**Understanding the Crusades: The Contribution of Correspondence**

*Sophia Menache*

*University of Haifa*

In previous studies I investigated the communication challenges experienced in medieval Christendom throughout the Crusade Period.[[1]](#footnote-1) This paper focuses on correspondence, one of the main networks available to the crusaders. I propose a new reading of crusade correspondence combining written and oral messages, that is, letters and the oral messages transmitted with them. This study argues that the combination of letters and oral messages offers a more comprehensive perspective on the transmission and reception of messages in the Early Crusade Period.

The chronological framework of this study begins at the first stages of the crusaders’ *Outremer* (1098) and continues up to the aftermath of the Battle of Hattin and the beginning of the Third Crusade (1190). The peculiar features of communication in the Early Crusade Period determine the *terminus ad quem*, particularly in light of the communication changes characterizing the thirteenth century, the subject of another study. The database of the *Revised Version of Röhricht’s* *Regesta Regni Hierosolymitani* [hereafter RRR] has provided an invaluable tool,[[2]](#footnote-2) complemented by English translations of relevant letters from the collection published by Malcolm Barber and Keith Bate.[[3]](#footnote-3)

The RRR comprises 191 letters in the period under consideration. They reflect, *inter alia,* the contemporaries’ opinions and feelings, the extent of interest of both Christendom and the Latin East in each other, and the chroniclers’ awareness of the relevance of correspondence as a historical source. Naturally it would be risky to assert that our data represents the complete documentation, since additional records could be discovered, a possibility taken into consideration by the RRR editors. Still, the very existence of 191 letters written throughout the twelfth century confirms the unique status of the Latin Kingdom and the considerable interest it aroused in contemporary society. The main questions addressed below relate to four main areas, namely:

1. Crusade correspondence and its nature: Schedule, messengers, oral transmission of news, and the interaction between written and oral messages.
2. Writers and their addressees: categorized according to wide social groups such as ecclesiastical dignitaries, members of the Military Orders, secular princes, merchants, and representatives of the Italian City-States, while differentiating between those writing from or to the Latin East.
3. Subject matters: mainly political/military news andcalls for assistance, ecclesiastical issues and exchange of vows,relics and their trade.
4. Reference to correspondence in twelfth-century narrative sources, either Latin orMuslim.

Referencing all of the letters would be rather tedious, thus particular letters are quoted only in exceptional cases. The same goes for the source collections with the complete text. The RRR number of each letter appears in the footnotes for easy identification of particular writers and their addressees, the matters they cover, and the complete version of each letter.

1. **Medieval Correspondence**

St. Ambrose, writing in the fourth century, claimed, “The epistolary genre was devised in order that someone may speak to us when we are absent.”[[4]](#footnote-4) This approach determined much of the value ascribed to correspondence in the Crusade Period, when the Mediterranean separated the two main sectors of medieval Christendom. The eleventh and twelfth centuries are considered the “golden age” of medieval epistolography,[[5]](#footnote-5) with letters becoming “the primary medium of medieval communication, administration, and propaganda.”[[6]](#footnote-6) Indeed, the *artes dictaminis*, together with Roman and Canon Law, public speaking, and preaching, became subjects of study for anyone aspiring to ecclesiastical or governmental careers.[[7]](#footnote-7) The different sections of letters were authoritatively established in a logical sequence, which comprised the *salutatio,* followed by the *exordium* consisting of some commonplace generality, a proverb, or a scriptural quotation. Next was the *narratio,* which included the particular purpose of the letter; the *petitio,* based on the two former,and thefinal phrases or *conclusio*.[[8]](#footnote-8)

This rigid structure was not accidental. Many letters were quasi-public documents, written to be collected or publicized, and intended to be read by more than one person. Thus Anselm of Ribemont, in the conclusion of his letter to Manasses, Archbishop of Reims (July 1098), expresses his hopes: “*We ask in the Lord Jesus that* ***all*** *who receive this letter will intercede with God for us and our dead*” (emphasis mine).[[9]](#footnote-9) Furthermore, letters were expected to be correct and elegant rather than original and spontaneous, and they therefore often adhered to practices and contents exemplified in model letters.[[10]](#footnote-10) Still, Alberic of Monte Cassino (d. 1088) defines letters as “a suitable arrangement of discourses (*sermones)* established to express the intention of the sender,”[[11]](#footnote-11) thus allowing some space for individual expressions of feelings or intentions.

