignia, remnants from crusades, etc. were displayed to guests in aristocratic homes.¹⁵

The dedicated enthusiasts took their obsession with the crusades so far that they even

¹² Edward Peters, “Firanj”.

¹³ Siberry, *New Crusaders*, 8 She is citing the comment from Michaud’s preface to his *Histoire des Croisades (1817-22)* which was translated into English in 1852.

¹⁴ Siberry, *New Crusaders*, 140.

¹⁵ Elizabeth Siberry, “Images of the Crusades in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries” in *Oxford Illustrated History of the Crusades*, ed. Jonathan Riley-Smith (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 366-70.

attempted the revival of military orders¹⁶ and the establishment of a Christian state in the Holy Land.¹⁷

Their travels to the east usually inspired the travellers to communicate their experiences and impressions to fellow countrymen in the form of travelogues or literary pieces. However, what they depicted did not often reflect the reality of these lands but the author's own imagination. Many of the early century travellers, including Chateaubriand, Disraeli and Lord Byron, in their writings, perceived the east as the mystical land of the medieval crusades, rather than a part of the nineteenth-century Ottoman Empire inhabited by an Arab population.¹⁸ Chateaubriand wrote that he travelled with "the idea, the object and the sentiments of an ancient pilgrim," Sir William Hillary, later to become famous for his endeavours at trying to establish a Christian state in the holy land, wrote in his pamphlet that "numerous bodies of knights [were] flocking to Palestine." Then in late century, John Dalton, the chaplain to the sons of the Prince of Wales, wishfully thought that, "that the Franks are about to return is the firm belief ... [They] would be heartily welcomed ... as a deliverance from the yoke of the Turk."¹⁹

In literature, crusades received interest as a part of the popularity of the medieval theme. In early nineteenth century, the works of Sir Walter Scott (whose best known novels were *Ivanhoe* [1819] and *The Tales of the Crusaders* [1825]) and Lord Byron (who had received overnight fame with his *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage*), were the most easily sold out along with Macaulay's history.²⁰ Moreover, Disraeli's Young England trilogy in the 1840s (composed of *Tancred*, *Coningsby* and *Sybil*), along with his other

¹⁶ Siberry, *New Crusaders*, 73-5 and 81-2.

¹⁷ Siberry, "Images of Crusades", 370-1.

¹⁸ Ibid., 366-7.

¹⁹ Siberry, *New Crusaders*, 66-7 and 78.

²⁰ Kenyon, *History Men*, 72.

works like *Contarini Fleming, Alroy and Lothair* were influenced by the chivalry and the crusading spirit of the middle ages. In addition to novels, various plays with the crusade theme were also staged in the early century, such as *The Saint* by Charles Kingsley, *The Blood Red Knight* (1810), *The Siege of Jerusalem* (1835), and *Richard and Saladin* (1843).²¹ In other spheres of artistic creation like music, poetry and painting, artists were equally influenced by the crusade theme: Verdi's *Jerusalem*, Rossini's *Armide*, Brahms' *Rinaldo*, Wordsworth's *Ecclesiastical Sonnets*, Lessing's *the Crusader's Vigil* and Delacroix's *The entry of the Crusaders into Constantinople* in early century were examples of this influence.²²

Apart from travel writing, literature and art, the crusades also supplied material to politics. Although some historians tend to treat the Vienna Campaign of 1683 as the last Christian crusade against Islam, we still observe substantial use of the notion of crusade in the military campaigns of the nineteenth century. In the discourses of the politicians, the wars fought in the east were often presented with reference to the crusades, for the purpose of appealing to the public opinion. Such was the case with the Crimean War (1853) and the Balkan War of 1877-8. These two wars erupted with talk of the security of the Holy Places or the condition of the Christian population under Muslim rule. Moreover, there had been the early century competition between European powers for the right to protect the Holy Places that manifested itself in the establishment of Jerusalem

²¹ Siberry, "Images of Crusades", 366-7 and 377-8; Siberry, *New Crusaders*, 65.

²² Siberry, "Images of Crusades", 373-81; Siberry, *New Crusaders*, 133.

consulates.²³ Related to the security of the Holy Places was the protection of the oppressed Christian community under the Turkish rule.²⁴

In the Crimean War, although the English fought on the side of the Turks against the Russians, in English public opinion the war was promoted as a kind of crusade against tyrants and oppressors, to rescue the Holy Places.²⁵ It is also remarkable that this was the last British war that began with the proclamation of a General Fast, and that the church attributed military disasters of the war to sin (i.e. neglect of public worship, drunkenness, etc).²⁶ Those both for and against the war used the crusade literature in their discourses. While the Church “preached the crusade against the Russians,” the opponents of the war (politicians as well as intellectuals and churchmen like Newman) described the Turks as “barbarians who hated all Christians,” identifying them with the Anti-Christ, described the war as un-Christian and the signing of the peace treaty as a sin against the oppressed Christians.²⁷ The 1878-8 Russo-Turkish War was also launched and conducted with talk of the mistreatment of Christians under Ottoman rule. The anti-Turkish views dominated the public opinion during this campaign, and the preachers against Turkish rule in the Balkans identified themselves with Peter the Hermit and St. Bernard.²⁸ The usage of crusade terminology in the period was not confined to the aforementioned wars. The objective of Napoleon’s 1798 Egyptian campaign was often linked to apocalyptic notions; in the defence of Acre against the French, the English on the side of the

²³ Ibid., 72.

²⁴ Norman Lowe, *Mastering Modern British History* (London : Macmillan, 1989), 163; Ann Pottinger Saab, *The Origins of the Crimean Alliance* (Charlottesville : University Press of Virginia, 1977), 9

²⁵ Siberry, “Images of Crusades”, 372.

²⁶ Siberry, *New Crusaders*, 83-4.

²⁷ Lowe, *British History*, 171.

²⁸ Siberry, *New Crusaders*, 84.

Ottomans were again depicted in crusading terminology by artists and writers.²⁹ All these wars, in turn, were also a source of inspiration to novelists, playwrights, poets, painters and so on who romanticised them by drawing parallels with the crusades.³⁰

An investigation of why and how the nineteenth century crusade histories were written requires us to look at the currents of influence that helped create the mind of the century. As the eighteenth-century histories of the crusades reflected the mind of the century in which they were written, by the same token, the histories of the following century reflect the nineteenth-century mind. Cantor asserts that

[i]t is well known that the image of the middle ages which obtained at any given period in early modern Europe tells us more about the difficulties and dilemmas, the intellectual commitments of the men of the period than it does about the medieval world itself.³¹

As J.W. Burrows remarks:

One of the ways in which a society reveals itself, and its assumptions and beliefs about its own character and destiny, is by its attitudes to and uses of the past ...³²

Although nineteenth-century historians did not have a uniform attitude towards the crusades (or the middle ages in general) they did have a particular interest in the period. It is notable that most of the significant histories of the nineteenth century were either medieval or included a narrative of part of the medieval period (though the period in question was not necessarily that of the crusades). In England, Sharon Turner, Henry Hallam, Charles Mills, Henry Stebbing, Francis Palgrave and Bishop William Stubbs were the most renowned of those historians, who wrote exclusively about the middle ages.

²⁹ Ibid., 140.

³⁰ Siberry, *Images of Crusades*, 378-9; Siberry, *New Crusaders*, 84-6.

³¹ Norman F. Cantor, *The Meaning of the Middle Ages: a sociological and cultural history* (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1973), 5.

³² Gertrude Himmelfarb, *The New History and the Old* (Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1987), 145.

Before elaborating on the British historical writing on the crusades, we may also consider briefly the French and German historical writing on the subject, as these countries produced more significant crusade histories than Britain during the century. The French historians were the first to focus on the critical use of original sources that were more and more available to historians' during the century. French historiography combined this critical use of the sources with romantic interests.³³ Romanticism in France was born out of the efforts of the post-revolutionary period (1815-1830) to idealise the medieval past as a part of the ancient regime.³⁴ Michaud, in support of the restored monarchy in France, narrated the story of the crusades, as he sought to remind the nation of past national and royal glories. In his three-volume *Historie des croisades* (1817-22), he described them as "one of the most important events of the middle ages," with the following comment: "providence sometimes employs great revolutions to enlighten mankind."³⁵ His experience in the middle east confirmed his romantic view of the crusades: in compliance with the fashion of his day, he travelled to the Holy Land and was made a knight of the Holy Sepulchre there.³⁶ German crusade historiography was the most substantial in Europe, along with that of France, in the century.³⁷ Friedrich Wilken's work *Geschichte der Kreuzzuge nach morgenlandischen und abendlandischen berichten* (1807-32) was to remain a key text until very late in the century. Keightley, the British historian, used the works of Michaud and Wilken as his chief references, which he explained, "saved him much labour in consulting the original authorities."³⁸ The attitude

³³ Peters, "Firanj".

³⁴ Ceri Crossley, *French Historians and Romanticism : Thierry, Guizot, the Saint-Simonians, Quinet, Michelet* (London: Routledge, 1993), 40-1.

³⁵ Siberry, *New Crusaders*, 8.

³⁶ Siberry, "Images of Crusades", 372.

³⁷ Siberry, *New Crusaders*, 7.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 18.

of the German historian Von Sybel agreed with that of Michaud, as he described the crusades as: “one of the greatest revolutions that has ever taken place in the history of the human race.”³⁹

Before going on with the nineteenth century influences that amplified the interest in crusade histories, it is necessary to point out that the nineteenth century had an interest in history in general. Some have attributed this to the influence of romantic currents and the Catholic revival in the early part of the century, some to growing nationalism and the need to create a national historical identity later in the century, which affected and was affected by the increasing availability of sources. On the other hand, it would be erroneous to assume that history was a neglected field of study in the eighteenth century either. On the contrary, Gibbon had called attention to the importance of the study of history in the period by describing the age as the “historical age.” What changed between the two centuries were the methods and objectives of historical studies. Moreover, the “growing appetite for history” in the nineteenth century, producing a quantity of medieval histories was remarkably more extensive than that of the eighteenth century.⁴⁰ Lord Acton, the late-century British historian, asserted the influence of romanticism in “the development of historical mentality,” as it introduced the study of history on its own terms, as well as history for its own sake, and helped to arrive at an understanding of the study of the past.⁴¹ The romantic appeal of the crusades combined with the interest in the east (resulting in the study of Arab sources), “gave the crusades a prominent place in the

³⁹ Ibid., 9.

⁴⁰ Leslie J. Workman, editorial to *Medievalism in Europe*, ed. Leslie J. Workman (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1994), 3.

⁴¹ Herbert Butterfield, *Man on his Past: the study of the history of historical scholarship* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1955), 70-2.

nineteenth century historical revival.” To this was added the impact of colonial interests in the last quarter of the century.⁴²

By the nineteenth century, the dark image of the middle ages that had been created by the Renaissance and the Reformation had started to change into a lighter, more benevolent reflection of a past that was very different from the (criticized) present. The difference between the previous dismissal of the age as not useful and its nineteenth-century definition is also reflected in the usage of terminology to define the period. Whereas before, the term “dark ages” was often used interchangeably with the “middle ages,” towards the end of the nineteenth century this identification was lost, accompanied by a clearer definition of the middle ages and diminution of the concept of its continuity of the ancient world.⁴³

However, if we trace the transformation of the darkness idea in the writings of the historians from the late eighteenth to the late nineteenth century, we will notice that there was no overnight change. The darkness was an intellectual one existing with and caused by a spiritual darkness, the presence of the Roman Catholic Church, acting as a direct influence on beliefs and a more indirect one on the learning of the period.⁴⁴ The association of darkness and light with ignorance and learning goes back to the seventeenth century in England and the eighteenth century included also rudeness and ferocity in the definition of the darkness.⁴⁵

⁴² Boase, “Recent Developments”, 110.

⁴³ Workman, *Medievalism*, 1.

⁴⁴ E.G. Stanley, “The Early Middle Ages=The Dark Ages=The Heroic Age of England and in English” in *The Middle Ages after the Middle Ages in the English-speaking World*, eds. Marie-Françoise Alamichel and Derek Brewer (Rochester, N.Y: D.S. Brewer, 1997), 46-7.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 49 and 60.

We see a gradual development of a positive view of the medieval world through the late eighteenth century into the nineteenth that manifested itself both as an admiration of the Gothic and the chivalry of the ages and also an idealization of the medieval church. The former of these approaches can be traced back to late eighteenth century when the historian, Richard Hurd, saw an agreement between heroic and Gothic manners, the term heroic representing the ancient Greek in this context. Bishop Thirlwall in 1835 took up the idea and “compared the Greek heroic age with [the] age of chivalry.” H.M. Chadwick, in late nineteenth century, still made the same comparison.⁴⁶ To a great extent, we owe the changing evaluation of the middle ages to the nineteenth-century romantics, when it was liberated from the “barbaric, ignorant and superstitious image” by the historians, poets, novelists, artists, etc.⁴⁷ In Cantor’s words, “At the hands of the romantics, the middle ages suddenly received good press.” In the new representations of the period, it no longer had an image of darkness but one shining with “idealism, spirituality, heroism and adoration of women.”⁴⁸

However, we do not immediately see a consistent sympathy with the crusades (or with the middle ages in general) when the century opens. Just at the turn of the century, we come across two significant histories of the middle ages, which approach the period with totally contrasting views. While Sharon Turner, the author of the *History of England from the Norman Conquest to the Reign of Edward I* (1814-23) departed completely from the Enlightenment view, criticizing past historians who had attacked the crusades, Henry Hallam in his *Sketch of Europe in the Middle Ages* (1818) did not seem to differ much in

⁴⁶ Ibid., 73-4.

⁴⁷ Norman F. Cantor, *Inventing the Middle Ages: the lives, works, and ideas of the great medievalists of the twentieth century* (Cambridge : Lutterworth Press, 1992), 28-9.

⁴⁸ Cantor, *Meaning*, 5.

opinion from the generality of the past century (acknowledging in the preface that he was born in the century of Voltaire and Hume). G.P. Gooch describes Hallam as, although “far removed from the contemptuous attitude of the eighteenth century towards ecclesiastical power, having a Whiggish contempt for clerical domination,” giving as example his scornful descriptions of the pretensions of Hildebrand and Innocent.⁴⁹ Hallam was more “a philosopher and a judge” of the past with “the pragmatic spirit of the eighteenth century,” painting a dark picture of medieval society, literature, education and commerce, although he made a distinction between the early and the high middle ages. Instead of condemning the whole period up to the Renaissance as dark, he projected the darkness towards the centuries before the twelfth, as ages “so barren of events worthy of remembrance.” He attributed the darkness of the early middle ages to their papal dominated learning and a “deplorable state of barbarism.”⁵⁰

... A prepossession against secular learning had taken hold of those ecclesiastics who gave the tone to the rest; it was inculcated in the most extravagant degree by Gregory I, the founder, in a great measure, of the papal supremacy, and the chief authority in the dark ages.... The tenth century used to be reckoned by medieval historians the darkest part of this intellectual night.... This, however, is much rather applicable to Italy and England, than to France and Germany. The former were both in a deplorable state of barbarism ...

The romantic novelist, William Godwin used a similar approach to Hallam's, which brightened the image of the middle ages. His dark ages of England were the pre-Conquest period, which made him celebrate 1066 as the beginning of “the introduction of politeness and learning.” This view was to be taken up later by others into the twentieth century.⁵¹

⁴⁹ G.P. Gooch, *History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century* (London: Longmans, 1913), 283.

⁵⁰ Stanley, “Early Middle Ages”, 64-5.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 61 and 65.

On the other hand, Turner extended the brightness to the middle ages as a whole. He exalted the period above his own as an age “when men feel rather than calculate” as opposed to those ages in which “knowledge has chilled the sensibility or selfish interest hardened the heart.”⁵² Although in England, romantic currents did not interact in the construction of a national identity in quite the same way as in France or Germany, the romantic spirit was transfused into the writings of the early period, and in this the influence of Sir Walter Scott’s depiction of the middle ages is not to be dismissed.⁵³ The romantic outlook was triggered by a dislike of the “excessive rationalism” and the materialism of the Augustan age. The middle ages for the romantics constituted a place they “sought comfort and refuge,” in their appeal to the “values of the heart and imagination.” The middle ages thus represented a spiritual idealism.⁵⁴ For the romantics, the middle ages were an ideological projection. Whereas those before them were proud of the modern civilization, they found the industrialized, nationalized and rational modern world repulsive and sought an alternative world, where the contrasts produced a happier society.⁵⁵ In that, what the image of chivalry meant to the nineteenth century was not so different from its meaning when initially constructed in the middle ages. Even in those ages in which chivalry originated, it was not a true reflection of the reality of the knightly behaviour, but the commending of an “altruism for redressing wrongs” in the social system.⁵⁶ Similarly, nineteenth-century romanticism embraced the chivalric codes of

⁵² Siberry, *New Crusaders*, 9-10.

⁵³ Breisach, *Historiography*, 252.

⁵⁴ Cantor, *Meaning*, 5.

⁵⁵ Cantor, *Inventing*, 29.

⁵⁶ Jeremy duQuesnay Adams, “Modern Views of Medieval Chivalry,” in *The Study of Chivalry: resources and approaches*, eds. Howell Chickering and Thomas H. Seiler (Kalamazoo, Mich.: Medieval Institute Publications, Western Michigan University, 1988), 148.

behaviour of the distant past ages not for what they were, but as a representative of the missing values of contemporary society.

Together with romanticism, another influence encouraging sympathy towards the middle ages was the positive appraisal of the medieval church, which accompanied a Catholic revival in England as elsewhere. Following the precipitate move to toleration of non-Anglican Protestants, the 1820s saw an inclusion of all non-conformists, including the Roman Catholics, in parliament. Increasing state intervention in the church matters, coupled with the validation of the non-conformist political positions, could easily lead to the former dissenting Catholics raising voices while also surfacing the tendency to embrace a religion less intervened by state. The revival of Catholicism, which took place towards the mid-century, was initially associated with the Tractarians or Oxford Movement. The movement was naturally in support of a church that had been historically authoritative and emphasised clerical hierarchy. These “restatements of the Catholic position” were, according to Medhurst and Moyser, responses to “liberal ‘modernist’ currents of thought” which, in turn, were heirs to eighteenth century latitudinarian views of religion, as well as to the evangelical revival of the same period.⁵⁷

Butterfield quotes Acton’s assertion that Romanticism “had the effect of producing sympathy for the Catholic cause,” thus linking the earlier Catholic revival of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries to the romantic currents of thought in the same period. He found that the romantic pursuit of judging the medieval past on its own terms worked into the hands of the promoters of Catholicism who were freed from

⁵⁷ K.Medhurst and G.Mayer, *Church and Politics in a Secular Age* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988), 11-13.

making excuses for the character of the medieval church.⁵⁸ Acton suggested that at first the defence of the middle ages was for the cause of Catholicism and that a real understanding of the period only came later.⁵⁹

The Catholic portrayal of the medieval church in the former century was best exemplified in Joseph Berington's works whose "assaults on popes were felt both unseemly and ominously reminiscent of sceptics like Hume."⁶⁰ Although Berington's views received support from Lingard in the early nineteenth century (*History of England*, 1819), the prevalent nineteenth century view of the medieval church was not to be that of Berington. Lingard, although a Catholic writer, was impartial in his account of the medieval church. This was apparent in his balanced portrayal of Becket.⁶¹ He neither had the prejudices of contemporary historians nor sympathised with what the age called enthusiasm. Dr. John Milner drew a completely different picture from these balanced portraits by idealizing the Roman Catholic centuries in his *History of Winchester* in 1798. His aim being the assertion of Catholic superiority, he saw his contemporary church as the heir of this realized ideal that existed in an idealized era. The medieval society that inspired the present was superior to the present one by the virtue of its religion.⁶² Milner's ideas, unlike Berington's, survived well into the late nineteenth century.⁶³ Cobbett, writing in the early nineteenth century made use of Milner's ideas, as well as of High Church Anglican and Non-Juring writers, as he traced the English Catholic Church

⁵⁸ Butterfield, *Man on his Past*, 71-2.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 69-70.

⁶⁰ R.J. Smith, "Cobbett, Catholic History and the Middle Ages," in *Medievalism in England II*, eds. Leslie J. Workman and Kathleen Verduin (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1996), 118.

⁶¹ Gooch, *History and Historians*, 284.

⁶² Smith, "Cobbett", 117-8.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 133.

to the Norman Conquest, and depicted the medieval period as a golden age.⁶⁴ Cobbett, in this respect, was influenced by the Gothic revival as much as by the Catholic idealization of the middle ages. Others, among whom Carlyle was a significant author, were affected by Cobbett and used the glorification of middle ages in a more extensive criticism of their society. Indeed, the condition of England question that involved issues like urbanism, industrialism, capitalism, pauperism and Protestantism, occupied the minds and writings of many authors in the century who played the idealized image of the middle ages against their own age. The novelist and the future prime-minister Benjamin Disraeli was one of these critics in mid century.⁶⁵

After Henry Hallam, with views closer to those of the Enlightenment, and Sharon Turner, with his positive appraisal of the crusades as a cult of the medieval church, Charles Mills, in 1820, wrote his *History of the Crusades for the Recovery and Possession of the Holy Land*, “the first significant crusade history in post-1800 England.” The work echoed Turner in its rejection of Enlightenment views. Like Turner, he declared the Enlightenment to have been “aimed at the destruction of Christianity” and “the path to infidelity.” As suggested by his holding a positive view of the medieval church, he was under romantic influence, manifested by his use of Torquato Tasso’s *Gerusalemme Liberata*, which, although a sixteenth century work, became an influence in the construction of the crusading image in the nineteenth century. Moreover Mills, unlike the authors of the preceding century, who lacked a notion of the east as a separate entity in the history of the crusades, acknowledged its presence by using a translation of

⁶⁴ Ibid., 121,128-9.