Crusade letters share many of the distinctive features of medieval correspondence. The geopolitical circumstances and the growing awareness of the limitations posed by time and space, however, created additional features that require further analysis.

**1b. Schedule, Carriers, and Particular Characteristics of Crusade Correspondence**

Absence of specific references to chronology, particularly the schedule gap between transmission and reception, constitutes a central methodological obstacle in the investigation of crusade correspondence. With the exception of papal letters, most contemporaries do not specifically mention the date of writing. The editors of RRR eventually suggest some chronological framework, which occasionally involves time periods that are too broad.[[12]](#footnote-12) In the exceptional cases for which chronological data is available, it is possible to trace the timeline of twelfth-century crusade correspondence. Some examples describe the contemporary state of affairs: Patriarch Daibert of Jerusalem refers in early February 1100 to the prior letter of Henry of Castella and John Michael, written to his predecessor approximately three months earlier, in November 1099.[[13]](#footnote-13) News of the Templar Master Gerard of Ridefort’s death on 8 October 1189 reached Rome by 11 January 1190.[[14]](#footnote-14) Similarly, the Temple preceptor’s report on the Christian losses at Hattin (August 1187) inspired Gregory VIII’s encyclical *Audita tremendi*,dated 24 October 1187,and a lost letter of Clement III the following year.[[15]](#footnote-15) It is reasonable to conclude that it took between two and three months, at least, for the crusaders to receive some response from Christendom. Sometimes the delay was much longer. The sealed letter of Patriarch Evremar of Jerusalem (3 April 1104) reached Lambert, Bishop Arras only by 17 November of that year.[[16]](#footnote-16) Pope Alexander III urged the prelates and Christian rulers to help the Templars (22 February and, again, on 12 April 1180), following their requests dated 29 August 1179; that is, between six and eight months earlier.[[17]](#footnote-17) King Louis VII refers to Bishop Nablus’s appeal for contributions from earlier that year in his letter dated 28 August 1170.[[18]](#footnote-18) Such a lapse of several months often became critical for the crusaders’ survival in a hostile environment.

The following table shows the crusade letters’ dates according to decade, thus allowing some evaluation of the intensity of crusade correspondence from and to the Latin East:



Analysis of crusade correspondence requires additional clarifications. The crusaders, and especially their leaders, needed to balance the very few and defective communication channels available to them with the imperative to receive continuous and urgent support from Europe. They thus became the main promoters of smoother communication channels. Regular mail services, like those operating in the neighboring Muslim States and Byzantium, remained completely alien to the crusader world.[[19]](#footnote-19) The crusaders did, however, gradually embrace the Muslim practice of carrier pigeons, although the birds were always exposed to falcons or hawks that could thwart their mission. Still, carrier pigeons proved to be effective across distances of up to a thousand miles, traveling at speeds that considerably exceeded those of mounted messengers at the time – up to 70 miles per hour.[[20]](#footnote-20) Although letter exchange across short distances – between Byzantium, Antioch, Jerusalem, and Acre – was relatively efficient, it encountered many difficulties between the Crusader Kingdom and Western Christendom.[[21]](#footnote-21) The maritime journey between Europe and the Latin East was relatively short, from fifteen to twenty-five days with favorable winds, but only during specific seasons, from late March to late October.[[22]](#footnote-22)

Hostile conditions, the danger of letters being stolen, as well as the many accidents that could hinder letters’ transmission led to the parallel use of multiple messengers,[[23]](#footnote-23) with the risk of repetition. Stephen of Blois, writing a second letter to his wife Adela, was well aware of the precarious situation:

*Count Stephen to Countess Adela, dearest friend and wife, the best and most pleasing greetings your mind can imagine. Be it known, my love, that I am enjoying a marvellous journey to Romania in all honour and good health. I took care to send you by letter from Constantinople an account of my life on pilgrimage, but just in case the messenger has suffered some accident,* ***I am rewriting the letter*** *to you*(emphasis mine)*.*[[24]](#footnote-24)

Writers and receivers were also aware that their letters might be falsified.[[25]](#footnote-25)

The climate conditions posed additional challenges, leading to an inflexible schedule of missions and messengers. Patriarch Aimery of Antioch excuses his modest gift to Hugo Etherianus – Emperor Manuel Comnenus’s adviser on Western Christendom – due to the immediate departure of his messengers.[[26]](#footnote-26) Several writers further underline the many perils experienced in their route eastwards and, eventually, their joy upon safely arriving in the Holy Land.[[27]](#footnote-27) Such feelings of relief were not simple rhetoric, since divine help or the forces of nature were not always on the side of the *milites Christi.* In his letter to Henry, Archbishop of Reims, King Amalric refers to his continuous attempts to send a suitable delegation to Christendom (May 1169). Since the ship carrying the first delegation was wrecked, the king had to appoint a suitable new delegation. The Archbishop of Tyre, Bishop of Banias, and the brothers of the Hospital thus replaced the members of the first mission, the Patriarch of Jerusalem, Archbishop of Caesarea, Bishop of Acre, and the brothers of the Hospital and the Temple.[[28]](#footnote-28) The high dignitaries selected in both missions hint at the king’s awareness of the importance of selecting the most reliable messengers, notwithstanding the many difficulties that plagued their mission. It can be argued that the careful selection of suitable delegates hints at Amalric’s reluctance to rely on written messages alone, and the vital importance he ascribed to a more personal, direct interaction between his messengers and their addressees. This is a common situation in diplomatic negotiations nowadays.

Along with their original duty as couriers, messengers also orally transmitted pieces or even large amounts of information.[[29]](#footnote-29) The careful selection of messengers reflects a most important necessity in message transmission between the Latin East and Christendom, combining written and oral practices. It is important to remember that letters were also called *sermones* or *orationes* because they were often delivered orally, as speeches, even to recipients who could understand and read Latin, monastic audiences among them;[[30]](#footnote-30) *legere* and *audire* were indeed often used as synonyms.[[31]](#footnote-31) Comprehending the interaction between written and oral messages is crucial for understanding, *inter alia,* the aristocracy’s active involvement in crusade correspondence, notwithstanding its low level of literacy.[[32]](#footnote-32)

The authors of crusade correspondence were well aware of their messengers’ vital role in the success of their missions, and they used their letters to praise the many merits of their emissaries. In his letter to Catholic prelates and laymen in the German region (May or June 1100), Patriarch Daibert of Jerusalem formally declares:

*Dearest brothers in Christ, we would have written at length on the amazingly great miracles and countless blessings which the generous goodness of God frequently showered on the army of Jerusalem on its journey and in the capture of the holy city of Jerusalem, but the practised eloquence of brother Arnulf, who was there to see and hear everything, will provide you with a full chronological account of events if you are kind enough to lend him an ear.*[[33]](#footnote-33)

Arnulf of Chocques was undoubtedly well qualified to fulfil his mission, being the former chaplain of Robert of Normandy, papal legate in the First Crusade, elected Patriarch of Jerusalem (1099, 1112–15, 1116–18), and eventually also Archdeacon (1099–1112) and Chancellor of the Kingdom (1099–1118).[[34]](#footnote-34)

A considerable number of authors further emphasize the credibility of their messengers, while formally declaring their complete trust in them.[[35]](#footnote-35) The Master of the Temple, Bertrand of Blancfort, writing to King Louis VII (November 1164), declares:

*…Most serene king, the troubles in the two lands of Antioch and Jerusalem are too numerous to enumerate to you in writing, so we are sending your worthy excellency Brother Walter to bear this letter. He is honest and careful in God’s business, and has been involved in these events from the beginning to the end. He will divulge to your holiness our decision, and your highness can have total confidence in what he says, because it will be as though coming from our own mouth.*[[36]](#footnote-36)

Indeed, Walter II Brisebarre, Lord of Beirut (1156-7- ca 1166), and subsequently Lord of the Transjordan (1166-1174) and Blanchegarde (1174-1179),[[37]](#footnote-37) was undoubtedly well suited to complete the most delicate missions.