⁶⁵ Ibid., 133-4.

an Arabic history among his sources.⁶⁶ On the other hand, Mills did not deviate very much from eighteenth-century views in so far as heroism is concerned. Siberry sums up his attitude as follows:

While he recognized examples of individual heroism and idealism, he accepted that these could coexist with selfish ambition and cruelty.⁶⁷

Whereas we still detect some criticism of the middle ages in Mills, ten years later, George Payne Rainsford James completed the rejection of his eighteenth-century counterparts. In his *History of Chivalry* (1830), he rejected the one accusation that Mills offered against the crusaders: brutality. Contending that “history should be evaluated in its own terms,” he justified the brutal acts of the crusaders whom he exalted for their chivalry.⁶⁸ Another history written in 1830 was that of Henry Stebbing, a *History of Chivalry and the Crusades*. He too, like Mills, used romantic narratives like Tasso and Michaud as sources (although he also used Gibbon), and was positive about the religious motives of the crusades, both in terms of institution and faith. He described the crusades as “those remarkable wars,” motivated by “the sentiment which gave birth to the grandeur of ecclesiastical institutions; which set men searching for external modes of showing their faith and embodying their feelings in processions.”⁶⁹

Romanticism manifests itself mostly as an early to mid-century influence on the English historians. Whereas the prominent British historians of the mid-century, Carlyle and Macaulay were under the influence of Scotts’ romanticism, in the late century, William Stubbs and Edward Freeman were inclined towards a Rankean model of

⁶⁶ Siberry, *New Crusaders*, 11.

⁶⁷ Ibid., 14.

⁶⁸ Ibid., 15.

⁶⁹ Ibid., 16.

scientific history.⁷⁰ Lord Acton marks 1860 as the end of the influence of romanticism in the portrayal of the middle ages: “The preference for the middle ages remained as a tendency but it was no more a danger to literature.”⁷¹ Thomas Keightley, in his *The Crusaders: scenes, events and characters from the times of the crusades* (1833-4) agreed with Rainsford James on the authenticity of the middle ages, but with the object of celebrating his own age rather than with a yearning for the medieval past. The view that the crusades were at the same time both “idiotic and flagrantly wicked” enterprises and the products of “high policy and statesmanship” was articulated by a reviewer in 1844.⁷² Siberry finds a shift from romanticism by the 1830s towards either balanced accounts like Keightley’s or towards anti-Catholic versions of history that became more pronounced in the period. Two accounts published in 1849, George Sargent’s *Sketches of Crusades* and a history by the London Tract society, both manifested anti-Catholic views. Both attempted to display the fanatical superstition and selfish interests behind the crusades and their incompatibility with the doctrines and precepts of divine revelation. These accounts had a close resemblance to some aspects of eighteenth-century writings; but they were counter-attacked by praise of the religious motivation of the crusades. Archibald Alison’s description of crusades in 1846 was the complete opposite view to that of Sargent: he spoke of “the most extraordinary and memorable movement that ever took place in the history of mankind.”⁷³ But still, the striving towards a balanced portrait was not lost. Francis Palgrave in his *History of Normandy and England* (1851–64) reacted against these religiously biased outlooks, and argued for a balanced view far from

⁷⁰ Breisach, *Historiography*, 253 and 255.

⁷¹ Butterfield, *Man on his Past*, 72.

⁷² Siberry, *New Crusaders*, 17-9.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, 20.

both the “depreciation of Protestants and rationalists” who drew a “dark and barbarous” portrait of the middle ages and also from that of “injudicious defenders.”⁷⁴ By late century, the balanced view of the crusades, that evaluated them in their own period, was held by two prominent historians of the period, George Cox (*The Crusades*, 1874) and William Stubbs (*Lectures on Medieval and Modern History*, 1878). Cox saw the crusaders as great actors but did not find all their actions moral, taking notice of the crime in the deeds of the heroes. Although he was critical of the brutality and superstition in the crusades, he nevertheless found some commercial and cultural benefits in them, viewing in the long term. Stubbs also had a neutral outlook on the crusaders: he rejected descriptions of them in “the delusions of cheap popular literature” as “papal conspiracies,” “the explosion of religious intolerance,” or “the savage outbreaks of barbarism.” Instead he chose to justify them in their own period, considering their objectives and results as any other event in history.⁷⁵

The last years of the century were, “one of the most productive for British crusade historiography,” producing a variety of views, mostly the product of party or faction. Whereas the editor of the *Secular View*, who wrote under the pseudonym of Saladin in 1887, attacked the crusades for their “madness” and “bloodiness,”⁷⁶ James M. Ludlow’s *The Age of the Crusades* published in the *Eras of the Christian Church* series (1897), praised the “exalted faith” manifested, but criticized the “grotesque superstition” and the “cruel selfishness” of the crusaders. Another history, *The Crusades* by Thomas A. Archer and Charles Lethbridge Kingsford, published in the *Story of the Nations* series in 1894, was written with a “distinctly English perspective.” In these last decades of the century,

⁷⁴ Gooch, *History and Historians*, 287.

⁷⁵ Siberry, *New Crusaders*, 21-3.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 23.

especially in the 1890s, there was a growing market for crusade histories, generated by the growth in popular and political interest in the east. Colonel Claude Conder's *The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem* published by the Palestine Exploration Fund in 1897 was, not surprisingly, written from the perspective of a surveyor and archaeologist and reflected an orientalist view.⁷⁷

Having mentioned the attitude of the nineteenth-century historians towards heroism and chivalry in crusades (whenever they were available from the secondary sources) in addition to their outlook on medieval church in the crusades, we may also comment briefly about their view of Richard the Lionheart, as the English crusading hero and king. First of all, it is necessary to establish that the nineteenth century was no different from preceding centuries in its attitude toward warlike kings, among whom Richard was a popular example. An example was Keightley, who, in attacked the romantic accounts of the crusades, in which Scott's portrayal of Richard the Lionheart was a particular target.⁷⁸ Authors of the century expected the fulfilment of modern kingly duties in the medieval world, with even more emphasis in late century, as the preoccupation with "nation building" and "administrative kingship" dominated historical narratives.⁷⁹ The Victorian period, Cantor argues, had "superseded romanticism with nationalism."⁸⁰ William Stubbs, already mentioned for his impartial outlook on crusades and crusaders, was one of the most prominent of these late nineteenth-century authors who reflected the Victorian understanding of the good ruler. He was simply unimpressed with Richard's kingly qualities. Richard showed no "political tact" and Stubbs disliked

⁷⁷ Ibid., 24-6.

⁷⁸ Ibid., 17-8.

⁷⁹ Ralph V. Turner and Richard R. Heiser, *The Reign of Richard Lionheart : ruler of the Angevin empire, 1189-99* (Harlow, England: Longman, 2000), 3-4.

⁸⁰ Cantor, *Inventing*, 79.

his warlike traits. He was “an unscrupulous and impetuous soldier” with the “cardinal trait of ‘love of warfare.’”⁸¹ This account of Richard in his *Constitutional History* was closer to Hume’s certain comments though Hume himself had also glorified Richard as a hero. While the latter had drawn attention to “a perpetual scene of blood and violence” during Richard’s reign, Stubbs talked of him as “a man of blood” and “familiar with slaughter.”⁸²

The development of nation states in late nineteenth century also contributed to the more extensive study of the middle ages, for the purpose of creation of a common national past. Norman Cantor asserts that “[i]n western Europe, nationalist ideologies of the nineteenth century encouraged close study of the middle ages in western Europe, because the modern European states were presumed to have had their foundations laid in the medieval world.” This precipitated archival work. During the period 1840 and 1880, in France, Germany and England, it was government subsidies that “initiated serious archival research and the publication of many medieval records.”⁸³ Although the Society of Antiquaries had been in existence since 1751 for the purpose, its achievements had not been collective or organized ones, just as the Record Commission, founded in the beginning of the nineteenth century, could only render itself useful in 1836.⁸⁴ The increase in the availability of the sources, for the study of the middle ages in general worked as a great incentive for more historians to take up the study of the crusades. The lack of sources was the constraint of the eighteenth-century historian, who although never an enthusiast for searching for historical evidence in archives (often despising the process

⁸¹ Turner and Heiser, *Reign of Richard*, 3-4.

⁸² John Gillingham, *Richard I* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999), 2.

⁸³ Norman F. Cantor, introduction to *The Encyclopedia of the Middle Ages*, eds. Norman F. Cantor, Elizabeth Brown et al. (New York: Viking Press, 1999), 7.

⁸⁴ Gooch, *History and Historians*, 285-6.

as “fact-grubbing”), was prevented from entering many important archives anyway.⁸⁵ In Britain, as well as in France or Germany, crusade sources began to be collected in various archives: in France the *Recueil des historiens des croisades*, that had been started by the Benedictines before the Revolution and had gone through a period of neglect during half a century, was eventually ready for publication in 1841.⁸⁶ Another archival source was *Archives de l’orient latin* that was published at the same time by *Société d’orient latin*. In Britain, the exploration and publication for new sources to cast light on the age of crusades happened at much the same time as in France: the *Chronicles of crusades* were collected in 1848 and the *Chronicles and memorials of Great Britain and Ireland in the middle ages* between 1858 and 1911. Then, in the later decades of the century, came translations of Joinville and Villerhardouin.⁸⁷

The Eighteenth Century

Having elaborated on the crusades as an inspiration to the “traveller, novelist, playwright, composer, poet and politician,” of the nineteenth century, it would be wrong to argue that they were not such an inspiration in eighteenth century at all. Two travelogues written in different periods in the century may be offered as examples illustrating at least that the east was attractive to the eighteenth century traveller. *Two Journeys to Jerusalem* (1715) comprises both an account of a contemporary pilgrimage and also those of fourteen late seventeenth century travellers to Jerusalem, suggesting that Jerusalem as a destination of pilgrimage or otherwise was of interest in the eighteenth century as much as the preceding or following centuries. Although the identity

⁸⁵ Marwick, *Nature of History*, 38.

⁸⁶ Siberry, “Images of Crusades”, 372.

⁸⁷ Siberry, *New Crusaders*, 6-7.

of the compiler of these pieces is unknown (as he only gives his initials), the fact that he has devoted a third section of the work to the “miserable situation” of Jewry in the Holy Lands suggests that he might himself have been a Jew. The author of the pilgrimage account, on the other hand, is more contemptuous of the French and the Catholics than of the Turks. The other account, belonging to late seventeenth century, is also void of remarks that indicate a crusading attitude towards the inhabitants of these lands.⁸⁸ Lord Baltimore’s *Tour to the East with Remarks on the City of Constantinople and the Turks in the Years 1763 and 1764: select pieces of oriental wit, poetry and wisdom* (1767), judging from its sub-title, may indicate an admiration of the east. This is a detailed description of the Ottomans with an emphasis on Constantinople, in which the author compared and contrasted the eastern and western ways quite impartially and without any remarks of religious or other kind of contempt towards the Turks.⁸⁹

Of the eighteenth-century drama, a number of tragedies that took their characters from crusade heroes deserve attention. These are James Thomson’s *Edward and Eleanora* (1739) (later to be adapted by Thomas Hull), *Tancred and Sigismunda* (1745) and Hull’s own *Richard Plantagenet* (1774).⁹⁰ Thomson, although not a Walter Scott or Lord Byron, seems to have been quite a well-paid poet and playwright in his own time,⁹¹ whereas Hull was a more obscure figure in comparison with him. On the other hand, Hull’s later adaptation of Thomson’s play may also be supporting the possibility that a

⁸⁸ R.B., ed., *Two Journeys to Jerusalem* (London: Nath. Crouch, 1715).

⁸⁹ Lord Baltimore, *Tour to the East in the Years 1763 and 1764: with remarks on the city of Constantinople and the Turks* (London: W. Richardson and S. Clark, 1767).

⁹⁰ James Thomson, *Tancred and Sigismunda, a Tragedy* (London: James Magee, 1745); Thomas Hull, *Richard Plantagenet, a Legendary Tale* (London: John Bell, 1774); Hull, *Edward and Eleanora, a Tragedy* (London: John Bell, 1739).

⁹¹ James Sambrook, "A just balance between patronage and the press: The case of James Thomson," *Studies in the Literary Imagination* (Spring 2001),

http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa3822/is_200104/ai_n8948581/pg_6

crusade theme was popular with the eighteenth-century audience in England. *Edward and Eleanora*, although presenting a romantic portrayal of Edward (“... Edward, illustrious heir of England’s crown ...”),⁹² reflects the opinion that he should return home from the crusade as the holy cause was far from being accomplished.⁹³

Believe me, ‘tis a much more pious office,
To tend your father’s old and broken years,
And fold his care-worn heart in downy peace:
A nobler office far! On the firm base
Of well proportioned liberty, to build
The common quiet, happiness and glory,
Of king and people, England’s rising grandeur

In later years, “The Return from the Crusade” by the poet Eliza Knipe (1787) tells of English crusaders returning sadly to their barren home country and lost relatives. The opening line, “From Judah’s land, sad scene of mourning! /Where many a Briton bold was slain” is expressive of the view then held by the majority of contemporary historians about the results of the crusades.⁹⁴ To speak of a rather different kind of literature, the political piece written by Eyles Irwin just at the close of the century, *The Failure of the French Crusade, or the advantages to be derived by Great Britain from the restoration of Egypt to the Turks* (1799),⁹⁵ examines the aforementioned military campaign of Napoleon as a French crusade against Turks, though is not supportive of it. The work is telling of the circumstances that aroused western interest in the capture of the east and, according to Siberry, played an important role in the re-depiction of the crusades.⁹⁶

Eighteenth-century histories, like those of the preceding centuries, were written not to describe the past for its own sake, but either as entertaining literary works or as

⁹² Thomas Hull, *Edward and Eleanora, a Tragedy*, altered from James Thomson (J. Bell: London, 1775), 2.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, 3.

⁹⁴ Eliza Knipe, “The Return from the Crusade” in *Six Narrative Poems* (London: C.Dilly, 1787).

⁹⁵ Eyles Irwin, *The Failure of the French Crusade, or the advantages to be derived by Great Britain from the restoration of Egypt to the Turks* (London: W.Bulmer & Co., 1799).

⁹⁶ Siberry, *New Crusaders*, 140.

moral pieces to instruct the governors of the state.⁹⁷ Besides, they were also tools of political or religious justification, as they looked back to the origins of ideas and institutions, and of philosophical debate, as they were used by enlightenment historians.⁹⁸ The availability of primary sources, on the other hand, was not extensive, other than in the works of antiquarians. However, references to sources were gaining more importance in this century, though not for the sake of a scientific history, but in order to justify the reliability of the (party) view of the author.⁹⁹

Enlightenment thought tended to degrade the past in favour of the enlightened present, which helped to create the romanticism of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, by way of reaction. A brief introduction to the most noted Enlightened histories that included crusades in the period will help to clarify why one expects to find the eighteenth century different from the nineteenth in interpreting the crusades. These works, of David Hume, William Robertson and Edward Gibbon, will not be examined among the eighteenth century histories selected for this study. Such views are well enough known.

First of all, Enlightenment thought, borrowing much from Protestant attitudes to the crusades, can be said to have given distinctive interpretations of religious motivation and organization in the undertaking of these expeditions. Edward Gibbon, the English *philosophe*, was a zealous critic of the corruption behind the crusades in his *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (1776). He held that both the clergy and the laity had motives other than religious zeal for claiming the Holy Land. They were fighting for their own

⁹⁷ David H. Richter, "From Medievalism to Historicism: representations of history in the Gothic novel and historical romance," in *Medievalism in England II*, eds. Leslie J. Workman and Kathleen Verduin (Cambridge: Brewer, 1996), 80.

⁹⁸ Cantor, *Meaning*, 3.

⁹⁹ Champion, *Pillars*, 26.

profits, “seduced by every temptation that nature prompts,” and with no sincere belief in the sanctity of their cause.¹⁰⁰ There was a clear paradox between the alleged cause of the crusaders and their ends as, “... the most ardent in slaughter and rapine were the foremost in the procession to the holy sepulchre.” Military orders were a good example of the irreligious nature of crusaders. They were “a strange association of monastic and military life which fanaticism might suggest,” “whose pride, avarice and corruption scandalized the world.”¹⁰¹

Not only were the crusaders and their preachers corrupt, but they were also ignorant and superstitious. Gibbon echoed David Hume and William Robertson and used the same vocabulary to describe the crusades: “a folly,”¹⁰² “a result of popular frenzy” with “superstitious objectives,”¹⁰³ and the crusaders were “superstitious fanatics”¹⁰⁴ and “ignorant fanatics.”¹⁰⁵ When talking of St. Louis and his crusades, Gibbon identified him as “the victim of his holy madness,” “corrupted by superstition.”¹⁰⁶ In comparison with the superstitious character of the European crusaders, the Muslim east represented a higher, more enlightened culture, tolerant towards other religions, cultivated, advanced both in science and humanity and wealthy. It highlighted the bigoted, ignorant, barbarous and vulgar character of Christians.¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁰ Edward Gibbon, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, Vol. 6 (Dublin: W.Wilson, 1776), 20, 33 and 50.

¹⁰¹ Ibid., 61 and 65-6.

¹⁰² Ibid., 16.

¹⁰³ David Hume, *The History of England, from the invasion of Julius Caesar to the revolution in 1688*, Vol. 1 (London: T.Cadell, 1767), 333 and 345.

¹⁰⁴ William Robertson, *The History of the Reign of the Emperor Charles the Fifth, with a view of the progress of society in Europe, from the subversion of the Roman Empire, to the beginning of the sixteenth century*, Vol. 1 (Dublin: W & W Smith, 1769), 29.

¹⁰⁵ Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, 39.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., 114.

¹⁰⁷ Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, 15; Hume, *History of England*, 345.

Evaluating the results of the crusades, Robertson found the superiority in eastern culture at the time as contributing to the beneficences of the crusades. He held that under the influence of the Muslim east, “the crusaders’ prejudices wore off and new ideas crowded into their minds,” which resulted in the expulsion of barbarity and ignorance from Europe. Other than that, he also found the beginnings of the establishment of regular governments in the time of the crusades, as the monarchs seized the lands of the crusading nobility, enlarged their kingdoms and strengthened their states.¹⁰⁸ Otherwise the crusades were “useless voyages,” “romantic and wild enterprises,” “adventures,” and a “waste of immense sums of money”¹⁰⁹ “enriching those at home and impoverishing those on crusade,”¹¹⁰ undertaken only with the object of “recovering a tombstone two thousand miles away from their country.”¹¹¹

Despite all these negative attitudes in the writings of these Enlightenment authors, when it comes to the crusade heroes, we see a different attitude. Hume’s glorification of Richard the Lionheart’s heroism and victories were striking compared to his overall attitude to the crusades.¹¹² Gibbon, too, was in favour of exalting heroes who were, to his grief, usually dismissed, due to “the too liberal and indiscriminate disdain of the *philosophe* age.”¹¹³ His favourite crusading hero was Godfrey of Bouillon, whom he described as “the most worthy champion of Christendom.”¹¹⁴

However, along with these Enlightened views, there existed a more benevolent view of the past in the late eighteenth century, anticipating the romantics. Inherent in the

¹⁰⁸ Robertson, *Emperor Charles*, 29.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, 27.

¹¹⁰ Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, 17

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, 83.

¹¹² Hume, *History of England*, 339-44.

¹¹³ Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, 83.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 50-1 and 61-2.

pride of “living in a more enlightened age than the past,” there also existed a view that the present was a “less spectacular, heroic or culturally innovative” age, discontinuous with the past.¹¹⁵ John and Thomas Leland’s *Longsword, Earl of Salisbury: an historical romance* (1762) was typical of this changing view towards the medieval (then referred to as Gothic), away from its barbaric, superstitious and violent image. Although moralizing is ever present, with the assumption of the unchanged nature of men vis-à-vis changing institutions, there was a deliberate attempt at prettifying the past. While the issues related to Catholicism were “kept at arm’s length” with “rejection of supernatural explanations,” the focus was kept on “knighthood and chivalry.” However, the unnecessary violence in the period was still regarded with contempt, and a desire for “the inestimable blessing of a wise, righteous and well-tempered rule” expressed.¹¹⁶

¹¹⁵ Karen O'Brien, *Narratives of Enlightenment: cosmopolitan history from Voltaire to Gibbon* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 11-12.

¹¹⁶ Richter, “From Medievalism to Historicism”, 84-6.

CHAPTER II

The Medieval Church, Christianity and the Crusades

Inherent in the general definition of the crusades as holy expeditions undertaken against the infidels is an emphasis on the role of the medieval church and Christianity in these particular expeditions. Thus, what I discuss in this chapter are the aspects of medieval religion which initiated the crusades as a cult of Christianity, of course with reference to my examination of parts of the historians' work on the crusades. I have inferred that the attitudes towards the religious aspect of the crusades can be grouped basically under two headings, which are given with R.J. Smith's reference to the "monstrous theory of papal domination" (papal self-interest and that of the clergy in general combined with the superstition of the middle ages).¹¹⁷ The reason for such a distinction is my assumption that whereas the aspect self-interest could be regarded as a natural extension of Protestant anti-papalism of the early modern period, the latter is more likely to be related to later notions of a superstitious middle ages vis-à-vis the Enlightened present. In the discussion of the interpretations of both aspects of medieval Christianity, I have tried to place the historians in the context of their religious/political background and their openness to Enlightenment influence.