Sometimes there are moving references to common experiences shared by the messenger and his addressee, further justifying the deep trust between them. In his letter to Baldwin I, Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury, refers to the close relations between his messenger and the king, which go back to childhood.[[38]](#footnote-38) Stephen of Tournai, Abbot of St. Genevieve, similarly reminds Eraclius, Bishop of Caesarea, of their common days as students in Bologna,[[39]](#footnote-39) while Ansell, cantor of the Holy Sepulchre, shares his touching memories of their diocese with the bishop and clergy of Paris:

*Although it is now twenty-four years since I left you and your church where I was nourished and educated, my love for you remains fervent and in my mind I still live in your church with you. For, over the years, I have always held conversations with those who have come here from you, those that know you or are known to you, asking for details of you and your church, what you are doing, how you are keeping, particularly those of you I have seen and known. As long as I live, although far from you I shall always love you, and I often dream that I am chanting with you in your rituals and processions, your Feast Day Matins and offices.[[40]](#footnote-40)*

At other times, there are frightening descriptions of the messenger’s many sufferings in the service of Christ:

*But because the bearer of the letter suffered dangers with us, and in Christ’s name gave his strength and his blood, so that his mutilated, lacerated body has left him incapable of working and useless for combat, we ask every single pious person to consider his needs, so that by your generous alms and his work and our prayers,* *he may complete his journey to the community of martyrs*.[[41]](#footnote-41)

After commending their messengers, many writers often asked explicitly for some reply,[[42]](#footnote-42) a request that hints at the possibility that many letters remained unreciprocated. Furthermore, the careful selection of messengers from very narrow social groups became most difficult in times of crises. Geoffrey Fulcher, preceptor of the Temple, warned King Louis VII not to expect additional messengers, because the prolonged absence of the king and master actually impeded direct additional *probi homines* to Christendom.[[43]](#footnote-43)

1. **The Authors**

Reference to the authors of crusade correspondence is risky at times, since some letters appear to be a product of collegial drafting, subsequently modified by anonymous authors during the long process of transmission.[[44]](#footnote-44) The following categorization thus follows the identification established by Röhrich and reproduced in the RRR.

Ecclesiastical dignitaries, with the papacy at their head, appear at the forefront of correspondence to and from the Latin East, with more than one-hundred letters written by different sectors of the Catholic Church. This is not surprising in light of the high literacy level attributed to the ecclesiastical hierarchy during the Central Middle Ages.[[45]](#footnote-45) Indeed, twelfth-century popes developed an active correspondence with the Latin East.[[46]](#footnote-46) However, no clear connection has been found between the pontificates’ longevity and correspondence with *Outremer*. Although six letters remain from both Paschal II (1099-1118) and Alexander III (1145-53), only one letter in the crusade context remains from Innocent II (1130-43). The existence of antipopes who challenged papal supremacy at the time,[[47]](#footnote-47) although sporadically mentioned, does not seem to have played a significant role in crusade correspondence.[[48]](#footnote-48) A similar conclusion can be reached concerning the legates,[[49]](#footnote-49) who played a vital role in the consolidation of the papal monarchy. Though the active involvement of Adhémar of Le Puy in the First Crusade[[50]](#footnote-50) was consistent with the communication channels developed by the Reformed Papacy, only a few legates appear thereafter in crusade correspondence.[[51]](#footnote-51)

Other members of the ecclesiastical hierarchy played a more active role in crusade correspondence, especially the patriarchs – with those of Jerusalem at the forefront.[[52]](#footnote-52) Besides ecclesiastical matters, their letters also referred to political and military issues, clearly reflecting the patriarchs’ involvement in government and their continuous efforts to contribute to its survival.[[53]](#footnote-53) Again, no clear connection has been found between the length of the patriarchs’ pontificate and the extent of their correspondence with Western Christendom. Ghibelin of Arles (1107-1112), for example, is completely absent. Conversely, there are four epistles written by the patriarchs of Antioch.[[54]](#footnote-54)

Archbishops[[55]](#footnote-55) and bishops, especially those officiating in the Levant, also played an active role in crusade correspondence.[[56]](#footnote-56) There are also some letters written by the high ecclesiastical hierarchy in Western Christendom.[[57]](#footnote-57)

While only four letters written by members of the Monastic Orders in the Levant are extant,[[58]](#footnote-58) there are a nineteen written by their colleagues in Western Christendom,[[59]](#footnote-59) with Bernard de Clairvaux representing a category by himself.[[60]](#footnote-60) Thomas L. Smith describes twelfth-century monastic letters written in the West as a means of “supporting, participating and engaging with the crusading movement.”[[61]](#footnote-61) He further claims that copying and diffusing crusade letters turned into a kind of spiritual weapon that, together with prayer, became a form of “scribal crusading.”[[62]](#footnote-62) The copying and transmission of crusade letters by monastic writers perhaps also heralded a gradual but slow transition from oral to written communication, a process completed by the Late Middle Ages.