For that reason it is necessary to offer some definition of the early Enlightenment in England during the period encompassing the late-seventeenth and early-eighteenth centuries, which can rightly be defined as "God-ridden."¹¹⁸ In contrast to France, Enlightened thought in England did not emerge from the work of secular *philosophes*

¹¹⁷ Smith, "Cobbett, Catholic History", 115.

¹¹⁸ John Redwood, *Reason, Ridicule, and Religion: the age of enlightenment in England, 1660-1750* (London : Thames & Hudson, 1976), 9. Although he initially describes the seventeenth century thus, he then asserts that nothing much had changed by the early eighteenth century.

outside the establishment, but from inside the “holy alliance” of Anglicanism and the new science, which Gascoigne traces back to the foundation of the Royal Society in 1660.¹¹⁹ Champion, on the other hand, argues for an earlier date and other reasons for the foundation of an Enlightenment debate in England. He holds that debates on Christianity in late seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century England did not originate from philosophical disagreements over the relationship between reason and revelation, but over discussions of the church and the state. As early as the Reformation, the Anglican church had to defend its position as “a valid institution,” independent from the church of Rome, by justifying with historical evidence the claim that it had originally been so.¹²⁰ This position could either be defended by deducing the independence of the episcopate in Britain (reputedly established during the reign of King Lucius) from the nature of apostolic government, and invalidating the claims of the bishopric of Rome to jurisdiction over the whole Christian world;¹²¹ or else, any jurisdictional authority to be exercised by bishops could be rejected on the grounds that it was prone to corruption and the political claims of episcopacy contradicted the teaching of the Scriptures. Therefore, in Erastian terms, the Reformation was defended as “a reaction both against Roman Catholicism and the dangers of clericalism.”¹²² Although the two views regarding the authority of the Anglican church were already there in the post-Restoration period, the labels High Church and Erastian came to be more appropriate in the aftermath of the Revolution of 1689, as the Erastians became more clearly anti-clerical and the High Churchmen anti-Reformation. The evolution of such opposing views inside the Church of

¹¹⁹ John Gascoigne, *Cambridge in the Age of the Enlightenment: science, religion and politics from the Restoration to the French Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 2.

¹²⁰ Champion, *Pillars*, 55.

¹²¹ Ibid., 67-8.

¹²² Ibid., 74-5 and 79.

England was closely related to secular politics: those in support of the succession of William III argued for the rights of the secular authority over the church, those in opposition rejected it and perceived it as “threatening the power of the Church,” as the Reformation had.¹²³ On the other hand, what the crown looked for after the Revolution was an extension of the boundaries of the Anglican church to include dissenters, as the Latitudinarians did, with more hope, in the Restoration period. Erastians after the revolution sought comprehension, for the purpose of “lessening the dependence of the monarch on the church and the church party,”¹²⁴ by relaxing censorship rules. In that context Champion traces a parallel between Erastian views that rejected the *de jure divino* authority of the church, and the Enlightenment inclination to a “civil religion” which caused the Erastians’ identification with the “Freethinkers.”¹²⁵ On the other hand, although there was an inclination in the eighteenth century to “represent Toryism as being in favour of Catholicism,” others recognized a distinction between “popish affiliations and mere High Church royalism.”¹²⁶ The crusades, as products of rising papal authority in the middle ages, would by nature not appeal to the holders of Whig/Erastian view. On the other hand, while the Tory/High Churchmen could also hold critical views of the papal role in the organization of the expeditions, they would be more inclined to hold positive views of the crusades than the Whig/Erastians.

Thus, the Church of England may be defined as an amalgam of these two views that had been in existence since its Reformation. It was only natural that the universities which had the education of clergy as their primary purpose (until well into the nineteenth

¹²³ Ibid., 90-2.

¹²⁴ J.G.A.Pocock, *Virtue, Commerce, and History: essays on political thought and history, chiefly in the eighteenth century*. (Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1985), 219.

¹²⁵ Champion, *Pillars*, 97-8.

¹²⁶ Redwood, *Reason, Ridicule, and Religion*, 20.

century) would accommodate the two positions. The fact that Oxford was identified with Tory/High Churchmen and Cambridge with Whig/Erastians was more a consequence of political choices than intellectual development: as Oxford had been the headquarters of the Stuart regime, Cambridge had naturally become that of the supporters of the new reign.¹²⁷ However, generalizations on the issue should be avoided: while Cambridge did not shun Tories, Oxford also accommodated quite a few Whigs. Although there existed a substantial divergence between the “values and intellectual suppositions” of the clergy and the laity by the early eighteenth century, and the universities tended to be regarded as fit chiefly for those who intended to pursue a clerical career, Cambridge, with its inclusiveness of “current intellectual and theological debate” in its curriculum, had opened the English church to Enlightenment thought.¹²⁸ Cambridge with the Latitudinarianism of the Restoration had seen a gradual shift in its method of theology: the new form “sought to minimise doctrinal discord by an emphasis on natural theology rather than revelation.”¹²⁹ Moreover, with the development in the printing trade, the book market swelled. The increase in book sales diminished the need for patronage in book publication, which enabled free expression of individual opinion. However, it should be noted that attacks on Christianity resulted in alienation even in the more intellectually fashionable atmosphere of Cambridge.¹³⁰

In England, although Deism was seldom publicly declared and the majority stayed loyal to the church into which they had been born, theological arguments inside the church assumed a rational character: aspects of Christianity such as moral teachings

¹²⁷ Gascoigne, *Cambridge*, 5.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, 17 and 21.

¹²⁹ Redwood, *Reason, Ridicule, and Religion*, 12-13.

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*, 136.

common to all Christians tended to be emphasized rather than dogmatic convictions.¹³¹ Sin and redemption, which resumed their centrality in Christian theology with Protestantism, appeared little in Enlightenment thought which had a more benevolent view of man than a sinful creature wholly subject to the divine will. Neither could Christian Enlightenment thought, sympathetic to toleration of other sects and religions on the basis of their shared belief in God,¹³² find any justness in the cause of fighting against the infidel. On the other hand, some issues of debate were not so different in the period following the Revolution from those “that had long divided the Christian community.” There were still questions about “the nature of the Trinity and Christ, the role of church in society and the Church’s responsibility in defeating heresy.”¹³³ Neither were supernatural or irrational explanations of events or fits of religious fanaticism absent in the period: “natural happenings were still seen as supernaturally inspired warnings and signs; governments still used the rhetoric of divine support and displeasure.”¹³⁴ Moreover, faced with the threat of irreligious modes of thinking (of the Enlightenment), conservative circles held on to the fear of divine punishment resulting from sin, in particular disbelief, and linked the social and political ills of the society to God’s vengeance.¹³⁵ Redwood finds the element of “ridicule” in the arguments of the Enlightened as playing into the hands of the puritan and the orthodox in the “battle of the pamphlets.”¹³⁶ It could be argued that there was a difference in the Anglican church between the late and early eighteenth centuries regarding the approach to Christianity.

¹³¹ Ulrich Im Hof, *The Enlightenment*, tr. William E. Yuill (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1994), 238; Gascoigne, *Cambridge*, 170-1.

¹³² Eamon Duffy, “Ecclesiastical democracy detected: I (1779-1787)”, *Recusant History*, 10 (1969-70): 196.

¹³³ Redwood, *Reason, Ridicule, and Religion*, 10.

¹³⁴ *Ibid.*, 16.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, 12.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*, 16. It is his main argument in *Reason, Ridicule and Religion*.

While the threat of the Stuarts who “associated themselves with the sacerdotal conception of monarchy” was still intact, the Anglican church was more concentrated on the rational and unmystical aspects of Christianity. But when the rational thinkers became the new threat in the late century, there began a shift towards a greater emphasis on revealed religion.¹³⁷

It would be impossible to deny that the intellectual life of the period was “shaped by religious and ecclesiastical developments”;¹³⁸ and to accept any “conceptual separation between issues of church and state, religion and politics” in England until Catholic emancipation.¹³⁹ These religious-based party politics had a great influence on the historical writing of the eighteenth century, while not offering a significant change in its methods or objectives. The eighteenth-century historians were no different from their predecessors in providing colourful entertainment in a literary form or teaching private virtue or public policy to the reader.¹⁴⁰ Whereas it would be an oversimplification to categorize the works of the historians, as Tory or Whig, it would not be surprising to find a certain pattern in the histories relating to the political stances of their authors. Moreover, provided that the reasons for the crusades are held to be religious, or explicitly held to be irreligious, their interpretation would be likely to have a correlation with the author’s religious affiliations, corresponding to political stances. In these histories, as in those of the past centuries, historical evidence of institutions or practices was a tool for the author who wanted to justify his view of the present. Thus history was “a tool either

¹³⁷ Im Hof, *Enlightenment*, 238.

¹³⁸ Gascoigne, *Cambridge in Enlightenment*, 3.

¹³⁹ Champion, *Pillars*, 18 and 6.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 25-6.

to authorize or criticise the present depending on the position taken by the author.”¹⁴¹ The use of historical evidence by both sides of an argument was not a conscious innovation in methodology, but a necessity that arose to establish the author’s credibility, where reputation and use of rhetoric were insufficient.¹⁴²

The history of the medieval Church, as a source for finding the origins of the contemporary English Church, was liable to controversy throughout the early modern period. The Anglican position after the Henrician reformation asserted that it had always been independent of the Roman Catholic Church. Anti-Roman claims found the first reception of Christianity with St. Paul or Joseph of Arimathea or in the reign of Geoffrey of Monmouth’s King Lucius. The Roman polemicists in opposition held the view that “the English church was subject to Rome because she owed the institution of her faith to St. Peter, which was later reinforced by Pope Eleutherius and St. Augustine.”¹⁴³ The Anglican apologetic position, as opposed to the Roman Catholic, was more diversified by the Erastian and sacerdotal visions of the church after 1660s. The supporters of the Erastian view denied papal rights in England by showing that papal power had been established in England much later than Christianity was originally planted, by “corrupting the dependence of the British episcopacy on the monarchy and replacing it with an obligation upon Rome.” The High Church view saw an independent Church that derived its power directly from Christ and transmitted it to bishops by apostolic succession.¹⁴⁴ Erastians looked for validation of their views in the high and late middle ages when “the original simplicity and innocence” of Christianity had been corrupted by “the self ends

¹⁴¹ Ibid., 12.

¹⁴² Ibid., 26-52.

¹⁴³ Ibid., 55-6.

¹⁴⁴ Ibid., 89 and 91-2.

and interests” of the clergy and the rightful civil authority over ecclesiastical jurisdiction was unhappily conceded to the clergy *de jure humano*. Heresy, which had been treated with indifference by lay rulers, was now persecuted as a result of this later medieval clerical usurpation of ecclesiastical power. The High Churchmen argued their claims about the *de jure divino* nature of this authority by giving medieval examples of its proper use.¹⁴⁵ Thus, although both positions were anti-papist, Erastians were hostile also to claims about English episcopal rights. Although they did not necessarily advocate Enlightenment ideas, the development of these ideas can generally be attributed to Erastianism. The organization of the crusades, as an important cult of the church in the high and late middle ages, was a manifestation of the authority of the medieval church which was in question.

James Tyrrell, writing just at the turn of the century, remarked on the order of command in the crusades, in which the pope was the “head” of the expedition and prelates presided over princes. This line of command follows the Catholic stance on episcopal hierarchy, in which the bishop of Rome rules over all the church and the laity. Tyrrell noted that:

... these consecrated armies were lifted at divers times, under several Christian princes, according as their present zeal excited them, yet the Pope was commonly esteemed their head, and his legates often presided in their camps, and without their approbation they seldom engaged in any enterprise¹⁴⁶

This remark might not have been read as a mere statement of a historical fact unless Tyrrell had already made his stance clear. He lamented on the heightened papal power at the zenith of the crusading zeal by drawing attention to what the Emperor Henry VI’s

¹⁴⁵ Ibid., 92-5.

¹⁴⁶ Tyrrell, *General History of England*, 495.

coronation signified (He was crowned by the Pope who kicked the crown back on the floor to show that he can depose him whenever he wants.)¹⁴⁷

By this we see to what a height the Pope's power was then grown.... And though his predecessors not many years before could never be ordained till the Emperor had confirmed the election, yet he then claimed to make and depose Emperors at his pleasure ...¹⁴⁸

Tyrrell's work, in view of the frequent references to and comparisons of original and secondary sources, has been identified by some as representing "the move towards a modern idea of historical objectivity." R.T. Ridley regards it as "approaching far more nearly to the standards of historical discussion than its predecessors," along with Laurence Echard's.¹⁴⁹ Yet Champion rejects such a conscious methodological innovation, arguing that the late seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century authors employed historical evidence for the sole purpose of justifying their positions vis-à-vis the Church and the state. Here we can assume in the light of the extract and of the information we have of him as an "early Enlightenment author"¹⁵⁰ that he was definitely an enemy to papal, and presumably clerical authority. In his narrative, Tyrrell compares and contrasts the sources, and sometimes offers with a plausible interpretation of the event himself, but not always. There are times when he prefers to leave the evidence to the reader's appraisal, perhaps following Paul Rapin de Thoyras' advice in his *Modest Critick* (1691).¹⁵¹

¹⁴⁷ The period spoken of is the eve of the third crusade.

¹⁴⁸ Tyrrell, *General History of England*, 491.

¹⁴⁹ R.T. Ridley, "The Forgotten Historian: Laurence Echard and the first history of the Roman Republic" in *Ancient Society*, 27 (1996): 300.

¹⁵⁰ Mark Goldie, "Tyrell, James (1642-1718)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2004), <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/27953>.

¹⁵¹ Rapin had commented that: "... good history 'ought to leave my heart free, to judge the better of what it tells me. Eloquence, which by its character, is an art that imposes, may steel upon my liberty, by striving to persuade me beyond my will.'" (Champion, *Pillars of Priestcraft*, 40).

Before Rapin's *History of England*, which had established itself as a reference book before Hume's volumes appeared, comes another history that was replaced by the former work. This was Laurence Echard's *The History of England: from the first entrance of Julius Caesar and the Romans, to the end of the reign of King James the First*.¹⁵² Echard was a minister of the Church of England (holding the Archdeaconry of Stowe from 1712 until his death), and his political stance was subject to dispute among his contemporaries and recent historians.¹⁵³ Although the fact that he was "manifestly unfair to those who were not members of the Church of England," seeing them as "simply provokers of disorder," may be an indication of his High Churchmanship, elsewhere he is referred to as a "moderate churchman."¹⁵⁴ The following remark of the historian Francis Palgrave may also be indication of his Whiggery:

Echard wanted a church and state history, a history which might teach Englishmen to respect their national constitution as well as their national religion, without urging on one against the other; ...¹⁵⁵

Moreover, the fact that he was under the patronage of the king, supported by a Whig churchman and under the influence of Whig histories, probably meant that his work should not be read as reflecting a Tory stance. Another historian observed that in the first volume of his *History* (which encompasses the period up to James I), "he was more Whig" than in the rest of it, which treated of more recent history.¹⁵⁶

In Echard's history, the words used for the zeal of the crusaders and of the clergy preaching the crusade are not at all critical: he calls the former "the soldiers of Christ," fighting for "the honour of God," and describes the latter as "resounding nothing but the

¹⁵² Ridley, "The Forgotten Historian," 296.

¹⁵³ Ibid., 281 and 300.

¹⁵⁴ Ibid., 298 and 300.

¹⁵⁵ Ibid., 298.

¹⁵⁶ Ibid., 300-1.

cross and the passion of Christ.”¹⁵⁷ Moreover, if we view the work as a whole, in so far as it deals with the medieval papacy, at first glance we don’t see any suggestions that the popes sought ends other than religious in the crusades or that their extensive power was oppressive on Christians. On the contrary, Echard implied that the pope was sincere, as:

... by a zealous harangue, he [the pope] animated the prelates to excite the faithful ... his exhortations were so warm and moving¹⁵⁸

Moreover, he did not seem to protest against the popes’ jurisdictional dominance over monarchs, both in ecclesiastical and civil matters. On the issue of the excommunication of King William Rufus who opposed the restoration of Archbishop Anselm, Echard commented that “... Pope Urban in these times had greater concerns to manage than the excommunication of a single prince.”¹⁵⁹ Further in his narrative of the events during Henry II’s and Richard I’s reigns, just in the heat of the third crusade, his picture of the relationship between the monarchs and contemporary popes reflected an acceptance of subjection of the former to the latter. Thus, for example:

And for a final confirmation, he [Richard I] offered that pope Clement should undertake for the performance of his part of the said agreement; and accordingly wrote letters to him upon that subject, freely giving him leave, upon any failure upon him, to put all his dominions under the severest censures.¹⁶⁰

Echard presented the relationship between the church and the monarch to the reader as a matter of fact, not as an unpleasant aspect of the medieval politics. But like Tyrrell, whom he used as a “modern authority” in his work,¹⁶¹ he was aware of the growing authority of the popes during the time of the crusades and expressed his uneasiness about it. He made two comments that hint at an anti-papal stance perhaps implying anti-clerical

¹⁵⁷ Echard, *History of England*, 212.

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 160.

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 217 See also on p. 211: “... And therefore [Henry II] sent his ambassadors to Pope Lucius, of whom he desired many grants; but the pope being displeased at his behaviour, denied all except one.”

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 293.

Erastianism if interpreted as relating to the medieval church's usurpation of jurisdictional rights of the monarchs, with the weakening of monarchical states. The first statement was about the increase in papal power as a negative result of the crusades. According to Echard, the crusades, in addition to having a number of other disastrous consequences, had also resulted in "the establishment and [i]ncrease of the power of the popes ..." ¹⁶² Then came the story of the prophecy of Joachim of Fiore (the famous prophetic historian at the time of the third crusade) which was full of anti-papal remarks. Joachim was called to the court of Richard I (whom Joachim called "the champion of the Christian Church") during his crusade, where he preached that the Antichrist was already in Rome "exalting himself above the seven crowns of earth." Echard linked this prophecy to the aforementioned coronation story of the Emperor Henry IV: the pope, by kicking the crowns of both the Emperor and the Empress back on the floor, signalled that "he had power to throw them out of their dominions whenever he thought fit."¹⁶³ Thus Echard repeated the Protestant vision of the pope as the Antichrist, who had usurped the jurisdictional power of monarchs and ruled over them. Although we do not see any anti-clericalism in the remark, Echard's emphasis on the civil authority may be taken as evidence of Erastian/Whig views.

The dislike of papal authority and corruption persisted in the writings of Whiggish authors. Thomas Salmon, early in the century, called the crusades, "holy cheats,"¹⁶⁴ speaking not only of self-interested papal schemes, but also pointing to the presence of clerical temporal interests. That was likely to be taken as anti-clericalism by High Churchmen. Salmon, who is referred to as monarchist in R.T. Ridley's article, manifested

¹⁶² Ibid., 160. For other disastrous consequences see the quotation on p.77 of this thesis.

¹⁶³ Ibid., 218.

¹⁶⁴ Thomas Salmon, *Review of History*, 26-9.

signs of anti-clericalism in his *History of England*, by bringing up the clerics who sought power in the domains of the lay rulers, whom they had lured from their dominions to go on crusade. He gives the example of Richard I:

... the clergy seeing him a bold, active prince, and likely to pry too inquisitively into their holy cheats, diverted the danger of his enquiries, by insinuating into this brave, but bigoted prince, how much it would conduce to his glory, how much to the procuring him the favour of heaven, and the pardon of his sins, to recover that country out of the hands of the infidels.... This was a stratagem they often practised on the like occasions; and while Christian princes were engaged at that distance from their dominions, they omitted no opportunity of introducing whatever might advance their interest or power over their subjects...¹⁶⁵

Paul Rapin de Thoyras, a Huguenot immigrant in England, and the decidedly Whig author of *The History of England*, declared that contemporary historical works reflected the party politics in Britain.¹⁶⁶ Despite his claim to be impartial, his history was defined by Trevor-Roper as an amalgam of Whig discourse and Huguenot knowledge of the past.¹⁶⁷ We also get a sense of what this Huguenot knowledge might have been from Im Hof. He describes the Huguenots as “suspected of being theologically too liberal” and “disinclined to practise the Calvinistic kind of bigotry” even before the revocation of the Edict of Nantes.¹⁶⁸ Huguenots, in addition to their rejection of the Catholic synthesis of history,¹⁶⁹ also tended towards tolerance and a moral emphasis in religion instead of the “traditional Calvinist zealotry.”¹⁷⁰ Rapin had fled France after the Revocation and after having served as an officer to William of Orange in his conquest of England, had settled

¹⁶⁵ Ibid., 29.

¹⁶⁶ Nicolas Phillipson, “Politeness and politics in the reigns of Anne and the early Hanoverians” in *The Varieties of British political thought, 1500-1800*, eds. J.G.A. Pocock, Gordon J. Schochet and Lois G. Schworer (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 212-3.

¹⁶⁷ Hugh Trevor-Roper, “A Huguenot Historian: Paul Rapin,” in *Huguenots in Britain and their French Background, 1550-1800: Contributions to the Historical Conference of the Huguenot Society of London, 24-25 September 1985*, ed. Irene Scouloudi (Totowa, New Jersey: Barnes and Noble, 1987), 3.

¹⁶⁸ Im Hof, *Enlightenment*, 170.

¹⁶⁹ Trevor-Roper, “Huguenot Historian”, 3.

¹⁷⁰ Im Hof, *Enlightenment*, 170.

there eventually. As an officer of William III, it goes without saying that he showed enthusiasm for Revolution principles.¹⁷¹

Rapin gave the negative view of the medieval papacy which might be expected from him. The papacy in the preparation of the crusades was a sinister institution with self-interest as a motive: "... the popes stirred up and s[e]mented their frantic zeal for crusades since they turned it so much to their advantage."¹⁷² The forms of self-interest were multiple: "making up the ground lost by the schisms", "furnishing themselves with opportunities of extending their authority" and "draining money from the people and the clergy."¹⁷³ The manipulation of the definition of heresy to the self-interest of papacy and "the extension of the boundaries of the crusade to include heresy"¹⁷⁴ are accusations made by Rapin in line with the traditional Protestant view of papal doctrinal corruption, springing from a desire for temporal power.

The examples Rapin gave of the papal ploys were numerous. In his account of the reign of Henry III in England, he depicted the pope as engaged in the task of draining money out of both the clergy and laity for supposedly holy purposes, or simply as "cheating." Pope Alexander was bold enough to divert the funds raised for a crusade to his scheme for the capture of Sicily, which he "would have thought much more important than that of Jerusalem," though pretending, of course, that the money would be "laid out in the war against infidels."¹⁷⁵ The Roman pontiff received a severe attack for extorting money for his private ends:

¹⁷¹ See the earlier definition of the revolution as "an attempt to preserve the Church and the constitution from popery and despotism" on page 3 above.

¹⁷² Rapin, *History of England*, 2: 428.

¹⁷³ Ibid., 2:429.

¹⁷⁴ Ibid., 2:427.

¹⁷⁵ Ibid., 3:416 and 418.

One may boldly say that in those unfortunate days the court of Rome had no sense of shame left.... with what greediness the Roman Pontiff sucked the very heart's blood of wretched England.... [If the Papal bulls were not there for evidence] one should hardly be persuaded that Christ's Vicar was so little of a Christian as to prefer his own private quarrel before the cause of God.... in order to get money, there was no means, though never so unjust, but what was approved of by this Pope.¹⁷⁶

Moreover, Rapin depicts King Henry III as used by the pope in his ventures, which was a source of grief to the “wiser people of England who were grieved to see their King become more and more a tool to the pope.”¹⁷⁷ Whether mention of these “wiser people” is read as a reference to the proto-enlightened, who, in turn had inherited the influence of Erastian thinking on the independence of the English crown from papal influence¹⁷⁸ or not is a matter of interpretation. Rapin also had criticism of the monarchical collaboration with the pope. He pointed out that attempts to “squeeze money out of the unfortunate kingdom” were as much for “the use of the pope as of the king.”¹⁷⁹

Although Rapin kept to his view of the crown as being merely a tool in this scheme, Robert Henry, who wrote almost half a century later, was harsher in his accusations against the English king, while also recognising the pope as the source of the corruption.

The church was now Henry's great resource for money; and by the assistance of Papal authority he squeezed the clergy without mercy.... it would be endless to enumerate all the arts which the pope and the king [Henry III] employed at this time to exhort money from the people¹⁸⁰ ...

... the fatal present of the crown of Sicily which the Pope made to Prince Edmund, furnished his holiness with an excellent handle for draining England of its wealth.¹⁸¹

In Henry's account, the medieval clergy was corrupt due to its temporal interests, sustained by the corruption of the papacy. Although he did not relate to clerical

¹⁷⁶ Ibid., 3:416-8.

¹⁷⁷ Ibid., 3:414.

¹⁷⁸ Champion, *Pillars*, 97-8.

¹⁷⁹ Rapin, *History of England*, 3:415.

¹⁸⁰ Robert Henry, *History of Great Britain*, 4:19.

¹⁸¹ Ibid., 4:296.

corruption during the crusades, he made remarks about it elsewhere in his history, in speaking of the canons framed in the council of London in 1237, which:

... made little or no reformation in any of these respects [pluralities, commendams, non-residence, the clergy's accepting civil offices] being chiefly designed to increase the power and revenues of the Pope, by granting dispensations.¹⁸²

Henry's anti-clericalism can be interpreted as only an anti-Catholic position. It would be wrong to assume an expression of Erastian tendencies in it as he was a minister of the Church of Scotland, a Presbyterian who was probably strictly against any lay patronage over the Church, let alone that of the monarch. Colin Kidd has explained that he rejected theories about the arrival of Christianity then in existence and conjectured its arrival with the Roman conquest in the mid-first century.¹⁸³ He opted for the independence of the English church from the papal mission of Augustine, though he did not mention any civil authority over the clergy during early ages of Christianity.

Oliver Goldsmith, writing his *Abridgement of the History of England* at roughly the same time as Henry was writing his work, has been described as an "overtly sentimental" Tory historian, though it is also said that his Toryism was "far removed from the High Church spirit."¹⁸⁴ Black asserts that he "struggled his way to success without any help from English institutions,"¹⁸⁵ though he believed in the utility of monarchical power, and his history was regarded as "betraying the liberties of the people."¹⁸⁶ In his *History*, Goldsmith takes a mild view of the crusades that relates them to the spirit of the age. He recognised that "at the time [taking the cross] was the highest object of human ambition" and occasioned by the "cruel treatment of eastern Christians

¹⁸² Ibid.

¹⁸³ Kidd, *Subverting Scotland's Past*, 190.

¹⁸⁴ O'Brien, *Narratives of Enlightenment*, 63-4.

¹⁸⁵ Black, *Goldsmith*, 3.

¹⁸⁶ Ibid., 69-70 and 141.

by the infidels.”¹⁸⁷ Although his description of the initial purpose of the crusades was not negative, his vision of the medieval church, elsewhere, was filled with anti-clerical remarks, together with support for lay patronage in the church. However, one does not come across many comments about the specific role of the papacy or the clergy in the crusades, except for the following anecdote about Peter the Hermit. The extract does not suggest any negative outlook on the role of the clergy or the papacy as initiators of the crusades.

... Peter the Hermit ... was a man of great zeal, courage and piety. He had made a pilgrimage to the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem, and beheld with indignation the cruel manner in which the Christians were treated by the infidels.... He preached the crusade over Europe by the pope's permission ...¹⁸⁸

If Goldsmith's comments on the crusades do not provide any clues for his position regarding the medieval church, other passages do. Here is an extract from his narration of the Thomas Becket affair in the reign of Henry II. The mention of Becket's self comparison with Christ and other manifestations to his self-aggrandizement point to Goldsmith's anti-clerical sentiments.

... The pope and he [Becket] were not remiss to retort their fulminations, and to shake the very foundation of the king's authority. Becket compared himself to Christ ... nothing could exceed the insolence with which Becket conducted himself upon his first landing in England. Instead of returning quietly to his diocese, with that modesty which became a man just pardoned by his king, he made a progress through Kent, in all the splendour and magnificence of a sovereign pontiff ...¹⁸⁹

Goldsmith's anti-clericalism is an extension of his anti-papalism and seen as part of one chain of corruption. The king, on the other hand, is the binding force for both the clergy and laity of his country. The authority of the king thus established over all the clergy and the laity alike could be interpreted to signal Goldsmith's Erastian anti-clerical views.

¹⁸⁷ Goldsmith, *Abridgement of History*, 36.

¹⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 36.

¹⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 48.

... the clergy were divided in their interests, and agreed only in one point, to hate the pope, who had for some time drained them, with impunity: the people, by some insurrections against the convents, appear to hate the clergy with equal animosity. These disagreeing orders only concurred in one point, that of esteeming and reverencing the king ...¹⁹⁰

The anti-papal stance existed not only in Protestant authors' work: Enlightenment-influenced Catholicism was evident in the late eighteenth century, when Joseph Berington led the Cisalpine movement in Britain. Cisalpinism was a re-emergence of the Catholic apologetic which had been muted since the late seventeenth century, for the purpose of political emancipation. While the traditional Catholic outlook in England argued for the historical independence of the English church from Rome, the Gallican denials of papal infallibility and temporal power also joined in the Cisalpine discourse, which had clearly come under the influence of Enlightenment thought.¹⁹¹ Duffy speaks of the tradition of "Old Catholicism" that emphasised the Englishness of the Catholic community and the isolation of the community from continental influence,¹⁹² adding that although English Catholics never openly denounced papal infallibility, they had always been rather ambiguous in their acceptance of it.¹⁹³ On the other hand, the "late and lukewarm enlightenment" that British Catholicism went through¹⁹⁴ is attributed to the role of lay patronage that superseded the authority of the Vicars Apostolic in parts of the

¹⁹⁰ Ibid., 72.

¹⁹¹ Duffy expresses the dual aspect of the Cisalpine position as: "Even where he consciously modelled himself on the pattern of the thinkers of the Enlightenment he never departed far from the traditional attitudes of the recusant Church" (Eamon Duffy, "Doctor Douglass and Mister Berington: an eighteenth-century retraction", *Downside Review*, 88 [1970]: 250); "... enlightenment optimism was joined to older Gallican denials of papal claims to infallibility and temporal power, and to Gallican defenses of the rights of national Catholic Churches." (Smith, "Cobbett, Catholic History," 115).

¹⁹² Duffy, "Ecclesiastical democracy I, 194-5.

¹⁹³ Duffy, "Ecclesiastical democracy I", 198; Duffy "Doctor Douglass", 260 and 265, n.2.

¹⁹⁴ The date of this late enlightenment is set as after 1750s; though the continuity with the few mid-century "scientifically-minded English Catholics" such as Abbé Auguste Mann and Revd. J.H. Needham, who believed in "an approaching age of reason and liberality" are recognized. (Duffy, "Ecclesiastical democracy I", 195) .

English Catholic Church.¹⁹⁵ Cisalpines were not the only movement to emerge among Catholicism which asserted the notion of national churches as opposed to Roman centralisation, along with some criticism of its doctrinal corruption. French Jansenism, for example, was an influence, in association with Enlightenment hostility, in the attack on the Jesuits, while Dutch Jansenists had separated themselves from Rome by the early eighteenth-century Utrecht Schism.¹⁹⁶

Although the vocabulary used by Berington to describe the crusades in general was that of a pious Catholic — he called Palestine “the native land of our saviour,” Jerusalem “that distant and venerable spot,”¹⁹⁷ the holy cross as “the cross on which our saviour suffered”¹⁹⁸ — his vision of the role of papacy in the crusades as a part of its medieval authority was not positive. The Cisalpine stance on the independence of the English Church from Roman claims of authority resembles very much the early Protestant apologetic against Catholicism which was insistent on an English church originating from St. Peter.

That realm [England], replied the monarch indignantly, was never the patrimony of Peter, nor ever shall be ...¹⁹⁹

In addition to “veiled Gallicanism,” Cisalpinism was also criticized for its Erastian tendencies.²⁰⁰ In fact, Berington might have implied the desirability of a church protected by the monarchy by his reference to the popes as the products of Constantine’s putting “Christianity under the wing of the civil state.”²⁰¹ After all, Cisalpinism had a

¹⁹⁵ Duffy, “Doctor Douglass”, 248.

¹⁹⁶ Im Hof, *Enlightenment*, 175.

¹⁹⁷ Berington, *Abeillard*, 39.

¹⁹⁸ Berington, *Henry II*, 338.

¹⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 578.

²⁰⁰ Duffy, “Ecclesiastical democracy I”, 194.

²⁰¹ Champion, *Pillars*, 68-9.

determination to “keep the time-honoured pattern of lay-control of church affairs.”²⁰² It was also anxious to trade some control of the church for Catholic participation in political life.

... it belongs not to the pope to interfere in state concerns. God gave to Peter and his successors the administration only of the Church. Why then shall Roman ambition extend itself to us? ... these pontiffs, truly, are the successors of Constantine, and not Peter, to whom, nor in deserts, nor actions, do they bear resemblance ...²⁰³

Berington found the origins of the papal usurpation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction in the pontificate of Gregory VII whom he called “the father of ecclesiastical despotism.”²⁰⁴ This reflected his Enlightened stance. Smith finds his attacks on popes “reminiscent of skeptics like Hume.”²⁰⁵ His treatment of Gregory VII suggests that he held that the rights given to the popes by monarchs were not even the *jure humano* but were, in truth, usurped.²⁰⁶ This usurping papacy had consolidated its authority by creating certain offences and their punishments that it pretended to be of God’s will, but in fact were associated with clerical self-interest. The examples given of the corruption of Christian doctrine by the medieval church were numerous. The indulgences were the highest point that “the discretionary power of the pastors of the church” reached “in the relaxation of some parts of the canonical penances imposed on sinners, as their fervour, or other circumstances, seemed to require it.” Of the indulgences extended to crusaders, Berington was critical.

... never, before this day, had it been seen that, for one single work of piety, a sinner was discharged from all the temporal punishments, to which he might be liable before the justice of heaven.... a plenary indulgence.... It was an innovation in the discipline of the church, from which many abuses followed ...²⁰⁷

²⁰² Duffy, “Ecclesiastical democracy I”, 197.

²⁰³ Berington, *Henry II*, 575.

²⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 616.

²⁰⁵ Smith, “Cobbett, Catholic History”, 118.

²⁰⁶ Champion, *Pillars*, 92-3.

²⁰⁷ Berington, *Abeillard*, 46.

The matter of heresy was another manifestation of the exploitation of teaching authority. Protestant apologetic of the early modern period pointed out that heresy was not subject to punishment in the primitive church, being by nature an offence against God.²⁰⁸ Berington indicated his hostility to the persecution of heretics, in speaking of the Albigenses, asking the question "... Or was it so great a crime, to have dissented from the faith of Rome?"²⁰⁹ He further drew attention to the violent measures taken up to combat heresy and questioned the papal authorisation in such crimes. The crusaders against the Albigenses:

... when they fell, had on their heads the crimes which unprovoked hostility, licentious devastation and premeditated murder could perpetrate. These no Papal decrees could authorise.²¹⁰

The fighting churchmen of the crusades constituted another example of behaviour and actions that seemed incompatible with Christian doctrines.

... churchmen, whose hands should never be stained with blood were not excluded from this meritorious service ... [their presence] half armed and half robed as the ministers of the altar gave a curious variety to the scene ...²¹¹

In evaluating Berington, I have used reference to Protestant apologetic and Erastian views of the Anglican Church to demonstrate that a late eighteenth-century Catholic author in England could echo a Protestant outlook on the medieval church. So, does this mean that English Catholics had converted to Protestantism at the end of the century? A plausible answer would rather be the link between Erastianism and the Enlightenment that Champion suggests.

²⁰⁸ Ibid., 93.

²⁰⁹ Berington, *Henry II*, 520.

²¹⁰ Ibid., 521-2.

²¹¹ Berington, *Abeillard*, 48 ; Berington, *Henry II*, 368.

In order to better understand the influence of Enlightenment anti-clericalism in the period, we may turn to the notion of the “superstition of the middle ages” in the writings of the same historians. Superstition was an important element in the darkness of the middle ages, along with barbarism, feudal organization, etc. Renaissance and Reformation currents of thought had already defined the medieval past as a period characterised by a “lack of learning” and “blinded and corrupted with superstition.”²¹² The anti-clericalism of the Erastians established medieval superstition as an extension of the clerical corruption of the Christian doctrine — a common Protestant theme anyway. Therefore, although the perception of the middle ages as an age of superstition did not begin with the Enlightenment, its frequent usage as a distinctive label to elevate the reason, learning and civilisation of the Enlightened present, can be attributed to the period. The Enlightenment purpose in distinguishing their age was similar to those of the early moderns: they had to establish that the “the power and pretensions of the Church” did not apply to their own age, but to the “ignorant, superstitious, bigoted and insular Middle Ages.”²¹³ The well-known figures of the French and Scottish Enlightenment, Voltaire, Hume, Robertson, and in England, Gibbon, all emphasized the darkness in similar terms: ignorance, superstition, weakness of reason, lack of progress in the sciences, etc, which all sprang from the false teachings, misinterpretations, degenerations, corruptions and oppressions of the medieval clergy.²¹⁴ With this view, the crusades were “acts of fanaticism” and “monuments of human folly.”²¹⁵

²¹² John Gillingham, *Richard Coeur de Lion: Kingship, Chivalry and War in the Twelfth Century* (London: Hambledon Press, 1994), xvii.

²¹³ Cantor, *Meaning*, 5.

²¹⁴ O’Brien, *Narratives of Enlightenment*, 58; Barbara G. Keller, *The Middle Ages Reconsidered: attitudes in France from the eighteenth century through the romantic movement* (New York: Peter Lang, 1994), 31-2.

²¹⁵ O’Brien, *Narratives of Enlightenment*, 52, 91, 137 and 195.

Plenty of the descriptions of the crusades in eighteenth-century histories are reminiscent of those of the *philosophes*, in that they emphasize the superstition and bigotry of the enterprises. Thomas Salmon and James Tyrrell recorded the “superstition of the times”²¹⁶ by general references; Horace Walpole saw the darkness of the age as allowing “belief in every kind of prodigy”;²¹⁷ Hugh Clarendon and Robert Henry both used the word “epidemic frenzy” to describe crusading zeal and emphasised the fanaticism of the churchmen in its dissemination;²¹⁸ Paul Rapin underlined the contrast with the present by “thanking God that this blind and inconsiderate ardour had been extinguished several ages since.”²¹⁹

In early-century authors we do not find much significant commentary on the superstition of the middle ages, except the few remarks that have been included above. It was only James Tyrell, described above as an early Enlightenment figure,²²⁰ who elaborated on superstition. He associated papal deceit with the superstition and bigotry of the age, as being kindled by it.

... The superstitious zeal of this, as well as of the former century, being kindled by the pope, and certain bigoted monks, had so prepossessed all ranks of men, both princes and subjects, that they believed these warlike pilgrimages to be the most Holy and Meritorious actions that Christians could possibly undertake, since they thereby proposed to rescue Jerusalem, and the Sepulchre of Christ, out of the hands of the Infidels.²²¹

He himself was, of course, a rational man of the early eighteenth century who looked for his reasons in the natural sphere. Although Tyrrell did not adopt a very harsh stance in

²¹⁶ Salmon, *Review of History*, 26-9; Tyrrell, *General History*, 1093.

²¹⁷ Horace Walpole, preface to the first edition to *Castle of Otranto: a Gothic Story*, tr. William Marshal (Cooper and Graham, 1796), iv.

²¹⁸ Clarendon calls Peter as “fanatic friar.” (Hugh Clarendon, *A New and Authentic History of England: from the Remotest Period of Intelligence to the close of the year 1767* [London: J.Cooke, 1768]), 133; Henry refers to the “epidemic frenzy of croisading” (Henry, *History of Great Britain*, 3:131 and 34).

²¹⁹ Rapin, *History of England*, 428-9.

²²⁰ M.G. Sullivan, “Rapin de Thoyras, Paul de (1661-1725).” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2004), <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/23145>.

²²¹ Tyrrell, *General History*, 495.

speaking of supernatural events, he nevertheless conveyed that he found them unbelievable.

It is reported that diverse strange signs and prodigies were the forerunners of the taking of Jerusalem [by Saladin], which I shall not take upon me either to relate or confute, since I look upon them as stories made in imitation of those prodigies recorded by Josephus before the Romans took that city²²²

Joseph Berington, possessed of an “enlightened optimism” and consequently confidence in his own age,²²³ could not compare the middle ages favourably with the present in any way. This helped clear the Catholic Church of his own age from the accusation of being “the heir to the medieval church,” and allowed him to establish it instead as “one of the groups that dissented from the Establishment.”²²⁴ The medieval church was clearly corrupted in doctrine and that helped to create the superstitious beliefs of the age. Berington held the preaching of the crusades immoral: killing of Muslims in exchange for absolution from sins was a contradiction of the morals of Christianity.²²⁵ As mentioned above, crusade against heretics was a sin equivalent of “unprovoked hostility”, “licentious devastation” and “pre-mediated murder.”²²⁶ A similar set of remarks were made by Robert Henry who ironically showed how incompatible the moral wretchedness and the mask of piety in the expeditions were:

... imagining it would be a good beginning of their pious enterprise to murder as many Jews as possible and seize their riches ... The *croisaders* who were concerned in these cruel massacres made haste to embark in their holy warfare.²²⁷

In the preface of his *Abeillard and Heloisa*, Berington made it clear why he chose those ages that did not suggest “any novelty to the learned reader” as his subject matter.

²²² Ibid., 498.

²²³ Smith, “Cobbett, Catholic History”, 115.

²²⁴ Ibid., 117.

²²⁵ Berington, *Abeillard*, 43.

²²⁶ Berington, *Henry II*, 521-3.

²²⁷ Henry, *History of Great Britain*, 3:139.

He was sure of both the superstition and bigotry of the middle ages and the capacity of “sagacious modern criticism” to “correct its errors.”

At a time, when truths of every kind are so eagerly investigated, and those of history in particular I have chosen a dark period; and if I can bring it before the public in any form that may raise attention, my design will be satisfied.... The learned reader must not expect to find any thing absolutely new. Where was I to look for novelty in the records of the eleventh and twelfth centuries? But as I have taken the liberty to form my own judgement on the characters and facts I have described, it may be that, sometimes, I shall seem to suggest new ideas, or to present an old object in a new point of view.... I would have [adhered more religiously to some opinions], could I have been prevailed on to believe that our ancestors were not men, open to prejudice and false impressions. There are circumstances, when it is rather advantageous to be placed at some distance from an object.... What errors has not the cool sagacity of modern criticism corrected in the too credulous annals of former times?²²⁸

His aim was to draw attention to those ages, probably not for their own sake, but to bring them out as a complete contrast to the present. His assertion that he “presented the facts and characters in a new point of view,” by “taking liberty on their judgement” explains the creation of certain voices of reason along with the superstitious in his histories.²²⁹ These Eamon Duffy calls proto-Cisalpinis.²³⁰ Such reasonable characters may serve the purpose of deepening the depiction of the superstition and asserting that Christianity, by origin, was not contrary to reason but only appeared so, having been corrupted by some in those dark ages.²³¹ His use of the phrase “reason and religion turn with horror”²³² in his description of the Albigensian crusade supports the view: that religion and reason were not at all in opposition. Thus in this superstitious age, the reasonable men of the age were usually clerics,²³³ although they were not representative of the whole church. The popes Gregory and Urban were commended for their “rational thinking”: Gregory was

²²⁸ Berington, *Abeillard*, vi-vii.