The two large Military Orders, the *Pauperes commilitones Christi Templique Salomonici* and the *Ordo Fratrum Hospitalis Sancti Ioannis Hierosolymitani* represent another category. Twenty-one letters written by the Templars[[63]](#footnote-63) and another twelve by the Hospitallers, notably their masters,[[64]](#footnote-64) hint at the active role played by the knights of *Outremer.* [[65]](#footnote-65)

Besides their active involvement in crusade correspondence, one should further note the active involvement of the ecclesiastical order in the many delegations in which they participated and sometimes led. Fifty-three letters were written by secular princes,[[66]](#footnote-66) twenty-six of them by the Kings of Jerusalem,[[67]](#footnote-67) but also by Louis VII of France and Conrad III of Germany, during their participation in the Second Crusade.[[68]](#footnote-68) All of these letters were written in the Latin East except two letters redacted by King Henry II of England.[[69]](#footnote-69) Muslim rulers such as Saladin, his associates and adversaries, as well as Shams al-Maluk Isma’il of Damascus, also corresponded with the crusaders in the last quarter of the twelfth century.[[70]](#footnote-70) The aristocracy’s active involvement in the First Crusade, clearly reflected in early twelfth-century letters,[[71]](#footnote-71) became exceptional towards the second half of the century.[[72]](#footnote-72) Conversely, only three letters remained from the representatives of the Italian city-states,[[73]](#footnote-73) a rather surprising datum.[[74]](#footnote-74) By the late twelfth century, merchant letters reveal an increasing tendency to report important political and military events for the sake of business interests.[[75]](#footnote-75) The merchants’ common use of written documents, as clearly evidenced in the Cairo Geniza, further justifies additional archival investigation, which may complement our data.[[76]](#footnote-76) Finally, there are a small number of miscellaneous letters, signed by Franks,[[77]](#footnote-77) an Egyptian imprisoned in Nablus,[[78]](#footnote-78) Rabbi Moses ben Maimon,[[79]](#footnote-79) and one signed by Eastern Christians.[[80]](#footnote-80)

It would appear that most letters were written in the Levant, perhaps with the exception of crusade correspondence sent by the papal curia and other ecclesiastical dignitaries. However, only 27 percent of crusade correspondence originated in Western Christendom, with the popes responsible for 85 percent of that correspondence . Analysis of the letters’ addressees further clarifies the contemporaries’ foci on both sides of the Mediterranean.

**2b. Addressees**

Only fifteen letters from the Latin East were addressed to twelfth-century popes,[[81]](#footnote-81) compared to twenty-three letters sent by the Apostolic See to the crusaders. Ten popes who held the See of St. Peter in the Early Crusade Period-- Paschal II (1099-1118), Callixtus II (1119-24), and Eugene III (1145-53) among them, are completely absent from crusade correspondence, notwithstanding the active communication between Bernard of Clairvaux and his former student.[[82]](#footnote-82) However, there is some degree of balance in the number of letters that the crusaders wrote to other members of the ecclesiastical hierarchy in Christendom, such as archbishops,[[83]](#footnote-83) bishops,[[84]](#footnote-84) and abbots,[[85]](#footnote-85) and those received in the Latin East.[[86]](#footnote-86) The number of letters addressed to the popes (fifteen), also equals the number of messages written to the Patriarchs of Jerusalem and those of Antioch. An eclectic category of addressees includes the faithful,[[87]](#footnote-87) canons,[[88]](#footnote-88) and unidentified churches in both Europe and the Latin East. [[89]](#footnote-89)

However, despite the many letters written by the masters and members of the Military Orders to Western Christendom, only ten letters were addressed to the Templars[[90]](#footnote-90) and Hospitallers,[[91]](#footnote-91) representing one third of the letters written by the knights. Moreover, considering that many letters addressed to the knights were written by other members of the Order and only two by popes and the Kings of Jerusalem, it is reasonable to conclude that correspondence did not represent the main channel of communication with the Orders at the time.