²²⁹ Smith, “Cobbett, Catholic History”, 116.

²³⁰ Berington, *Abeillard*, 205.

²³¹ Smith, “Cobbett, Catholic History”, 116.

²³² Berington, *Henry II*, 16.

²³³ Berington, *Abeillard*, 45 and 205. Abeillard, Abbott Suger and Peter the Hermit were among these rational clergymen.

described as “too wise a man to give much weight in his own mind to a circumstance in itself trifling” (meaning the rescue of the Holy Places from the hands of the infidel) and show with the “wild enthusiasm to which they [the crusades] were generally ascribed.”²³⁴ The initial reasons Berington finds for the undertaking of the crusades were indeed reasonable.

The infidel powers were become terrible to Europe.... Europe ... was cruelly lacerated by internal wars; the hand of every man was armed against his brother; ... They had had recourse indeed to a singular expedient, which was called the *Truce of God*.... But could the arms, which Christians used for mutual destruction, be turned against a common enemy, the evils of domestic discord would cease, and Europe might again prosper and be happy.²³⁵

He contrasts this with the motives of “the multitude or their leaders.”

Not that I mean to insinuate that the multitudes or their leaders were influenced by such rational motives; these can only belong to such men as Gregory or Urban his successor.... They [the multitudes] viewed themselves as the chosen soldiers of the Lord ... and they were promised that, in the blood of the unbelieving mussulmen, their own crimes should be cancelled....²³⁶

The “misguided piety” of the age, joined to its enthusiasm resulted in the “empty devotion of the people”. The masses, having been promised of “the eternal crown”, went wild “with the sacred cross on their shoulders” committing “every excess which cruelty, avarice, lust could instigate,”²³⁷ especially when their “wild expectations of supernatural assistance” waned.²³⁸

... And this holy pillage it was ... on which a misguided piety could fasten with enthusiasm, not sensible how empty the devotion was, and how spurious, in general, were the objects of their veneration.²³⁹

The medieval multitudes of Berington hardly seemed to have a will of their own, as in addition to the enforcement of the church, and maybe even more coercive than that, they

²³⁴ Ibid., 41-3.

²³⁵ Ibid., 42.

²³⁶ Ibid., 43.

²³⁷ Berington, *Henry II*, 468-9.

²³⁸ Berington, *Abeillard*, 49-50.

²³⁹ Berington, *Henry II*, 468-9.

had feudal ties binding them to their lords. He held that, “The commonalty followed the example of their lords; indeed, they were vassals and bound to servitude ...”²⁴⁰ A similar view had earlier been taken up by Rapin, who had emphasised the dominating role of the aristocracy in the mind of the period. He agreed that the multitudes were “in blind imitation of their sovereigns.”²⁴¹ Berington also stressed that reason was so weak that it would not overcome superstition in the period: “[The reasonable ones] saw the infatuation and lamented it, but they did not have the fortitude to warn the multitude, even if they had, they would not be listened to ...”²⁴² The instances where the superstition of the period and the reasons for it were recalled are numerous in the narrative, but not without an emphasis that they belonged to those distant centuries.

When the minds of men, from a concurrence of circumstances, have been long exposed to certain impressions – it matters not with what disgust or even horror they were at first received – gradually they become familiarised with them, and reason, or what by them is called reason, will soon be disposed to give them its solemn approbation. At this moment, the most trifling cause will produce the greatest effect: it is a spark which falls upon a mine of gunpowder.²⁴³

Enthusiasm ... was a great feature in the character of times; for mankind was then ignorant and unoccupied.... External impressions are then most forcible, because the thoughts are unengaged ... Human nature in a state of incultivation, knows nothing of finer feelings ... The observation applies to the twelfth century ...²⁴⁴

The crusades were not only a product of medieval superstition but superstitious beliefs were nourished by them.

... it seems, that they brought little back with them, but the bodies of saints, and the tales of strange adventures, and that a vain superstition joined to a horror of those, whom they deemed the enemies of Christ ...²⁴⁵

²⁴⁰ Ibid., 47.

²⁴¹ Rapin, *History of England*., 3:427.

²⁴² Berington, *Henry II*, 340.

²⁴³ Berington, *Abeillard*, 43-4.

²⁴⁴ Ibid., 102.

²⁴⁵ Berington, *Henry II*, 624.

Miracles and supernatural happenings asserted the truth of Christian doctrines. It was natural that the crusader who went on a holy expedition to rescue the Holy Places from the infidel would need a sign from God that his act was divinely approved. Berington here did not make a distinction between the clergy and the laity who believed in these supernatural happenings:

... the appearance of miracles was to them no uncommon phenomenon. They attested, they thought, the sanctity of the living ... A competent knowledge of the laws, by which nature acts, was not at hand to unravel the mystery:... the churchmen also, who then possessed the greatest knowledge, were themselves more than ever interested to believe the attestation of their senses, and to propagate among the people the happy illusion.... That they [the clergy] meant to deceive is most foreign from my mind to insinuate but I believe they were themselves by no voluntary act imposed on.²⁴⁶

... they [the crusading armies] had been vainly taught to believe that heaven, by supernatural assistance would supply all their necessities.²⁴⁷

... [t]he voice or example of a man, deemed to be inspired from heaven; or the awful denunciations of God against sinners; or the horror itself, which certain minds, cast in a better mould, are apt to feel at the view of enormous crimes: these impressions, respectively, would produce their effects; and it appears that multitudes, at this time, were disposed to receive them ...²⁴⁸

In speaking of the story of the cross appearing in the heavens just after the first crusaders had taken the cross, he indicated that he thought it mere “fancy.”²⁴⁹ As to accounts of supernatural intervention in the third crusade, he remarked:

I can not persuade myself to believe that heaven could have so manifestly interfered to promote a scheme, at once so extravagant in itself and which was to end disastrously. These extraordinary facts were really no more than the common effects of a heated imagination, aided by ignorance and enthusiasm.²⁵⁰

On the other hand, the late eighteenth-century Italian peasant was not much different from the medieval crusader in his need for supernatural signs that he would be rescued from the hands of Napoleon. Moreover, the necessity of “the perpetuity of miracles for

²⁴⁶ Berington, *Henry II*, 270-1.

²⁴⁷ Berington, *Abeillard*, 49-50.

²⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 102.

²⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 341.

²⁵⁰ Berington, *Henry II*, 367.

the defence of the Christian system” was still a question of debate in eighteenth-century Catholicism. Thus, even the enlightened Berington could not deny the existence of miraculous powers, although he held that they did not add to the evidence of Christianity.²⁵¹ His treatment of miracles in his histories anticipated the controversy that took place between him and conservative Catholics over the events in Italy. In his *Letters* written on that occasion, he cried for support: “I now look for a man who will be hardy enough to maintain, that the deity can patronise superstition!”²⁵²

A prejudice against supernatural explanations of events was not shared by all authors in the century. Two early century historians for example were quite keen on using miracles and other supernatural events as historical evidence in their works. David Scott, the Jacobite author of the *History of Scotland*, often used miraculous curing stories of the monarch to assert his sacred character, in line with his Jacobite politics.²⁵³ The other historian to use supernatural explanations was Laurence Echard. In various places in his *History of England* he spoke of those “punished with the vengeance of heaven.”²⁵⁴

Not all late century’s authors advocated a dark view of the middle ages, adorned with ignorance, superstition, bigotry, etc. On the contrary, some acknowledged “skill in sciences, deep inquiries into philosophical subjects and a subtle reasoning” in the ages that could even have been “more than the most enlightened ages of antiquity.” The holder of this view was the pre-romantic Oliver Goldsmith, who was of the opinion that the negative perception of the middle ages was the fault of poets and historians, who

²⁵¹ Duffy, “Doctor Douglass”, 252-3.

²⁵² Ibid., 252. The controversy was about visions alleged to be seen in the aftermath of Napoleon’s Italian Campaign in 1796. Berington had received harsh criticisms as he rejected the centrality of the perpetuation of miracles in the Christian belief.

²⁵³ Scott, *History of Scotland*, 161.

²⁵⁴ Ibid., 224.

could not transmit the accomplishments of the age, as they wrote “mere speculative amusements” and “researched on trifles.”²⁵⁵ Although his lack of “Enlightenment optimism” involved a constant criticism of development “associated with increasing artificiality, dissoluteness and decomposition,”²⁵⁶ Goldsmith did acknowledge the clerical corruption that took its force from the superstition of the age.

This instrument of terror [the papal interdict issued upon England in John’s reign] in the hands of the see of Rome, was calculated to strike the senses in the highest degree, and to operate upon the superstitious minds of the people ...²⁵⁷

In the crusades, to which he attributed a special significance as “one of the most noted enterprises that ever adorned the annals of the nations, or excited the attention of mankind,” Goldsmith recognized a self-serving enthusiasm. The crusaders, who from “all ranks flew to arms with the utmost alacrity to rescue the Holy Land from the infidels,”²⁵⁸ were not motivated by the “superstition of the age” but by “temporal interests.” He gave the example of:

Robert duke of Normandy. The crusade was entirely adapted to his inclinations, and his circumstances; he was brave, zealous, covetuous of glory, poor, harassed by insurrections, and ... naturally fond of change.²⁵⁹

In summary of what has been said in this chapter, two general points may be made. Firstly, it seems that whatever their religious/political stances were, the historians held unanimously anti-papal (though not always anti-clerical) views, if they had any views at all on the role of the papacy and clergy in the crusades. Not even a Catholic author like Joseph Berington, a non-juror like Thomas Carte, nor a Tory like Oliver Goldsmith argued for the superiority of the medieval church or its sincerity in the

²⁵⁵ Stanley, “The early middle ages”, 51-2

²⁵⁶ Marshall Brown, *Pre-Romanticism* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991), 114

²⁵⁷ Goldsmith, *Abridgement of History*, 61

²⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 36

²⁵⁹ *Ibid*

organization of the crusades, but even, in the case of Berington, held that there was corruption and self-interest. Secondly, the attacks on superstition and the beliefs behind the crusades came mainly from those authors that we claim to have been influenced substantially by Enlightenment thought. Although almost every historian of the century acknowledged the “superstition, fanaticism, frantic zeal, etc” of the age as motivation for the crusades, we observe a greater concentration of remarks on the subject in the early Enlightened author James Tyrrell and in the Catholic Enlightenment figure Berington. Even the pre-romantic Goldsmith, although no believer in the darkness of the middle ages, did not manage to purge them of superstition.

CHAPTER III

The Crusade Hero: Richard

In this chapter, I shall examine those crusade figures, whose treatment in the histories is substantial enough to suggest something of the author's outlook. Richard I, Saladin Eyyoubi, Phillippe II Augustus of France and Edward I are the heroes under discussion here, for a number of reasons. Richard is the central figure not only because he is so frequently referred to in the histories, but also as his image in the eighteenth century reflects many traits of that age. Moreover, his crusade occupies such a central place in his reign that it determines the interpretations of his character. He is praised as a great warrior king or criticized as an absentee king.²⁶⁰ During the four centuries up to the seventeenth, he had been a model for English monarchs, due to his crusading credentials, which then gradually began to be used against him.²⁶¹ Edward I was a later English monarch depicted in Richard's image. Saladin as Richard's adversary in the crusades, and Phillippe as the counter reflection of the national image, had always been compared with him. Thus, the other figures that will be under discussion in this chapter can be thought of being dependent in their depictions on the image of Richard the Lionheart.

John Gillingham gives a general account of the attitudes towards Richard as the English king and the crusading hero, in his *Richard Coeur de Lion*, where he notes a departure from the medieval view of a chivalric crusading hero by the seventeenth century. Whereas by virtue of his military prowess he had been treated as a model king for at least four centuries following his death, in the early seventeenth century there were

²⁶⁰ Gillingham, *Richard I*, 8-9.

²⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 3.

signs of change in his image.²⁶² He was criticized mainly for his prolonged absences from his domains (mostly due to crusading), and for draining England of its resources in order to raise money for his expeditions (again chiefly for his crusade). Gillingham attributes such a gradual change by the early seventeenth century primarily to two circumstances. There was the impact of Reformation anti-clericalism, which rendered suspicious medieval sources written by clerics. There was also the change in the definition of kingship associated with the early modern period. The medieval portrait of a ruler was influenced by the clerical historians of the age who naturally saw “the priority of a chivalric lord as the liberation of holy places.”²⁶³ Post-Reformation writers were apt to disregard these works as “papist evidence,” and despise their authors as “monkish writers.” In the case of Richard, they believed that he would naturally be favoured by the clerical authors of his age as they would be obliged to Richard on account of the holy work he undertook. The image they preferred was that of Henry II, Richard’s father, as he had been reluctant to take the cross. He was already a Protestant hero for his stance against the pope and Thomas Becket.²⁶⁴ Then too, the early modern model of kingship constituted a departure from the medieval ideal of a good monarch. The latter emphasised warrior-like qualities, more than administrative. The twelfth century, which Turner and Heiser describe as “an era of religious fervour and warrior ethos,”²⁶⁵ was very distant from “the rationalism of Enlightenment,” which saw a further change in the accepted basis for commendation of a ruler.²⁶⁶

²⁶² John Gillingham, *Richard Coeur de Lion: kingship, chivalry and war in twelfth century* (London: Hambledon Press, 1994), xiv-xv.

²⁶³ Turner and Heiser, *Reign of Richard*, 2.

²⁶⁴ Gillingham, *Coeur de Lion*, xv-xviii.

²⁶⁵ Turner and Heiser, *Reign of Richard*, 1.

²⁶⁶ Gillingham, *Coeur de Lion*, vii.

Gillingham traces this change in the attitude to Richard back to the 1618 history of Samuel Daniel whose concern with financial drainage reflected the political controversies of his day. Attached to the court of James I, which opposed the organization of a Protestant crusade against Spain, arguing its financial consequences for the crown, Daniel complained that “Richard had consumed the mighty treasures of England abroad.”²⁶⁷ Then Sir Winston Churchill in late seventeenth century asserted the close relations between Richard and the clergy by describing the king as “the clergie’s darling.” However, Gillingham does not suggest a sudden and complete change in the attitude towards Richard. He rather finds it gradually evolving from an early seventeenth-century heterodoxy to a nineteenth-century orthodoxy. Laurence Echard and Paul Rapin de Thoyras, as well as David Hume, are given as examples of influential historians who adopted the idea of Richard as the absentee king, wasting the resources of his kingdom. The modern image of Richard even persisted in the writings of Sir Walter Scott, despite the fact that he captured the imagination of a whole generation of readers and authors with his romantic portrayal of the middle ages and its chivalric codes. He acknowledged that even though Richard’s reign “furnished themes for bards and minstrels, [it] afforded none of the solid benefits to his country.” On the other hand, although Echard and Rapin represent the shift in the view of Richard’s government towards a negative one, neither of the historians seem to be ignorant of the king’s qualities as a warrior.²⁶⁸ Echard referred to him as “this great prince ... with so much courage and bravery,”²⁶⁹ while Rapin called his military victories “valiant achievements attracting the admiration of the whole

²⁶⁷ Ibid., xv

²⁶⁸ Ibid., xv-xviii

²⁶⁹ Echard, *History of England*, 218 and 221-2

world.”²⁷⁰ Therefore, I think it necessary to acknowledge the eighteenth-century attitudes to Richard as having two components: he was both the king who governed badly and the heroic crusading warrior.

Though I will not go here into the reasons for and results of anti-clericalism in the early modern period, having made a detailed analysis of this in the previous chapter, I should like to provide some examples from the historians’ work of their dislike of “monkish writers.” As the name refers to clerical authors in general rather than monks proper, I shall avoid the pejorative designation. Indeed among chroniclers writing during Richard’s reign, only four were monks. It was natural that these chroniclers, or medieval historians, as churchmen, had a church-centred outlook on the events of Richard’s reign. Thus, Richard’s crusade did indeed receive the greatest approbation and was perceived as the “highest goal of the chivalric lord.” Moreover, three of the secular clerks who wrote the history of Richard’s reign had especially close ties to the court, which made their accounts “quasi-official records of the central government.” As Turner and Heiser suggest, these writers were more liable to write on behalf of Richard than monastic writers, who might well have had anti-government biases, perhaps having suffered from the king’s taxation.²⁷¹ Therefore, the accounts of clerical chroniclers could be undependable for different reasons. They might be biased on account of the character of the writers or they might be written under the patronage of the king. Salmon clearly conveys that what made a prince good or bad in the writings of these authors was nothing but his proximity to and benevolence towards the Church:

... and they [the writers] rendered them [kings and great men] good or bad, as they were more or less kind and beneficent to the church, churchmen and themselves, and extolled

²⁷⁰ Rapin, *History of England*, 3:114 and 121.

²⁷¹ Turner and Heiser, *Reign of Richard*, 2.

them as they appeared for, and favoured their ecclesiastical liberty.... Who would not think Simon Montfort, earl of Leicester, a great patron of the liberties of the people, a saint, an innocent person, and good subject, that barely reads the monks of those, and succeeding times, and such modern writers as have since followed them? He professed himself the champion of church-liberty, and by that means made himself the darling and favourite of these men, and the whole clergy; and they gave him a character, and transmitted his memory to posterity accordingly; though really he was the greatest hypocrite and traitor that had been heard of in that age.²⁷²

In addition to partial interpretations, the clerical authors were also accused of inaccurate and fabricated statements. Horace Walpole, the late century author, famous for his interest in the Gothic, attacked the monks for “forging donations and charters” and labelled them as “impostors” in his *The Life and Reign of King Richard III*.²⁷³ Berington was not so harsh in his criticism, but simply conveyed that he found some facts implausible, such as the number of men who perished during Richard’s siege of Acre. He did not believe these exaggerated stories of Richard’s heroism, one of which was even refuted by an account written by Richard himself, referring to the siege of Ascalon, where he was portrayed as slaughtering so many Saracens.²⁷⁴ According to Berington, “... these extraordinary facts were really no more than the common effects of a heated imagination, aided by ignorance and enthusiasm.”²⁷⁵ The clerical accounts of the middle ages were also criticised for their style. Echard found the works of the clerics “highly disagreeable to the taste and genius of this refined age” and objected to the “impertinency” in them.²⁷⁶ Tyrrell remarked on the contradictions between the dark points in the medieval sources.²⁷⁷

²⁷² Salmon, *Review of History*, 46-7.

²⁷³ Horace Walpole, *Historic Doubts on the Life and Reign of King Richard III* (Dublin: G.Faulkner, 1768), viii.

²⁷⁴ Berington, *Henry II*, 383 and 386.

²⁷⁵ Berington, *Abeillard*, 341.

²⁷⁶ Echard, *History of England*, 1.

²⁷⁷ Tyrrell, *General History*, 467 and 69.

The ideal king in the eighteenth century was more than a heroic warrior. By the seventeenth century it was perceived as unusual for an army commander to engage in front-line fighting. Politics were praised as an alternative. As Daniel put it: “more came to be effected by wit than the sword.”²⁷⁸ The king, in Whig thought, was one of the crucial branches that constituted the state along with the Lords and Commons, whose responsibility was “to protect the lives and property of subjects from tyranny.” Moreover, the excellence of the instrument of state was in the balance that existed between the branches, which prevented any one of them from “sacrificing the nation to its own interests.” In this Whig scheme, it was hoped that the monarch would be ready to trade off a great deal of his executive authority for getting parliamentary support for his fiscal policies during wartime. The ongoing wars between 1690 and 1713 had presented the crown with the need for money on an unprecedented scale, which it could only get with parliamentary approval.²⁷⁹ The continental wars in William III’s reign were an issue on which Tories and Whigs were divided. Whereas Whigs were for the war, Tories contested that “commitment to continental warfare was intolerably expensive” with a disproportionate burden being imposed on landholders.²⁸⁰ Of course, the medieval government of England, on the other hand, worked quite differently: while the royal household decided on matters of war and diplomacy, another mechanism under the justiciar’s supervision enforced the raising of revenues for the campaigns.²⁸¹ However, the notion of “the people’s well being as the responsibility of the ruler” existed as well in the “old principles of kingship” which saw it as “God entrusted” and rather in the fashion

²⁷⁸ Gillingham, *Coeur de Lion*, xviii.

²⁷⁹ Philip Harling, *The Modern State: an historical introduction* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2001), 11-3.

²⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 23.

²⁸¹ Turner and Heiser, *Reign of Richard*, 8.

of a father's duty towards his family.²⁸² That notion remained familiar enough and indeed dominant in the eighteenth century.

In the light of eighteenth century views about monarchs and their policies of war outside of England, Richard no longer provided the model of an ideal king, as understood by Roger of Howden or Matthew of Paris. He had decided to wage a war in a distant land, the relevance of which to the interests of his country was disputable and he extorted the means of doing so from the financial resources of his country. By doing that, he was not only endangering “the lives and property of its subjects” which he was bound to protect, but was also “sacrificing the nation to the interests” either of his own dynasty which had claims to the crown of Jerusalem, or to those of the clergy with whom he was often depicted of being in a close relationship.²⁸³ It is only recently that Gillingham has brought a new perspective to the debate about Richard's kingship: he argued that he was very well up to the standards of an ideal medieval monarch as he was “successful in warfare.”²⁸⁴ As the only English monarch “to play an active leading role in the great events of world history (in the struggle for control of the middle east) against an adversary as formidable as the great Saladin,”²⁸⁵ he was quite remarkable as a medieval monarch. Turner and Heiser mention Gillingham's view that Richard was quite competent in fulfilling his kingly responsibilities, which included the defence of the Angevin patrimony — and that included going on crusade. It was not only the rights of the eastern Christians, but the rights of the Angevin dynasty that he defended there.²⁸⁶ Moreover, Gillingham stresses that Richard was not incompetent by modern standards

²⁸² Ibid., 3.