On the other hand, neither the nobility,[[92]](#footnote-92) the Kings of Jerusalem[[93]](#footnote-93) or other rulers[[94]](#footnote-94) attracted much attention in crusade correspondence. None of them received the attention given to King Louis VII of France, to whom twenty letters were addressed before and after his crusade.[[95]](#footnote-95)

A miscellaneous category that includes the faithful and unidentified correspondents and benefactors[[96]](#footnote-96) complemented the rather small number of letters written to the Italian city-states and merchants.[[97]](#footnote-97) The following table shows the number of crusade letters written and received in the Latin East during the Early Crusade Period:



A possible conclusion at this point is that there is greater balance between letters written and received in well-defined groups, such as the secular princes and, to a lesser extent, the popes. Conversely, patriarchs and members of the Military Orders wrote almost two times as many letters as they received. Finally, the laity also received a much larger number of letters than they wrote. This imbalance is likely due to there being a central source of monetary support for the Latin East. The following table corroborates the gap between letters written from and to the Latin East, whose inhabitants directed many of their hopes across the sea.

Bearing in mind the very low degree of literacy attributed to the laity during the Central Middle Ages, the data above calls for further analysis. Nancy Harper claimed that, until about the eleventh century, illiteracy was more the rule than the exception. Not only were much of the lower social strata unable to read or write – but so too most kings and princes.[[98]](#footnote-98) Harper’s conclusions have been corroborated by Toussaert’s research on eleventh-century Flanders, where “illiteracy governed everywhere and the great lords took pride in their ignorance.”[[99]](#footnote-99) The illiteracy attributed to the laity in the Central Middle Ages, then, is a common theme in medieval historiography.[[100]](#footnote-100) However, the very fact that letters were written to be read aloud as discourses or sermons neutralizes the weight attributed to the literacy of the addressees, especially among the laity.[[101]](#footnote-101) Recent scholarship further corroborates the relationship of nobles to literacy through the mediation of the chaplains at their service.[[102]](#footnote-102) Furthermore, whether read or listened to, letters represented only one part of message transmission, which was complemented by oral messages.

1. **Subject Matter**

Many letters contain reports of central political and military developments overseas, quite similar to those found in modern newspapers. The selected examples further identify general tendencies in crusade epistolography, thus mitigating some of the reservations aroused by particular letters in recent historiographical research.[[103]](#footnote-103)

Most correspondence in the Early Crusade Period concerns the crusaders’ dealings in the Levant from the beginning of the *Gesta Dei*, victories and defeats,[[104]](#footnote-104) the election and/or death of kings,[[105]](#footnote-105) and problems following the pilgrims’ return to their homelands and/or the duplicity attributed to the Eastern Emperors.[[106]](#footnote-106) The letter of Bohemond and other nobles to Pope Urban II bears witness to the exaltation of the crusade leaders following their early victories and the finding of holy relics, but also the first seeds of disagreement with the Apostolic See (11 September 1098):

*We all wish and desire that you should know how great was the favour of God and how evident was his help in our capture of Antioch, the capture and slaughter of the Turks who had heaped so many insults on our Lord Jesus; how we, pilgrims of Jesus Christ, avenged the wrong done to God the Highest; how we first besieged the Turks and then in our turn were besieged by the Turks of Khurasan, Jerusalem, Damascus and many other lands, but were liberated by the favour of Jesus Christ….During that time the most merciful compassion of Almighty God that watched over us came to our aid. In the church of St Peter, chief of the apostles, we found the Lance of the Lord which Longinus had used to pierce our Saviour’s side[[107]](#footnote-107)…But, as is often the case, happiness was clouded by sadness, for the bishop of Le Puy, who you had appointed as your vicar, died on the kalends of August….We ask you again and again, our dearest father, as father and leader to come to the place of your fatherhood, and as vicar of St Peter to sit on his throne and have us as your obedient sons in all legitimate actions, eradicating and destroying all types of heresy with your authority and our valour….Something has come to my knowledge that is bad news for God and Christians everywhere, namely that people signed with the cross have received permission from you to stay among the Christian people. As you are the originator of this holy expedition I am very surprised….We your sons, who obey you in everything, most pious father, you should separate from the unjust emperor who has never fulfilled the many promises he had made us. In fact, he has hindered and harmed us in every way at his disposal…*[[108]](#footnote-108)