²⁸³ Gillingham, *Coeur de Lion*, xv-xvii.

²⁸⁴ Turner and Heiser, *Reign of Richard*, 9 Gillingham is mentioned as a scholar of Richard's image.

²⁸⁵ Gillingham, *Richard I*, 1.

²⁸⁶ Turner and Heiser, *Reign of Richard*, 6-7.

either. He was both a good administrator of his realm and ruler of his subjects, and was also rather good at projecting a successful image.²⁸⁷ It was the eighteenth century which magnified the financial difficulties of England during the reign of Richard I and held the crusade responsible for it to a great extent; but the authors depended on their medieval sources as a basis for such accusations. However, although some contemporaries of Richard, “who lived through the heavy financial demands of the last years of his reign” had lamentations, for the most part they justified these with the wars where “the justice was on the king’s side” and did not let the “heroic light” fade away.²⁸⁸ In the eighteenth century, the widespread view held by the moderns that Richard “took no interest in England except as a source of revenue”²⁸⁹ and that he consumed the sources of England abroad, received an added emphasis. “After the completion of the conquest of Ireland and the union with Scotland” in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century, authors had greater respect for a king like Henry II who extended English power in the British Isles, than for Richard who wandered in distant lands.²⁹⁰ They should have paid more attention, Gillingham suggests, to a medieval author, John of Fordun. He held that in Richard’s reign “there was so hearty a union” between England and Scotland, as the king was so friendly to the Scots.²⁹¹ Nevertheless, even in the eighteenth century, there were some who thought that Richard could have made a good monarch if the circumstances permitted. Thomas Salmon in early century held the opinion that:

Had king Richard lived in any other times than when superstition over-spread the whole face of Christendom, he might have made an admirable governor ...²⁹²

²⁸⁷ Ibid., 9.

²⁸⁸ Gillingham, *Richard I*, 8.

²⁸⁹ Turner and Heiser, *Reign of Richard*, 8.

²⁹⁰ Ibid., xvii-xviii.

²⁹¹ Gillingham, *Richard I*, 9.

²⁹² Salmon, *Review of History*, 29.

The absence of Richard from his domains combined with the financial ruin of England due to the crusade was a dominant theme reflected in the writings of most eighteenth-century authors. Tyrrell satirized the sales of crown lands to finance the crusade with the words, "... he would sell London itself if could find a good chapman."²⁹³ On this, Echard elaborated:

... those great sums he extorted ... were not sufficient.... and when he was questioned why he sold so many places and manors, he made an answer, that he would sell London itself, if he could find a good chapman; so earnestly intent he was upon his plausible enterprise.²⁹⁴

Moreover, putting aside Richard's "noble qualifications," he accused him of making his people suffer during his absence and under his fiscal policies. The blame for the financial exhaustion did not fall solely on Richard, though. In his absence his justiciaries had worked equally well.

Tho' he had many noble qualifications, yet England suffered severely under his government, thro' the constant occasions he had for money, and the great rapacity of his justiciaries during his absence from England, where he never spent above eight months of his whole reign: so that his subjects felt all the inconveniences of his courage....²⁹⁵

On the other hand, Rapin's accusations were often directed towards Richard both for financial drainage and for neglect of England.

It may be said that England, where he never was above eight months, during his whole reign, ... was very unhappy under his government. He loaded his subjects with frequent impositions and excessive taxes. ...²⁹⁶

Richard himself, when he went to the Holy Land, had almost quite drained the kingdom of all the coin. Besides, the *croises* had likewise carried off large sums....²⁹⁷

Whilst Richard's affairs went on prosperously abroad, England began to suffer by his absence.²⁹⁸

²⁹³ Tyrrell, *General History*, 473.

²⁹⁴ Echard, *History of England*, 215.

²⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 229.

²⁹⁶ Paul Rapin de Thoyras, *Rapin's Impartial History of England*, tr. John Kelly (London: John Harrison, 1784), 1:234.

²⁹⁷ Rapin, *History of England*, 3:135.

Rapin's contemporary, Thomas Salmon, who often quoted from Echard word for word, repeated the same line about Richard's absence and the justiciaries, while also adding the criticism of the results of the crusade: " ... 'Twas this unfortunate fruitless expedition to Palestine that first occasioned the king's oppressing his subjects with such heavy taxes."²⁹⁹ Berington stressed the continuity in Richard's harmful policies in England: "As with a shameful prodigality, before his expedition to the east, he had alienated many parts of the royal demesne; the same he now resumed with an unheard of rapacity ..."³⁰⁰ He saw all the negations of the necessary virtues of a statesman in Richard. He found him "irritable" and "hot headed,"³⁰¹ with a "wild and intemperate precipitancy,"³⁰² "spending time with discordant pursuits of amusement and penitence"³⁰³ and expending his treasure "with a lavish generosity."³⁰⁴ Berington's concluding verdict on Richard was that "if he had any virtues they never sprang to life."³⁰⁵

The contradiction between the tax pressure on the English people and their ever-lasting love for Richard must have established a problem for the eighteenth-century authors. They, who were conscious of their cultivation over the medieval barbarian and proud of their governmental system, could not approve of the sufferings of the people under the ill-government of Richard, though they acknowledged that the uncultivated did not have the clear-sightedness they had.³⁰⁶ In their comments on the medieval praise of Richard, they indicated that they might be excused. Rapin saw that the medieval

²⁹⁸ Ibid., 109.

²⁹⁹ Ibid., 28-30.

³⁰⁰ Ibid., 407.

³⁰¹ Berington, *Henry II*, 345.

³⁰² Ibid., 367-8.

³⁰³ Ibid., 375.

³⁰⁴ Ibid., 366 and 386.

³⁰⁵ Ibid., 427-8.

³⁰⁶ Gillingham, *Coeur de Lion*, xviii.

multitudes were easily satisfied with a little glory: "... And yet no other benefit accrued to the people for these prodigious sums, but a little glory for their king, with which however they were satisfied ..."³⁰⁷ Hume attributed this apparently contradictory situation to the dazzlement of Englishmen by the "splendour of Richard's enterprises," though the king should have "promoted their happiness by a sound and well-regulated policy."³⁰⁸ Then he continued that, "... had he reigned further, he would have exhausted his kingdom."³⁰⁹ It is not surprising to find the Enlightened Berington repeating the same vision with an added emphasis on the folly of the multitudes in contrast to "human reason":

So great was the attachment to Richard, a prince possessed of no quality, which could make his people happy, and from whom they had as yet experienced only insult and oppression. But he was a soldier, and the glory, which his arms had acquired, dazzled the multitude. To the shame of human reason, such are the characters whom popular applause has magnified!³¹⁰

... had he lived, the people of England would have seen another crusade, and would have cheerfully resigned to their last shilling, to promote the wild undertakings of their lion-hearted prince.³¹¹

If being a warrior king was bad, going to distant lands to fight the infidel at the expense of the resources of his own country was worse, and worse still, not succeeding in that enterprise. Today some historians agree that Richard did more good to the Christian world than he would have by capturing Jerusalem. Gillingham, among the historians of the alternative view, contends that, in the context of the period, neither the reasons for, nor the results of this expedition should be denigrated.³¹² He primarily proposes that Richard's undertaking the crusade was as important to his reign, or even more important, than staying at home and governing the internal affairs of his own country, as the east

³⁰⁷ Rapin, *Impartial History*, 234.

³⁰⁸ Gillingham, *Richard I*, 12-3.

³⁰⁹ Gillingham, *Coeur de Lion*, xviii.

³¹⁰ Berington, *Henry II*, 406.

³¹¹ *Ibid.*, 429.

³¹² Turner and Heiser, *Reign of Richard*, 6.

was important to the west in the twelfth century. Furthermore, even though Jerusalem was not captured, a close evaluation of the crusade's overall results could hardly allow it to be deemed a failure. Not only did it extend the life of the Latin kingdom for over another century, it saw the conquest of Cyprus, which was strategically a far more important place than Jerusalem.³¹³ On the other hand, the eighteenth-century historians' view of the success of the crusade was strictly in terms of the capture of Jerusalem, in which it had failed. Therefore they argued that the crusade, in addition to being "needless,"³¹⁴ had also ended up "fruitless."³¹⁵

Echard, although he did recognize the greatness in the initial undertaking of the crusade, denied glory to the expedition in view of its results. He commented that, "this great crusade ... ended with little more advantage than the taking of one single city; and the King Richard departed with the displeasure of having ... concluded a dishonourable truce." In short, it "... ended as ingloriously as it was first magnanimously undertaken."³¹⁶ Rapin, on the other hand, contrasted the benefits of the expedition with its expenses, to conclude:

Thus ended the famous crusade, which had drained France and England both of men and money.... It proved of very little benefit to the eastern Christians, whilst it ruined those of Europe, by the prodigious sums therein expended....³¹⁷

Henry agreed with Rapin, using the phrase "the unprofitable conquests of Richard in the east,"³¹⁸ while Berington also contrasted the crusade's trivial achievements with its great

³¹³ Gillingham, *Richard I*, 3-4.

³¹⁴ Tyrrell, *General History*, 473.

³¹⁵ Salmon, *Review of History*, 30.

³¹⁶ Echard, *History of England*, 222.

³¹⁷ Rapin, *History of England*, 3:124.

³¹⁸ Henry, *History of Great Britain*, 3:144.

losses: the capture of “some towns on the coast, some scattered castles,” against the “drainage of treasure and bravest men of Europe.”³¹⁹

The reign of Richard ... disfigured by discontents at home, and abroad by a lavish waste of men and treasure in the wild wars of Palestine, has nothing to engage the attention of the philosophic historian ...³²⁰

Goldsmith saw the expedition as a failure of Richard’s ambitions, as he commented that, “ ... Jerusalem [was] the object of his long and ardent expectations.... But just at this glorious juncture his ambition was to suffer a total overthrow ...”³²¹

Despite the dark picture of the results of Richard’s crusade, some historians recognized some brightness. Echard allowed some satisfaction to Richard for “having bestowed two kingdoms [Jerusalem and Cyprus] at his departure,”³²² while Goldsmith recognized the glory in the expedition.³²³ Moreover in Echard, we see a balance between the negative consequences of Richard’s crusades, described as “all the inconveniences of his courage,” with “his other good qualities in time of peace.”³²⁴

The majority of the historians did not see any benefit in crusading in general either. Their criticisms are reflections of the modern view that praised the strong monarchical states of Europe. Echard’s view of the ill results of crusades were, “an infinite expense of blood and treasure, the weakening of many nations, the ruins of great lords and multitudes of people, [and the] establishment and increase of the power of the popes.”³²⁵ Rapin observed that the crusades failed to fulfil their mission of “ending internal feuds in Europe,” as “the crusaders returned to the shedding of Christian blood

³¹⁹ Berington, *Henry II*, 395.

³²⁰ *Ibid.*, 600.

³²¹ Goldsmith, *Abridgement of History*, 57.

³²² Echard, *History of England*, 222.

³²³ Goldsmith, *Abridgement of History*, 58.

³²⁴ Echard, *History of England*, 229.

³²⁵ *Ibid.*, 160.

with greater fury than ever” once the crusades were over.³²⁶ Berington shared the same view in late century. The crusaders “returned loaded with all those [things] which the eastern nations were best able to supply.... [and] soon they resumed their fury, and raged as before.”³²⁷ However, his Enlightened view saw progress and commercial development as the long-term benefits of the crusades, though he preferred to remain cautious about the extent of this influence and to be mindful of their “consumption” effects. He projected a gradual but unintended development in western civilization, with the first crusade as an encounter of the east and the west.

... the crusades must not be forgotten; for they also, in return for the treasure and the lives which they consumed, contributed something to the general stock of improvement. But this has been overrated. From the intercourse of so many nations, which the common cause united, and from their mutual collision, advantages, I know, would be derived, and to these, in the last expedition, might be added some acquirements in the art of navigation, and the lessons which the improved state of Sicily would present to the inquisitive and the curious.... No benefits, at least were so prominent, as to have produced a sensible change in the arts of agriculture, trade or manufactures. I mentioned, in its place, some of the advantages which western Europe derived from the taking of Constantinople....³²⁸

Despite all criticisms of Richard as a king, historians agreed on seeing him as the crusading hero with chivalric virtues. Although chivalry was the criterion that marked the ideal king in the middle ages, in the eighteenth century it was a separate entity from successful kingship. To understand why and what the historians under discussion liked about the chivalry and heroism of crusading, it is necessary to offer a definition of chivalry and then assess the relevance of it to eighteenth century perceptions of the hero. As F.J.C. Hearnshaw defines it, it is a “knightly system of the later middle ages with its peculiar religious, moral and social codes and customs.” It represents a somewhat gentler,

³²⁶ Rapin, *History of England*, 3:88.

³²⁷ Berington, *Abeillard*, 55.

³²⁸ Berington, *Henry II*, 623-4.

orderly and cultivated notion of the middle ages, in contrast to their earlier irrational and barbaric image. The chivalrous knight was obliged to behave in a certain way in warfare, religion and the social sphere, which called for rationalization and humanization in his behaviour.³²⁹ What chivalry demanded was “boldness and bravery accompanied by courtesy and gentility,” which were held to have been present in medieval knighthood.³³⁰ Richard’s image as a chivalrous hero was already being created by his own age, which endowed him with the “knightly qualities of prowess, loyalty, largess and courtesy.”³³¹ It is not extraordinary that chivalry was esteemed highly in the eighteenth century as a commendable feature of the middle ages that left the legacy of gentlemanly honour to the modern age. The gentleman was, as James Kelly puts it, “the type figure of the dominant social and political estate of the *ancien regime*.”³³² “Although chivalry vanished from the practical art of war in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, it lingered in education, in manners, in morals, in society, in court, in all relationships of the governing class.”³³³ The approval of the chivalrous virtues that made up the honour of a gentleman had never died in England anyway. Prowess, courage, loyalty, liberality and magnanimity, joined to pride and assertiveness, were the virtues earned by birth for “those born to command,” which were only modified by humanist influence to include learned virtues and action.³³⁴ Furthermore, the eighteenth century was the age of the “polite and commercial people,” who differentiated themselves by their civilized manners from the brutal codes of a

³²⁹ F.J.C. Hearnshaw, “Chivalry and its Place in History” in *Chivalry: a series of studies to illustrate its historical significance and civilizing influence*, ed. Edgar Prestage (London: Routledge, 1996), 2 and 25

³³⁰ Conkin and Stromberg, *Heritage and challenge*, 26.

³³¹ Turner and Heiser, *Reign of Richard*, 2.

³³² James Kelly, *The Damned Thing called Honour: duelling in Ireland, 1570-1860* (Cork: Cork University Press, 1995), 11.

³³³ Hearnshaw, “Chivalry”, 27.

³³⁴ R. Malcolm Smuts, *Culture and Power in England, 1585-1685* (New York: St.Martin’s Press, 1999), 8-10.

feudal society.³³⁵ The ideals of chivalry in the three spheres of a knight's life involved having virtues that were not all objectionable to the eighteenth century man. The chivalrous knight had to be courageous, loyal and generous in war; faithful and obedient to his church and devout in religion; and courteous, humble and beneficent in his social circle. More specifically, he would be expected to be trustworthy in war, true to his engagements, which were never to be broken out of necessity or advantage; religiously to embrace fully the Catholic faith and submit to the authority of the clergy; to be ready to be generous with a genuine regard and politeness towards others, even at the expense of his own poverty and humbly serve those weaker or poorer than himself.³³⁶

In the evaluation of character, both chivalry and lack of it were sought in the characters of the historical figures, with an emphasis on such chivalrous behaviour as the eighteenth century commended as much as the middle ages. In early century, the authors seem to be in confusion about the image of the medieval warrior in the persons of Richard and Saladin. These historical characters both reflected the barbarity of the dark ages and the chivalry which marked an "advance on the savagery of the dark ages."³³⁷ In addition to this confusion, there is no preference for the western over the eastern hero: they are treated on equal terms. Richard, by his warlike qualities, did not earn only the admiration in the Christian world, but also presented an example for the eastern enemy, who was automatically assumed to share the same set of chivalric values. James Tyrrell,

³³⁵ Paul Langford, *A Polite and Commercial People: England 1727-1783*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), 4-5.

³³⁶ Hearnshaw, "Chivalry", 32-3.

³³⁷ *Ibid.*, 31.

distinguished Richard as a “great figure” in the whole history of crusades,³³⁸ admired not only by the Christian world but by his enemies, the Saracens to the extent that:

Saphadine [brother of Saladin] himself was so transported with his valour that he sent him, even during the fight, two brave Arabian horses ...³³⁹

[Saladin] called God to witness that he had so great an esteem for king Richard’s worth and valour that if it must be his fate to lose that country, he had rather it should be to him, than to any other prince whatsoever.³⁴⁰

Paul Rapin, writing after Tyrrell, repeated the same story with similar words.

Richard sent Saladin word that he might depend upon seeing him again.... The Sultan, with a politeness which had nothing of the barbarian in it, returned in answer, that if it must be his fate to lose that part of his dominions, he had rather it should be to the king of England, than to no other monarch in the world.³⁴¹

In Tyrrell’s narrative, it was not only the Saracen sultan but also the Emperor, who held him in captivity on his return to Europe, who was impressed.

... but the king knowing his own innocenc[e], answered all the Emperor’s allegations with so much eloquence and courage that he not only gave the greatest satisfaction to all there present, but moved the Emperor himself to compassionate [his] misfortunes and to reverence his person ...³⁴²

Tyrrell’s Saladin was no less remarkable a hero than Richard as “the wisest and most valiant king that ever the Turks had ...”³⁴³ Saladin,

... after this, pushed on his good fortune with ... great bravery and success ... [but] used his victory with great moderation.... publicly declaring that he took the Christians into his protection and therefore that they should no ways be molested in the exercise of their religion.³⁴⁴

This admiration of Saladin seems to be an amalgam of the eighteenth-century Enlightened ideal of a religiously tolerant leader and of medieval chivalry, that manifested itself in Saladin as that moderation which accompanies courage and success.

³³⁸ Tyrrell, *General History*, 495.

³³⁹ Ibid., 512.

³⁴⁰ Ibid., 514.

³⁴¹ Rapin, *History of England*, 3:125.

³⁴² Tyrrell, *General History*, 518.

³⁴³ Ibid., 525.

³⁴⁴ Ibid., 497.

Although Saladin was powerful, in compliance with knightly virtues, he showed moderation in using it, when he protected Christians who were weaker. The further example Tyrrell gave of Saladin's treatment of Christians suggests that he was indeed attributing Enlightened qualities to him. He pointed to Saladin's behaviour as an example to intolerant statesmen of his own day, which:

... may serve as a reproof to some princes of this age, who assume a sovereignty over men's consciences as well as over their persons; an usurpation, not only contrary to the spirit of the Gospel, but such, as a Mahometan prince thought unworthy [of] the doctrine of Alcoran...³⁴⁵

Rapin was so enthusiastic about the 'valour' of Richard that he filled a paragraph praising it.

It depended then on Richard, to save the honour of the Christians, and to repair their loss.[and] he was seen to perform such astonishing acts of valour, that those who envied him most, could not forbear having him in admiration.... Richard's valour made such an alteration in the face of the battle, that Saladin saw himself obliged to reinforce his right-wing with part of the victorious troops of the left.... Richard maintained the fight on the left, with a constancy and courage which seemed somewhat more than natural.... Thus Richard by his valour and conduct, obtained a complete victory over the enemies of the Christian name, of whom forty thousand lay dead in the field of battle ...³⁴⁶

Echard's portrayal of Richard's bravery was not different than Rapin's.

Still king Richard vigorously pursued his designs, and after several brave and important actions, marched up within sight of Jerusalem, where he skirmished with the enemy, and overthrew the convoy or caravan of Saladin, which came richly laden from Babylon, and was guarded by ten thousand men; whom Richard valiantly attacked with five select soldiers, put most of them to the sword, took three thousand camels and four thousand horses and mules, and recovered a noble booty. After this, and many other great exploits, as the relief of Joppa, and the repulse of Saladin from that place, the king, indefatigable in his brave attempts, ... [endeavoured] to regain Jerusalem ...³⁴⁷

Like Rapin and Tyrrell, he also reported the Saracens' esteem for Richard. He found Richard's "courage and prowess great beyond exception and so formidable to the Saracens" repeating Saladin's message of praise to the English king when he was finally leaving the Holy Land. He also spoke of the stories Saracens told to their children that,

³⁴⁵ Ibid.

³⁴⁶ Rapin, *History of England*, 3:121-2.

³⁴⁷ Echard, *History of England*, 221.

“King Richard was coming for them”³⁴⁸ which was, in turn, repeated by Thomas Carte.³⁴⁹

Carte, writing just before mid-century, conveyed Richard’s worth for earning admiration with the following words: “... the king distinguished himself by such prodigious acts of valour, as rendered him the admiration and terror of the enemy ...”³⁵⁰ Echard’s Richard was “the famous general King Richard,” not only brave and valiant, but also a true Christian, humbly “imploping the mercy of God in making a solemn confession of all his excesses before his bishops,” with his mind fixed on “the honour of the Christian Church, whose champion he was ...” The portrayal of Richard was presented with the additional remark that the examples of this kind of “Christian humility” were “rare among princes and potentates.”³⁵¹

Together with the chivalrous features of the crusade heroes, there was a criticism of the traits that did not comply with the codes of chivalry. Brutality, fierceness, pride, avarice, luxury, dishonesty and self-interest were the unchivalrous features found in Richard and Saladin which established a duality in the interpretations of the early eighteenth-century authors.³⁵² Of these, brutality and fierceness were perhaps the most frequently criticised. The Enlightenment mind sought out the violence in the heroism of the middle ages. Gillingham quoted Gibbon asserting cynically that: “if heroism be confined to brutal and ferocious valour, Richard Plantagenet will stand high among the heroes of the age.”³⁵³

³⁴⁸ Ibid., 222 and 229.