This letter provides the papal curia with a moving insight into the feelings and expectations common among the leaders of the First Crusade. Sometimes, letters further reflect the history of an ancient past, as in the letter of Stephen of Blois to his wife Adela:

*As I said earlier, with the triumph of God, the surrender of Nicaea took place on the thirteenth day before the kalends of July. In early church history, it is written that the holy fathers held a religious synod in Nicaea where they demolished the Arian heresy and under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, they confirmed the truth of the Holy Trinity. The city was a teacher of error because of its sins, but now by the mercy of God has become a student of truth because of its sinning servants. I tell you, my love, that five weeks after leaving the oft-mentioned Nicaea we will reach Jerusalem if Antioch does not hold us up. Farewell*.[[109]](#footnote-109)

At this stage of research, it is almost impossible to corroborate the reactions, if any, that each letter aroused in its intended public.

The imbalance in the correspondence between *Outremer* and Christendom became most uneasy with regard to the considerable number of letters asking for assistance, which often reflect their authors’ despair:[[110]](#footnote-110)

*We are surrounded by the Saracens on all sides. Babylon is to the east, Ascalon to the west, Arsuf on the coast, Damascus to the north. Why mention these perfidious kingdoms and the innumerable others that attack us non-stop? Every day we are invaded, every day slaughtered or captured. We are decapitated and our bodies thrown to the birds and the beasts. We are sold like sheep. What more can we say? In the name of Jesus we are ready to die rather than desert the holy city of Jerusalem and the Lord’s Cross and the most Holy Sepulchre of Christ*.[[111]](#footnote-111)

The letter of Patriarch Eraclius of Jerusalem to Pope Urban III (September 1187) further testifies to the worsening of the crusaders’ situation:

*We can hardly describe to your pious ears the magnitude of the sorrow and grief we feel as we are forced to see in our times the contrition of our people, the miserable, lamentable desolation of the Holy Church at Jerusalem and that which is holy given to the dogs*. *Truly, Holy Father, the wrath of the Lord has gone over me…He has allowed the sacrosanct and life-giving Cross, the unique, particular means of help for our salvation, to be captures by the Turks…He handed over our king and the whole of the Christian army to the pagans. Of those who were present nearly all died by the sword or were taken prisoner – only a few managed to escape in flight…Alas, alas, reverend father, it is thus that the Holy Land, the legacy of the Crucified One, has been handed over to the pagans…Your Holiness should have no doubts that after the recent battle if the Turks were to approach the Holy City they would find it totally lacking in men to defend it. Therefore, as God is our only refuge we hasten to your feet, expounding tearfully to your Holiness our afflictions and unbearable misfortunes, like sons to their father, shipwrecked sailors coming to a harbour, so that with paternal affection your heart will be moved towards us and the holy city of Jerusalem…*[[112]](#footnote-112)

If the message was not clear enough, there follows a long list of Christian locales conquered by Saladin and his army. Even if one takes into account the weight of biblical rhetoric, so dear to twelfth-century writers,[[113]](#footnote-113) it is impossible to neutralize the outburst of feelings that followed the Christian defeat at Hattin.

 Bearing in mind the considerable number of ecclesiastical dignitaries who were involved in correspondence with the Latin East, the significant attention devoted to ecclesiastical matters is not surprising. Indeed, the rights and privileges of provinces and dioceses,[[114]](#footnote-114) as well as the election and apostolic confirmation of Latin prelates,[[115]](#footnote-115) characterize many letters. Pilgrimage to the Holy Land and indulgences,[[116]](#footnote-116) and eventually relics, their verification and trade, were all mentioned.[[117]](#footnote-117) Maurice de Craon (1132-1196), governor of Anjou and Maine under Henry II, who returned to France about 1170, played a most important role, with ten letters addressed to him that verify his relics’ authenticity.[[118]](#footnote-118)

 It would be impossible to cover every nuance of correspondence in the Early Crusade Period,[[119]](#footnote-119) but it will be worthwhile to devote some attention to the exchange of books between Christendom and the Holy Land, where some of the prelates were anxious to reinforce their doctrine against the many deviations they attributed to Eastern Christians.[[120]](#footnote-120)