³⁴⁹ Carte, *General History*, 1:781.

³⁵⁰ Ibid., 1:755.

³⁵¹ Echard, *History of England*, 217-8.

³⁵² Gillingham, *Richard I*, 12.

³⁵³ Gillingham, *Lionheart*, 6.

In this respect, the views of early eighteenth-century authors might be said to constitute a half-way position between a romantic view of chivalry and the Enlightened view. Whereas Tyrrell was quite generous in his flattery of Richard for his exemplary greatness as a warrior and a hero, he also noted the “brutality” that accompanied his actions.

... this king’s temper, methinks deserves a little of our observation.... as the king had the courage, so he had likewise somewhat in him of the fierceness of that beast, from whence he afterwards obtained the surname of Coeur de Lyon.³⁵⁴

This brutality resulted in his insulting those weaker than him (to whom a true chivalrous knight is meant to be generous); extracting benefits for himself (when he was supposed to be fighting for the sport of it); and not sharing with others (though a knightly behaviour would mean lavishing largesse). Tyrrell saw this unchivalrous behaviour punished, as he connected Richard’s behaviour during the crusades with the consequent ills. He noted that Richard’s insulting the duke of Austria by taking out his flag and (with the French king Phillippe) not sharing spoils with him during the crusade eventually led to his own imprisonment,

... which may serve as a warning to more potent princes, not to insult over those that are weaker than themselves, since there may some unexpected opportunity happen.³⁵⁵

He narrated that Richard “killed Turks with his own hands,” and “cut their heads with one strike of his sword.” Although he could be thought of displaying Richard’s skills as a commander by reporting that he “lost but a few Christians on the battle ground in contrast to seven hundred dead bodies on the Turkish side,” he immediately allowed suspicion of

³⁵⁴ Tyrrell, *General History*, 488.

³⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 500.

their credibility by adding that these events were “almost incredible.”³⁵⁶ Echard repeated the depiction of Richard’s brutality with almost identical words:

... the bold and magnanimous Richard, from his qualities [was] surnamed Coeur de Lion; a prince who had somewhat of the fierceness and brutality, as well as courage and bravery of that creature ...³⁵⁷

Tyrrell depicted not only the crusading Christians but the Saracen enemy as “barbarians” for slaughtering so many captives, instead of selling them for slaves, “which would have been much better than to exercise such barbarity only to satisfy that inhuman passion of revenge.” He further showed him as unchivalrous: “the subtle Saracen,” breaking the articles of the treaty with Richard and “not meeting and fighting the Christians fairly.”³⁵⁸

Echard chose to present Saladin’s barbarity in contrast to the English king’s bravery.

When Saladin could by no means obtain a longer day for the performance of the said articles of composition, he barbarously cut off the heads of all his Christian captives.... [but] Richard encountered him with so much courage and bravery that he constrained him to fly dishonourably.³⁵⁹

He also accused Saladin of bribing the duke of Burgundy.³⁶⁰ Rapin had similar charges of deceitfulness³⁶¹ for Saladin and then repeated what Tyrrell had suggested about the barbarity of the two leaders: “Richard and Saladine exhibited a spectacle of horror to their armies, by commanding the prisoners each had in his power, to be put to death ...”³⁶² When he went on to find “the first author of this barbarity,” he noted that Saladin had earlier shown chivalrous traits of generosity and concluded that only “natural fierceness” might have induced him to this act, though it was at variance with his “generous temper” that “appeared upon other occasions.” He was somewhat more severe

³⁵⁶ Ibid., 512-3

³⁵⁷ Echard, *History of England*, 229

³⁵⁸ Tyrrell, *General History*, 501

³⁵⁹ Echard, *History of England*, 221

³⁶⁰ Ibid.

³⁶¹ Rapin, *History of England*, 3:115

³⁶² Ibid., 3:119

about Richard, asserting that he “could not find in him any other virtue than ‘a brutish fierceness’ together with an insatiable love of money, pride and lust” that was the cause of the unhappiness of England under his reign.³⁶³ Thomas Salmon joined in agreement, speaking of “the fierceness and brutality of the lion” with “the courage and bravery of that creature” and Richard’s “wit and arrogance but with too great a mixture of pride.”³⁶⁴ Richard’s tendency to violence was so detestable that it saw punishment on various occasions.

This was the fatal end of the bold and magnanimous Richard ... whose disloyalty to his father was punished with innumerable troubles in his reign, and whose voracious temper met with death itself.... It is observable that he who had revived the use of that fatal engine, the cross-bow, and had himself dispatched so many with it, now himself perished by the same instrument.³⁶⁵

Rapin was in agreement with Echard about the punishment of Richard’s disloyalty, but did not recognize an act of justice in his death, not because he declined the religious explanation, but by the virtue of the fact that cross-bow had been in use before Richard’s reign.³⁶⁶

The lion-hearted king had other vices. Many authors spoke of the “three daughters” of the king that he could not part with, “pride, avarice and luxury,”³⁶⁷ listed by Rapin as “pride, avarice and lust”³⁶⁸ which countered the chivalric qualities of moderation, genuine concern for others, selfless service and lavishness. Echard, as usual, was milder in his criticism. While he found his extracting money, which he did “more voraciously than was agreeable to a great man,” he allowed some excuses suggested by medieval sources. Matthew Paris had seen Richard’s policy necessary to build a

³⁶³ Gillingham, *Lionheart*, 6.

³⁶⁴ Salmon, *Review of History*, 28.

³⁶⁵ Echard, *History of England*, 229.

³⁶⁶ Rapin, *Impartial History*, 234.

³⁶⁷ Echard, *History of England*, 229.

³⁶⁸ Rapin, *Impartial History*, 234.

“powerful army against the French.”³⁶⁹ On the other hand, Rapin was not apologetic. In addition to finding greed among Richard’s motives, he also suggested that he used “diverse, not very honourable means” to extract money out of England.³⁷⁰ That would be repeated in late century by Robert Henry, the Scottish minister, who asserted that,

...by these and various other methods, some of them very dishonourable and unjust, Richard amassed a much greater treasure that had ever been in the possession of any king of England ... all dissipated in this romantic expedition..³⁷¹

Salmon does not credit historians’ charges of the “pride, avarice and lust,” as he did not see any evidence for them in their writings.³⁷² Overall, Salmon seems to be the one of the mildest critics of Richard’s kingship.

If there was one historian who did not hold anything against Richard and drew a uniformly positive picture of him, it was Thomas Carte, the Non-Juror historian of the mid-century. His Richard, except for his temper, was perfect in every respect. He was both physically and intellectually superior with a strong and likeable character. He was,

... tall and strongly made ... his air and mien graceful, noble, majestic, and worthy of empire.... He had a very good understanding ... a clear head, a sound judgement, as appeared in his conduct, when the hastiness and impetuosity of his temper allowed time for reflection; he had a natural eloquence that was very moving.... He had a great deal of ready wit ... and though he was naturally grave and serious ... yet in private, he was assable and pleasant in conversation ...³⁷³

And of course, he had chivalric virtues.

He was of a frank, open and generous disposition, incapable of deceiving anybody; true to his word; faithful to his promises; and in all respects a man of strict honour and great probity ...³⁷⁴

Unlike his contemporaries, Carte did not have complaints about Richard’s pride, brutality or greediness, but excused them.

³⁶⁹ Echard, *History of England*, 225.

³⁷⁰ Rapin, *Impartial History*, 233.

³⁷¹ Henry, *History of Great Britain*, 3:138.

³⁷² Salmon, *Review of History*, 30.

³⁷³ Carte, *General History*, 1:779.

³⁷⁴ Ibid.

The haughtiness of his mind and the cholerickness of his nature rendered him obstinate in pursuing what he undertook, incapable of bending on any occasion.... Hence arose the roughness complained of in his manners, a too great fondness of his own humours, a violence in carrying his point, and a severity that might pass for cruelty in some instances of persons that opposed his will; which seem to have been the most remarkable of his defects.... He is charged by some with being covetous and rapacious, because he was not scrupulous about the ways of getting money: yet it must be owned that his occasions for it were urgent.... The appearances of his gout for money seem evidently the result of mere necessity, arising from the vast expenses as well of the holy war, in which his poetry and zeal for Christianity engaged him ...³⁷⁵

Then he adds that the taxes were “not so heavy as is generally imagined.”³⁷⁶

Carte’s definition of the hero was very much reminiscent of that of Richard Hurd, already mentioned in the first chapter, who came up with a comparison of the Greek heroic age and the medieval, early in the eighteenth century, to be followed by others. This had initiated a romantic picture of the medieval warrior. Carte, the Non-Juror, with sympathy for medieval Christianity, combined the heroism of antiquity with Christian piety to come up with an idealized image of the medieval hero in Richard.

... he fought in the noblest manner, in ways which the religion of the age authorized and in which it was found by the greatest heroes of antiquity; nor was he inferior to any of them in courage, valour and intrepidity.... he well served the glorious appellation of a hero ...³⁷⁷

Then in late century, we see Robert Henry, who otherwise adopted a critical tone while talking about crusades, making reference to Richard as “the gallant leader” and speaking of “the two bravest leaders in the world,” with “the famous” Saladin and “performing prodigies of valour.”³⁷⁸ Both sides in the conflict, in Henry’s narrative, were depicted with the same enthusiasm.

... astonishing acts of valour were performed on both sides. At length, these two great armies, animated by the most implacable hatred, inflamed by religious zeal, and conducted by the two bravest leaders in the world, came to a general action ...³⁷⁹

³⁷⁵ Ibid., 1: 779-80.

³⁷⁶ Ibid., 1: 781.

³⁷⁷ Ibid., 1: 780.

³⁷⁸ Henry, *History of Great Britain*, 3: 143, 147 and 151.

³⁷⁹ Ibid., 3:147.

Henry was quite melodramatic in one description probably due to his source (Geoffrey of Vinsauf in this case), when he spoke of Richard leaving Acon with “the tears, prayers, and benedictions of an infinite multitude of people, who had tasted his bounty, and beheld his valour.”³⁸⁰ However, although he recognized the valour and zealotry in Richard as warrior-like qualities, the rest of the commendable traits he found can better be interpreted as those of an Enlightened statesman than a chivalrous hero. Eloquence had already been noted by the earlier Enlightenment figure, Tyrrell. Indeed David Allan suggests the impact of Enlightenment thought in defining historical characters in his *Virtue, Learning and the Scottish Enlightenment*. He argues that Henry “tried to adapt the eighteenth century qualities in history, like eloquence of speech, acute philosophy, etc, in short everything for which the Enlightened scholar seemed or wished to stand.”³⁸¹ So Richard was eloquent.

....But Richard being permitted to speak for himself, answered all these accusations in so clear and full, and at the same time in so elegant and affecting manner, that he not only convinced the whole assembly of his innocence, but drew tears from many of his noble hearers.³⁸²

And he was intellectually endowed, as well as physically.

The natural endowments of his mind were not inferior to the perfections of his body. His understanding was excellent, his memory retentive, his imagination lively, and his courage so undaunted that it procured him the surname of Coeur de Lion, or the Lion-hearted. In consequence of these endowments, he is celebrated by contemporary writers, as a wise politician, an eloquent orator, an admired poet, and the most illustrious warrior of the age in which he flourished ...³⁸³

Moreover, he was such a lover of the public good that when the council declared its decision for the crown of Jerusalem in favour of Conrad of Monferrat,

³⁸⁰ Ibid., 3:151.

³⁸¹ Allan, *Virtue, Learning*, 222.

³⁸² Henry, *History of Great Britain*, 3:154.

³⁸³ Ibid., 3:163.

... who had long been his open enemy, he confirmed their choice, and sacrificed his private resentment to the public peace. Still further to secure the tranquillity of the army and the country in his absence, he generously bestowed the kingdom of Cyprus on Guy de Lusignan ...³⁸⁴

On the other hand, Joseph Berington, despite the fact that he did not see any virtue in Richard, took a quite exalted view of Richard on the battlefield. Although he made it clear that he was following his sources, Richard's portrayal as the crusade hero was not at all critical, but romantic.

The monarch's spurs were of gold.... His sword of tempered steel hung on his thigh.... He came forward with a truncheon in his hand, whilst the spectators eyed with wonder the gorgeous champion of the cross.³⁸⁵

Although this description was not Berington's own, he nevertheless "could not omit it." Richard not only looked like a hero, but acted like one. Berington again quoted from his medieval source, most probably Roger Howden, a contemporary of Richard. He had the moral character of a hero.

On the journey, his behaviour excited a general admiration, being uniformly firm and unembarrassed, manifesting, that he was above the caprice of fortune and it was not only in the field that he possessed the powers of a hero.³⁸⁶

And he had too the honour of a chivalrous knight who would not leave his engagements even though a necessity arose. Talking of the time during the crusades when it became urgent for Richard to go back to England, Berington remarked on the chivalric virtue of the king who "could not, in honour, leave the country exposed to the attacks of the enemy ..."³⁸⁷ Berington's description of crusaders in general also recognized their chivalrous qualities of zeal and bravery, though he was highly critical of them overall.

³⁸⁴ Ibid., 3:150.

³⁸⁵ Berington, *Henry II*, 381.

³⁸⁶ Ibid., 399-400.

³⁸⁷ Ibid., 394.

...Their zeal, however, their bravery, and their irresistible force still carried them forward.... Flushed with success, the champions of the cross advanced towards Jerusalem ...³⁸⁸

... the triumphant warriors, after every enemy was subdued and slaughtered, immediately turned themselves with sentiments of humiliation and contrition towards the Holy Sepulchre.... They were met with hymns of jubilation by the Christians they rescued, with them they sang anthems to their saviour, who had there purchased their salvation by his agony and death.... devotion so overcame their martial fury that they dissolved in tears ...³⁸⁹

Saladin, as in the histories of others, was also a crusading hero: Berington called him “the bravest and the wisest prince the east had long beheld”³⁹⁰ and “the brave infidel.”³⁹¹ As he did not find any behaviour in Richard that was incompatible with his chivalrous image, neither did he in Saladin. He asserted that he did not break the treaty, as he was “religiously punctual” and did not use violence against his captives either, towards whom he was hospitable.³⁹²

The late century romantic Goldsmith’s portrayal of Richard, even though it presents instances of the king’s chivalrous behaviour, also depicts some non-chivalrous aspects of his character. Richard depicted by Goldsmith, was too ambitious and “wished to have all the glory of such an expedition to himself.”³⁹³ Ambition, by nature, is contrary to the chivalric ideal, in which there is to be “service without remuneration.”³⁹⁴ “The sport of crusading” was to be undertaken without regard to the knight’s interest or his fortunes. However, the same Richard, when lying on his deathbed, could display a striking degree of chivalry by manifesting generosity even to his assassin, an act worthy

³⁸⁸ Berington, *Abeillard*, 51.

³⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 53.

³⁹⁰ Berington, *Henry II*, 327.

³⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 339.

³⁹² *Ibid.*, 338 and 340.

³⁹³ Goldsmith, *Abridgement of History*, 55.

³⁹⁴ Hearnshaw, “Chivalry”, 32-3.

of a truly gallant knight.³⁹⁵ Upon learning that he had killed the father and two brothers of the assassin, he “ordered him to be presented with a hundred shillings and set at liberty.” In contrast to Richard’s gallantry, was his general who was unmerciful towards the weak. He was “a true ruffian” for torturing and hanging Richard’s assassin against the deceased king’s orders. Another portrait of a non-chivalrous character was that of the duke of Austria, who, as the “barbarous monarch,” “condemned Richard to be imprisoned and loaded with shackles, to the disgrace of honour and humanity.”³⁹⁶ Although Goldsmith did not write much on Saladin, he did not fail to praise him as “the most heroic of all Saracen monarchs.”³⁹⁷

Richard, more than any other medieval monarch was a source of national pride. He was the first English king since the Norman Conquest to become a folk hero.³⁹⁸ Just a century after his crusade, he “had come to represent the English nation with his wars that were representations of English superiority over other nations, especially the French.”³⁹⁹ There had always been a historical enmity between the two nations, and the eighteenth century saw it at a high level. The Dutch invasion of 1688 and the revolution of 1689 was part of an anti-Catholic campaign led by William of Orange, who “was an arch-enemy of Louis the Fourteenth.” War in eighteenth century was still justified by religion, though it was now the cause of Protestantism or of Catholicism. The wars going on from the late seventeenth to the late eighteenth century found support in the public opinion as those of “a Protestant nation favoured by God” against the “Catholic powers of France and

³⁹⁵ Ibid., 26 and 32-3.

³⁹⁶ Ibid., 58-60.

³⁹⁷ Ibid., 57.

³⁹⁸ Gillingham, *Lionheart*, 7..

³⁹⁹ Gillingham, *Richard I*, 9.

Spain.”⁴⁰⁰ Thus, the almost century-long conflict between the two countries had resulted in the expression of anti-French, anti-Catholic feelings in what might be described as a premature nationalism.⁴⁰¹ At stake during the French wars both in early and mid century was “the political and military leadership of Europe” in the presence of a “national enemy.” The eighteenth century representation of the British image was “warlike, proud and heroic,”⁴⁰² the French image being constituted by the corresponding defects.

English historians were always aware of the need to counter the French narratives, which deprived the English of the glory of the crusading expeditions. Tyrrell undertook to save Richard from false remarks.

I have been the more particular in relating the chiefest and most remarkable actions that were performed by this valiant prince in this famous expedition, because it has never yet been so largely told in English, and because it is so much to the honour of this king’s memory, and may serve for a vindication of one of our greatest monarchs from the false and rude aspersions of divers of the French historians.⁴⁰³

Rapin accused the French historians of putting the blame on Richard for the failure of the Jerusalem scheme.

Some however have taxed him with not having known how to make the best of his victory, by marching directly to Jerusalem. But I can not tell whether he is to be blamed upon their authority. There are so few capable of judging rightly in these matters, especially when the circumstances are but very imperfectly known, that I do not think it the part of a prudent man to pass his verdict about them.⁴⁰⁴

And he justified his decision of return to England by enumerating reasons for it.

All these things together were too capable of making him think of returning home, and are reasons sufficient to justify the truce he made with Saladine, notwithstanding the vain declamations of those who have had the confidence to blame him for [deserting] the cause, when within the view of Jerusalem.⁴⁰⁵

⁴⁰⁰ Frank O’Gorman, *The Long Eighteenth Century: British political and social history 1688-1832* (London: Arnold, 1997), 97.

⁴⁰¹ Harling, *Modern State*, 14.

⁴⁰² O’Gorman, *Long Eighteenth Century*, 96-8.

⁴⁰³ Tyrrell, *General History*, 515.

⁴⁰⁴ Rapin, *History of England*, 3:122.

⁴⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 3:124.

Carte agreed that Richard was unjustly evaluated by the French, who accused him of seeking his own ends. He asserted that “whatever money was raised ... was employed to the honour of his nation,” because “he loved his countrymen,” unlike his predecessors.⁴⁰⁶ Thus, Carte justified Richard’s national image by picturing him as reciprocating the love of his nation. It was only Berington who showed signs of recognition of English bias. He was suspicious of the English historians’ accounts of the French army deserting Richard’s forces, observing: “this is so narrated by the English historians.”⁴⁰⁷ Moreover, he showed admiration for Phillippe’s character.

But in France, for some years, we had beheld the growing greatness of Philip Augustus; while, by the side of Richard, whether in his own territories, or at Messina, or in Palestine, his temperate, but manly character, commended our admiration, and defied competition ...⁴⁰⁸

Those who accused French historians of partiality were not neutral themselves in evaluating the episodes involving Phillippe during the crusade. While Tyrrell recognized the contributions of the “French and other nations” to the victory of Acon,⁴⁰⁹ Carte was not sure of the sincerity of the French in their efforts. He held that Richard might have taken Jerusalem, “... if the Templars (who were of the French party), had not persuaded him to neglect it, in order to re-fortify Ascalon ...”,⁴¹⁰ and spoke of “... the French retir[ing] to other places, to pass their time in luxury ...”⁴¹¹ He also accused Phillippe of conspiracy against Richard: “... the duke of Burgundy ... said to have had orders from Phillippe to obstruct Richard’s success ...”⁴¹² Still Tyrell was cautious in his accusations. He commented that Phillippe’s alleged plots of treachery against Richard in Sicily “ [if

⁴⁰⁶ Carte, *General History*, 1:780-1.

⁴⁰⁷ Berington, *Henry II*, 394.

⁴⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 600.

⁴⁰⁹ Tyrrell, *General History*, 499.

⁴¹⁰ Carte, *General History*, 1: 749.

⁴¹¹ *Ibid.*, 1: 754.

⁴¹² *Ibid.*, 1: 755.

true] would derogate very much from the honour of that prince ... ”⁴¹³ although he went on to give notice of his intention to reveal King Phillippe’s mischief in his later chapters: “... the king of France ever after endeavouring to do King Richard all the mischief he could, (as will be further seen in the sequel of this history) ...”⁴¹⁴ Echard found “a foul and dishonourable design of the French king” against Richard in Sicily, though in the later dissension during the crusade, he found fault in both kings: they were “so much distempered by their own violent hearts.”⁴¹⁵ But the French king’s behaviour was unchivalrous, as he abandoned the crusade seeing “so little probability of honour or advantage.” Thus he “had dishonourably forsaken his purpose and vow to God.”⁴¹⁶ Rapin started by asserting that,

Richard had acquired a certain superiority ... the number and good condition of his forces, his personal valour ... [and his victories in battles] of which he had all the honour gained him particular esteem and regard from the whole army.⁴¹⁷

This made Phillippe jealous of him. “Not bearing to see a distinction so much to the advantage of king of England ... he sought some other pretences to colour his resentment.”⁴¹⁸ Pretending that he was ill, he left the crusade “to take possession of the lands of the late earl of Flanders,” though Richard was suspicious that he “had some design on his dominions in France” as well.⁴¹⁹ Robert Henry, in late century, repeated the same view of Phillippe with similar words.

[Phillippe] beheld his own glory eclipsed by the superior splendour of Richard’s achievements, which gave him great disgust. The Earl of Flanders had died before Acon without issue, and he expected, by his presence in France, to secure a part if not

⁴¹³ Tyrrell, *General History*, 486.

⁴¹⁴ Ibid., 487.

⁴¹⁵ Echard, *History of England*, 217 and 220.

⁴¹⁶ Ibid., 220-1.

⁴¹⁷ Rapin, *History of England*, 3:116.

⁴¹⁸ Ibid., 3:117.

⁴¹⁹ Ibid., 3:118.

the whole of his succession, to say nothing of his intention to seize some of Richard's dominions in his absence....⁴²⁰

William Howell, a decade before, had suggested it was Phillippe's envy of Richard that turned him to vicious acts against his rival. He spoke of "the French king envying the English king's noble exploits returned into France" and stated that "while Richard was busied in the Holy War, the king of France, after his return home, devised how to trouble and endamage his dominions."⁴²¹ Goldsmith did not criticise Phillippe, but simply exalted Richard as dominating the scene, as "the king of England who had long filled the world with his fame" and who "went from victory to victory."⁴²² This greatness was at least recognized at least by his own subjects.

[N]othing could exceed the joy of the English upon seeing their monarch return after all his achievements and sufferings ...⁴²³

Richard, as the first king to have been regarded as a hero in England after the Norman Conquest, brought with him others with a similar claim, of whom Edward I was the most promising candidate. Although Edward occupies a very small place in the history of the crusades, he did earn a remarkable reputation among the kings of England as a crusader.⁴²⁴ This is due not to his achievements, but the collective attempts to create a new Richard out of him. A poem composed early in the reign of Edward I went: "Behold he shines like a new Richard," which, Gillingham remarks, was a sign that "Richard had set the standard to which kings were expected to aspire."⁴²⁵ Paul Rapin spoke of the promise of such an identification, asserting that "[Edward's] valour, fame

⁴²⁰ Henry, *History of Great Britain*, 3:146.

⁴²¹ Howell, *Ancient and Present State*, 50.

⁴²² Goldsmith, *Abridgement of History*, 58.

⁴²³ Ibid., 57.

⁴²⁴ Michael Prestwich, *Edward I* (London: Guild Publishing, 1988), 66.

⁴²⁵ Gillingham, *Richard I*, 8.

and the reputation of King Richard his great uncle, struck ... a terror into the infidels ...⁴²⁶ while he also earned the admiration of others:

... He distinguished himself so much on these occasions that, Alliaga, king of the Tartars, ... sent him, ..., letters full of friendship, expressing the highest admiration of his valour and great qualities, ... and offering to send ... his general with a numerous army to his assistance against the Saracens.⁴²⁷

Even though his crusading credentials did not match Richard's, Edward was greatly mourned after his death with the words: "Jerusalem, you have lost the flower of all chivalry."⁴²⁸ Edward was indeed portrayed as a great English hero by the eighteenth-century authors. He was the "magnanimous prince,"⁴²⁹ "reviving the glory of the English name in the holy wars."⁴³⁰ The epic of Edward started with his decision to take the holy cross quite zealously, unlike the French king, St. Louis who was more concerned about his own affairs in Tunis than going on to Jerusalem.⁴³¹ Soon Louis died; but Edward kept his vow and went on with the crusade, even though his chances of making any great progress in Palestine were slim. The picture of Edward swearing to go to Acon, whatever it took, was reproduced by many historians. Tyrrell, Echard and Rapin's narration of the oath were almost the same.

He was so bent upon going that when he was dissuaded from it in Sicily, he [struck] his breast and swore "by the blood of God, though all shall desert me, yet will I go to Acon, if I am attended only by Fowen, my groom ..."⁴³²

Edward's crusade prematurely ended when he was stabbed by the poisoned dagger of an assassin. The story was liable to receive romantic elaboration by historians, some of whom (Echard, Scott, Goldsmith, Howell) mention the story that Edward was saved by

⁴²⁶ Rapin, *History of England*, 3: 488.

⁴²⁷ Howell, *Ancient and Present State*, 173.

⁴²⁸ Prestwich, *Edward I*, 66.

⁴²⁹ Tyrrell, *General History*, 1092-4.

⁴³⁰ Goldsmith, *Abridgement of History*, 72.

⁴³¹ Rapin, *History of England*, 3: 487.

⁴³² Ibid.

his wife, Eleanor, who sucked the poison out of his wound, though usually expressing doubt on its certainty.⁴³³ Howell, though, was certain:

At Acon an assassin wounded him with a poisoned knife; which wound his Queen Eleanor daily licked with her tongue, till therein the poison was extracted, and the wound healed; [she] herself receiving no harm ...⁴³⁴

Others (Tyrrell, Rapin, Carte) held that this version of the story must have been made up by Camden in his *Britannia*.⁴³⁵ Still, Rapin did not hesitate to create a great hero out of Edward who, although he had been wounded, “beat the assassin down backwards and leaping upon him at the same time, wrestled the dagger out of his hand and killed him.”⁴³⁶ Carte, on the other hand, found the chivalric virtue of moderation in Edward who, despite having been attacked by the assassin, reprimanded his servants “for striking a dead person.” Moreover,

[i]t was not the only instance the prince showed of his moderation on this occasion: and when the Christians, enraged at so detestable an attempt, were for revenging it on the Saracens, he prevented them by a very prudent remonstrance that it would draw down the like vengeance on all the Christian pilgrims that were at Jerusalem ...⁴³⁷

If we summarize what the eighteenth century interpretations of the crusade heroes might tell us, first of all we can conclude that the historians’ feelings towards Richard I were mixed. Although they admired his warriorlike qualities, they did not consider him a good king, for basically two reasons: they neither believed the comments of the “monkish writers” on his kingship, nor found that the crusading king of the middle ages fitted their modern ideal. Their admiration of the warrior was not void of criticism. While they praised the courage, physical strength, chivalry, intellect, etc., of Richard, they also

⁴³³ Echard, *History of England*, 300; Scott, *History of Scotland*, 169 ; Goldsmith, *Abridgement of History*, 72; Howell, *Ancient and Present State*, 66.

⁴³⁴ Howell, *Ancient and Present State*, 66.

⁴³⁵ Rapin, *History of England*, 3:489; Tyrrell, *General History*, 1094; Carte, *General History*, 2:174.

⁴³⁶ Rapin, *History of England*, 3:488-9.

⁴³⁷ Carte, *General History*, 2: 174.

despised the brutality of his character, sometimes along with his pride and greed, which contradicted the chivalric image that was agreeable to the civilised “polite and commercial” people of the eighteenth century. The idea of chivalry in the age was perhaps closer to Greek heroism than medieval knighthood, which involved Catholic piety.

This image of a hero, as well as of the barbarian, was extended to Saladin, while Phillippe Augustus, the French king was contrasted with Richard to build the latter’s image as a national hero. That also involved accusing the French historians of painting a dark picture of Richard. Richard’s heroism constituted such an ideal that Edward I, his great nephew, was admired as a warrior in his image. Overall, in all these aspects, the crusade heroes received almost a uniform treatment from the eighteenth century historians and seems to have been much more positive than those of the later centuries, less inclined to a positive appraisal of warriors.⁴³⁸

⁴³⁸ See p.18 above.

CONCLUSION

What conclusion can be drawn from the examination of the works of those eighteenth-century historians, who have been examined here? Most fundamentally, it may be asked if these English histories contained such significant comment on the crusades, as to warrant the effort of interpretation. Did an eighteenth-century British historical outlook on the crusades, or at least one worth describing, exist? This may be answered in the affirmative. The eighteenth century appears to have possessed a substantial and distinctive view of the crusades, much more uniform than that found in the nineteenth century. While the latter period manifested a variety of stances, from anti-Catholic or generally anti-religious ones to those of the nationalist or enthusiastic medievalist, the former period was characterized by Enlightened, anti-Catholic and Whiggish views, which might indeed be modified, but not entirely rejected. The ideology imposed on Britain by the Hanoverian state prevailed.

Nevertheless, the modifications pointed to in the second chapter are quite interesting in that they illustrate the many crucial parts of the content of the received ideology of the period, while also indicating that it was commonly applied to histories, even to the sections as unimportant as those concerning the crusades. However, the still existing variations from this ideology are also interesting as they provide evidence for where the much greater nineteenth-century variations had their roots.

The third chapter disclosed material of even greater interest. The origins of an interest in the crusades' chivalric heroes, in particular Richard I, are not difficult to find. Partly they are in a nationalism, still indeed fundamentally religious in its content, by virtue of the Catholicism of the French enemy. Partly it lay in the social structure of the

British *ancien regime*, the elite of which cherished and was partly defined by an aristocratic ethos. These two themes of nationalism and the *ancien regime* character of the Hanoverian state together have received much attention in recent British historiography. The treatment of the crusading heroes here, it is hoped, has done something to illustrate how both nationalist and *ancien regime* ideology could not only co-exist but merge.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

- Baltimore, F. *Tour to the East in the Years 1763 and 1764: with remarks on the city of Constantinople and the Turks*. London: W.Richardson and S.Clark, 1767.
- Berington, Joseph. *History of the Lives of Abeillard and Heloisa: comprising a period of eighty-four years, from 1079 to 1163, with their genuine letters from the collection of Amboise*. 2nd ed. London: G.G.J. & J. Robinson, 1788.
- . *History of the Reign of Henry II, and Richard and John, his sons (from 1154-1216)*. London: G.G.J. & J. Robinson, 1790.
- Carte, Thomas. *A General History of England: containing an account of the first inhabitants of the country, and the transactions in it*. Vol 1 and 2. London: J. Hodges, 1747.
- Clarendon, Hugh. *A New and Authentic History of England: from the remotest period of intelligence to the close of the year 1767*. London: J.Cooke, 1768.
- Echard, Laurence. *The History of England: from the first entrance of Julius Caesar and the Romans, to the end of the reign of King James the first, containing the space of 1678 years*. 2nd ed. London: Jacob Tonson, 1718.
- Gibbon, Edward. *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. 6th ed. Vol.6..Dublin: W.Wilson, 1776.
- Goldsmith, Oliver. *An Abridgement of the History of England from the Invasion of Julius Caesar to the Death of George II*. London: B.Law, 1774.

- Henry, Robert. *The History of Great Britain from the Invasion of it by Romans under Julius Caesar: written on a new plan*. Vol 3 and 4. London: T.Cadell, 1777.
- Howell, Dr. William. *The Ancient and Present State of England: being a compendious history of all its monarchs from the Julius Caesar, to the accession of his present majesty George III*. London: T. Osborne, 1766.
- Hull, Thomas. *Richard Plantagenet, a Legendary Tale*. London: John Bell, 1774.
- . *Edward and Eleanora, a Tragedy*. Altered from James Thomson. J. Bell: London, 1775.
- Hume, David. *The History of England, from the invasion of Julius Caesar to the revolution in 1688*. Vol 1. London: T.Cadell, 1767.
- Irwin, Eyles. *The Failure of the French Crusade, or the advantages to be derived by Great Britain from the restoration of Egypt to the Turks*. London: W.Bulmer & Co., 1799.
- Knipe, Eliza. *Six Narrative Poems*. London: C.Dilly, 1787.
- Rapin de Thoyras, Paul. *The History of England, as well ecclesiastical as civil*. Translated by. N. Tindal. Vol 2 and 3. London: James and John Knapton, 1728.
- . *Rapin's Impartial History of England*. Vol 1. Translated by John Kelly. London: John Harrison, 1784.
- R.B., ed. *Two Journeys to Jerusalem*. London: Nath. Crouch, 1715.
- Robertson, William. *The History of the Reign of the Emperor Charles the Fifth, with a view of the progress of society in Europe, from the subversion of the Roman Empire, to the beginning of the sixteenth century*. Vol 1. Dublin: W & W Smith, 1769.

- Salmon, Thomas. *A Review of the History of England: containing the titles and pretensions of our several kings, and the most remarkable transactions and occurrences in each reign, from the Conquest to the Revolution*. Vol 1. London: Charles Rivington, 1724.
- Scott, David. *The History of Scotland: containing all the historical transactions of that nation, from the year of the world 3619 to the year of Christ 1726*. Westminster: J.Cluer and A.Campbell, 1727.
- Thomson, James. *Tancred and Sigismunda, a Tragedy*. London: James Magee, 1745.
- . *Edward and Eleanora, a Tragedy*. London: John Bell, 1739.
- Tyrrell, James. *The General History of England both Ecclesiastical and Civil from the earliest accounts of time, to the reign of his present majesty, King William III*. Vol 2. London: W.Rogers, 1700.
- Walpole, Horace. *Castle of Otranto: a Gothic Story*. Translated by William Marshal. London: Cooper and Graham, 1796.
- . *Historic Doubts on the Life and Reign of King Richard III*. Dublin: G.Faulkner, 1768.

Secondary Sources

- Allan, David. *Virtue, Learning and the Scottish Enlightenment*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1993.
- Atiya, Aziz S. *The Crusade: Historiography and Bibliography*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1962.
- Boase, T.S.R. "Recent Developments in crusading historiography." *History*, 22 (1937): 110-25.

- Breisach, Ernst. *Historiography: Ancient, Medieval & Modern*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994.
- Brown, Marshall. *Pre-Romanticism*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991.
- Black, William. *Goldsmith*. London: Macmillan, 1935.
- Butterfield, Herbert. *Man on his Past: the study of the history of historical scholarship*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1955.
- Cantor, Norman F. "Introduction." In *The Encyclopedia of the Middle Ages*, edited by Norman F. Cantor, Elizabeth Brown et al. New York: Viking, 1999.
- . *Inventing the Middle Ages: the lives, works, and ideas of the great medievalists of the twentieth century*. Cambridge: Lutterworth Press, 1992.
- . *The Meaning of the Middle Ages: a sociological and cultural history*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1973.
- Champion, J. A. I. *The Pillars of Priestcraft Shaken: the Church of England and its enemies, 1660-1730*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Conkin, Paul Keith and Roland N. Stromberg. *Heritage and Challenge: the history and theory of history*. Arlington Heights, Ill.: Forum Press, 1989.
- Crossley, Ceri. *French Historians and Romanticism: Thierry, Guizot, the Saint-Simonians, Quinet, Michelet*. London: Routledge, 1993.
- Duffy, Eamon. "Doctor Douglass and Mister Berington: an eighteenth-century retraction." *Downside Review*, 88 (1970): 246-69.
- . "Ecclesiastical democracy detected: I (1779-1787)." *Recusant History*, 10 (1969-70): 193-209.
- . "Ecclesiastical democracy detected: II (1787-1796)." *Recusant History*, 10

- (1969-70): 309-31.
- . “Ecclesiastical democracy detected: III (1796-1803).” *Recusant History*, 13 (1975-6): 123-48.
- Gascoigne, John. *Cambridge in the Age of the Enlightenment: science, religion and politics from the Restoration to the French Revolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Gillingham, John. *Richard I*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999.
- . *Richard Coeur de Lion: kingship, chivalry and war in twelfth century*. London: Hambledon Press, 1994.
- . *Richard the Lionheart*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1989.
- Goldie, Mark. “Tyrell, James (1642-1718).” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/27953>.
- Gooch, G.P. *History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century*. London: Longmans, 1913.
- Harling, Philip. *The Modern State: an historical introduction*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2001.
- Hearnshaw, F.J.C. “Chivalry and its Place in History.” In *Chivalry: a series of studies to illustrate its historical significance and civilizing influence*, edited by Edgar Prestage. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Himmelfarb, Gertrude. *The New History and the Old*. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1987.
- Im Hof, Ulrich. *The Enlightenment*. Translated by William E. Yuill. Oxford:

- Blackwell Publishers, 1994.
- Ker, Ian, ed. *The Genius of John Henry Newman: selections from his writings*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.
- Keller, Barbara G. *The Middle Ages Reconsidered: attitudes in France from the eighteenth century through the romantic movement*. New York: Peter Lang, 1994.
- Kelly, James. *The Damned Thing called Honour: duelling in Ireland, 1570-1860*. Cork, Ireland: Cork University Press, 1995.
- Kenyon, John Phillips. *The History Men: the historical profession in England since the Renaissance*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1993.
- Kidd, Colin. *Subverting Scotland's Past: Scottish Whig historians and the creation of an Anglo-British identity, 1689-c1830*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Langford, Paul. *A Polite and Commercial People: England 1727-1783*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Lowe, Norman. *Mastering Modern British History*. London: Macmillan, 1989.
- Marwick, Arthur. *The Nature of History*. Houndmills: Macmillan, 1991.
- Medhurst, K and G Mayer. *Church and Politics in a Secular Age*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988.
- La Monte, J.L. "Some Problems in Crusading Historiography." *Speculum*, 15 (1940): 56-75.
- Nenner, Howard. "The Later Stuart Age." In *The Varieties of British political thought, 1500-1800*, edited by J.G.A. Pocock, Gordon J. Schochet et al. Cambridge:

- Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- O'Brien, Karen. *Narratives of Enlightenment: cosmopolitan history from Voltaire to Gibbon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- O'Gorman, Frank. *The Long Eighteenth Century: British political and social history 1688-1832*. London: Arnold, 1997.
- Peters, Edward. "The Firanj are Coming— Again." *Orbis* (Winter 2004).
<http://www.fpri.org/orbis/4801/peters.firanj.html/>.
- Phillipson, Nicholas. "Politeness and Politics in the Reigns of Anne and the Early Hannoverians." In *The Varieties of British Political Thought, 1500-1800*, edited by J.G.A. Pocock, Gordon J. Schochet et al. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Pocock, J. G. A. *Barbarism and Religion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- . *Virtue, Commerce, and History: essays on political thought and history, chiefly in the eighteenth century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Prestwich, Michael. *Edward I*. London: Guild Publishing, 1988.
- Du Quesnay Adams, Jeremy. "Modern Views of Medieval Chivalry." In *The Study of Chivalry: resources and approaches*, edited by Howell Chickering and Thomas H. Seiler. Kalamazoo, Mich.: Medieval Institute Publications, Western Michigan University, 1988.
- Redwood, John. *Reason, Ridicule, and Religion: the age of Enlightenment in England, 1660-1750*. London: Thames & Hudson, 1976.

- Richter, David H. "From Medievalism to Historicism: representations of history in the Gothic novel and historical romance." In *Medievalism in England II*, edited by Leslie J. Workman and Kathleen Verduin. Cambridge: Brewer, 1996.
- Ridley, R.T. "The Forgotten Historian: Laurence Echard and the first history of the Roman Republic." *Ancient Society*, 27 (1996): 277-315.
- Saab, Ann Pottinger. *The Origins of the Crimean Alliance*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1977.
- Sambrook, James. "A just balance between patronage and the press: the case of James Thomson." *Studies in the Literary Imagination* (Spring 2001).
http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa3822/is_200104/ai_n8948581/pg_6.
- Siberry, Elizabeth. "Images of the Crusades in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries." In *Oxford Illustrated History of the Crusades*, edited by Jonathan Riley-Smith. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- . *The New Crusaders: images of the crusades in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries*. Aldershot, England: Ashgate, 2000.
- Simons, John. "Medievalism as Cultural Process in Pre-industrial Popular Literature." In *Medievalism in England*, edited by Leslie J. Workman. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1992.
- Smith, R.J. "Cobbett, Catholic History, and the Middle Ages." In *Medievalism in England II*, edited by Leslie J. Workman and Kathleen Verduin. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1996.
- Smuts, R. Malcolm. *Culture and Power in England, 1585-1685*. New York:

- St.Martin's Press, 1999.
- Stanley, E.G. "The early middle ages=the dark ages=the heroic age of England and in English." In *The Middle Ages after the Middle Ages in the English-speaking World*, edited by Marie-Françoise Alamichel and Derek Brewer. Rochester, N.Y.: D.S. Brewer, 1997.
- Sullivan, M.G. "Rapin de Thoyras, Paul de (1661-1725)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/23145/>.
- Sweet, Rosemary. *Antiquaries: The Discovery of the Past in Eighteenth Century Britain*. Hambledon & London Ltd, 2004.
- Trevor-Roper, Hugh. "A Huguenot Historian: Paul Rapin." In *Huguenots in Britain and their French Background, 1550-1800: contributions to the historical conference of the Huguenot society of London, 24-25 September 1985*, edited by Irene Scouloudi. Totowa, New Jersey: Barnes and Noble, 1987.
- Turner, Ralph V. and Richard R.Heiser. *The Reign of Richard Lionheart: ruler of the Angevin Empire, 1189-99*. Harlow, England: Pearson Education, 2000.
- Woolf, Daniel R. *Reading History in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Workman, Leslie J. "Editorial." In *The New Studies in Medievalism, medievalism in Europe*, edited by Leslie J. Workman. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1994.