**Reference to Letters in Narrative Sources**

Very few twelfth-century chroniclers were aware of the importance of correspondence as a historical source, as against later historiographical trends.[[121]](#footnote-121) William of Tyre and Ralph of Diceto are exceptional examples because of their many quotations of contemporary letters, perhaps because they both had better access to crusade correspondence. Some letters chosen by William deal with ecclesiastical matters (RRR 49, 131) and matrimonial treatises (RRR 251-2, 1005). There are also references to diplomatic and political issues of great importance to the Latins’ survival, such as Godfrey of Bouillon’s death (RRR 46), Rainald of Chatillon’s alleged insanity (RRR 549), and the complicated dealings with the Byzantine Emperor (RRR 614, 798, 800, 1005).[[122]](#footnote-122) Of particular interest are Ralph of Diceto’s references to the release of Christian prisoners (RRR 1123, 1139) and Saladin’s advances in the Holy Land (RRR1148, 1235). [[123]](#footnote-123)

Most twelfth-century Latin chroniclers, however, stood far away, quoting crusade letters on few occasions.[[124]](#footnote-124) Conversely, some Muslim chroniclers were more aware of the benefits of letters as historical sources.[[125]](#footnote-125)

The chroniclers’ disregard for the historical value of letters, on the one hand, and their receptiveness toward oral messages, on the other, further corroborate the weight ascribed to orality during the Early Crusade Period. Fulcher of Chartres faithfully reflects a common mood when he refers to his fellows’ excitation at the arrival of ships from the West and describes them approaching the newcomers “like saints”, since “everyone was anxious to ask for [news] about his country and household.” Fulcher further refers to the joy or sadness of the listeners after receiving news from home.[[126]](#footnote-126) Oral transmission, indeed, was the rule in the Early Crusade Period and thus played an important role in shaping the significance of crusade correspondence.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

Giles Constable wrote some years ago, “The history of letters, and of those who wrote them, thus merges into the history of bureaucracy and diplomacy and forms an important chapter in the development of government and administration in the Middle Ages.”[[127]](#footnote-127) Conversely, Parsons recently claimed that “the conception of the crusade letters as a direct link to the events of the First Crusade, in contrast to the more fictive histories, is out of date.”[[128]](#footnote-128) Parsons recognizes, however, that his reservations do not neutralize the value of letters, even those ‘problematic’ in his view, as transmitters of crusade narrative. This study argues that the history, as well as the development of crusade correspondence, its nature and means of transmission, provide additional facets for attaining a better understanding of the Early Crusade Period. Unfortunately, research into medieval correspondence has commonly approached letters according to their modern form, i.e., as a unit that encapsulates the whole message. Crusade letters, however, were just one part of message transmission, complemented by oral messages. The careful selection of messengers among the sociopolitical elite turned them into a key factor in the transmission of news. In medieval terms, messengers became political troubadours, well equipped to receive the attention not only of the letters’ addressees but also of wider audiences. In medieval practice, they became a kind of social catalyst, around whom the sociopolitical elite met, listening to messages from the Latin East. In the same way that medieval people learned about the Holy Land and sacred history from the preaching of local or itinerant priests, they **listened** to the crusaders’ dealings since, for the most part, they were not able to read their accounts. Letters, therefore, as written documents, represent only a fragment of the troubadours’ performance and not always their most important dimension. Still, the honorific aura that accompanied Latin documents, especially among illiterate audiences, turned crusade letters into a kind of holy relic and, as such, into an important component in the transmission of messages between Western Christendom and the Latin East. It is reasonable to conclude that a better understanding of the interaction between messengers and letters, between oral and written messages, would contribute a more accurate perspective on the nature and weight of crusade correspondence, and through it, the Crusades as a whole. On the one hand, the relationship between letters and “political troubadours” reflects the sociopolitical and economic changes characteristic of the Central Middle Ages, which brought about the decline of the feudal system and its small, local units. Crusade correspondence thus appears as another reflection of the expanding horizons of medieval Christendom. The transcribing of crusade letters, on the other hand, heralds the slow and gradual transition to written documents, as already proclaimed by Roman Law, thus paving the way for the spread of literacy, and eventually the printing press, by the Late Middle Ages.
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