

*On the Psychology of the Crusades.* II. By WILLIAM  
W. IRELAND.

IN the "children's Crusade" we witness the enormous credulity of the Dark Ages in its simplest form, although the delusions which the children indulged in must have been encouraged by their parents. The orders of the King of France to stop their pilgrimage had evidently been disregarded. Was it that a whole people had become mad? Some writers have argued that nobody is quite sane; in that case we should need another word for those who cannot do without restraint.

No doubt amongst the crowd of pilgrims there were persons, frenzied, hysterical, paranoiacs, not without their influence in inciting the others; but the bulk of the Crusaders were different from ordinary lunatics. The inmates of an asylum could not be united for any one purpose; if they show any general desire, it is to be set at liberty, which they could effect if they would only combine.

Granting their premises to be true, the pilgrims cannot be said to have acted illogically. If, as they believed, the Church could grant them a sure entry into heaven by taking the cross, it was bare wisdom to accept such a permit as a lucky chance; whatever befel they would escape impending damnation and gain eternal happiness. In the present day there are many persons who profess beliefs in which they have not sufficient faith to lead to action. Indeed, it is amazing how many inconsistent beliefs some people nowadays quietly entertain without troublesome comparisons.

We have such graphic accounts of the first Crusade that the characters of its leaders stand out with unusual clearness. Of Robert, the unfortunate Duke of Normandy, the eldest son of William the Conqueror, we know enough. Godfrey of Bouillon was renowned for his prowess: he is reported to have cut a Saracen in two so that the one portion of the body was carried away by his horse. He is described as tall and thin, agreeable in conversation, with an inexhaustible sweetness of character. We are pleased to learn that on the taking of Jerusalem he did not join in the massacre, but went humbly to say his prayers at the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. Bohemund, the Norman, from Sicily, is described as taller by

the head than the other chiefs. He was much feared by the Greek emperor and regarded both by the Christians and Mohammedans as the ablest in council; brave but prudent, he never forgot his own aggrandisement. It is worthy of note that both Bohemund and Baldwin the brother of Godfrey were made prisoners by the Saracens, who might have put them to death, as the Mexicans did the Emperor Maximilian, in revenge for the massacre of the Mussulmans at Jerusalem. However, neither of these chiefs was actually present at the storming of that city and their captors were satisfied with a heavy ransom. Tancred, a relative of Bohemund who followed him from Sicily, left the reputation of a gallant knight-errant ever seeking brave adventures, punctilious of honour and quarrelsome, but, like the rest of the Normans, ambitious and eager for gain. Tancred appears as the most attractive character in Tasso's great epic "Jerusalem Delivered."

The Abbot Guibert<sup>(1)</sup> has some very edifying accounts of the rigid chastity of the Crusaders in the leaguer of Antioch. Evidently unacquainted with the habits of soldiers, he feels safe in presuming that those who were every day exposed to lose their lives could not abandon themselves to sensual passions. No prostitutes were suffered in the camp. If a woman who had no husband was found to be pregnant, she was forthwith severely punished along with her seducer. A monk from a celebrated convent was surprised with a woman. Convicted by the ordeal of red-hot iron, he was, by the orders of the Bishop of Puy and the Princes, walked through the whole camp along with his concubine. They were then stripped naked and whipped, to the great edification of all who witnessed the sight.

Yet there are other passages which hardly bear out this exemplary state of things. The dissolution of home ties and the mingling of pilgrims of both sexes in a disorderly march gave both temptation and opportunity. Moreover, one might fairly infer that the promise of complete forgiveness of sins without any repentance following upon a pilgrimage to Jerusalem or to Rome was not conducive to morality. Another writer of the Crusades gives us a lurid picture of the corruptions of the morals in those days amongst both the laity and the clergy.

Men beset with one idea have effected wonderful things in

the world's history, and no fanatic has done more mischief than Peter the Hermit. Anna Comnena<sup>(2)</sup> tells us that her father, the Emperor Alexis, who had sent a party to rescue him from the Turks, in a friendly way reminded Peter how he had neglected his advice. The Hermit, who had left so many thousands to perish, boldly replied that he was not to blame for the evil which had come upon them because they had neglected the commands of God and his own counsel. They were, he said, "brigands and robbers not worthy to be admitted to the adoration of the holy sepulchre." No doubt many scoundrels had followed his leading, but there must have been not a few humble, trusting, pious souls who in their simple faith wished to give back to God love for love, sacrifice for sacrifice, and thought to exchange the cares and miseries of the world for the eternal joys of Paradise. The Greek princess describes the huge piles of bones which she saw about Nicæa, lately the framework of living men and women, who might have peacefully finished their lives in their own villages had they not been led to destruction by those whom they so blindly trusted.<sup>(3)</sup>

Peter, who had not lost his sanctity in the eyes of the common people, accompanied the army of the princes and counts, acting as a guide to a crowd of beggars who had followed the camp.

A man from Normandy managed to keep this disorderly crowd under some rule: he called himself King of the Tafurs, or tramps; he would not allow his followers to keep in their possession any money whatever. These men made themselves useful in carrying burdens, in foraging and scouting, though it was dangerous to enter their encampment. Anna Comnena tells us that the first host of Crusaders led by Peter on entering Asia Minor, amongst other enormities, dismembered sucking children, transfixed them with wooden spits, and roasted them. The Abbot Guibert admits that in some times of great distress they were reduced to eating pieces of the flesh of the Saracens. Raoul de Caen, himself a Crusader, confesses that some men in the pangs of hunger came to eat human flesh, and that they had thrown young Gentiles into the pot, and had put infants upon the spit, roasted, and eaten them. Raimond d'Agiles tells us that at Marpah some of the besiegers greedily devoured the bodies of the Saracens which had already lain for a fort-

night in the ditches of the town. In the old French ballads quoted by von Sybel these horrible feasts are loudly proclaimed. As they lay in leaguer before Antioch :

“In evil case the army stood, their stores of food were spent,  
Peter the Holy Hermit, he sat before his tent.  
Then came to him the King Tafur, and with him fifty score  
Of men at arms, not one of them but hunger gnawed him sore.  
‘Thou holy Hermit, counsel us, and help us at our need,  
Help, for God’s grace, these starving men with wherewithal to feed.’  
But Peter answered, ‘Out, ye drones ; a helpless pack that cry,  
While all unburied round about the slaughtered Paynim lie ;  
A dainty dish is Paynim flesh, with salt and roasting due.’  
‘Now by my fay,’ quoth King Tafur, ‘the Hermit sayeth true,’  
Then fared he forth the Hermit’s tent, and sent his menye out  
More than ten thousand, where in heaps the Paynim lay about.”

We may spare the reader the disgusting description that follows.

Some of the Christian princes passing that way, the Emir cried from the walls :

“‘To do dead bodies such foul wrong is insolence and sin.’  
But Bohemund made answer : ‘Fair lord, what here ye see  
Is none of our commanding, nor wight thereof have we.  
’Tis King Tafur’s devising, his and his devil’s crew,  
An ill rout are they, God wot.’”

We have the testimony of Guibert that the hardships of the siege were too much for the hermit, who fled with some others, but was persuaded by Tancred to return: even this scandal did not destroy his influence.<sup>(5)</sup> After the crusading host had entered Antioch they were surrounded by a Moslem army and reduced to great distress. Peter the Hermit was sent with four others as an envoy to deliver a challenge to the Emir Kerbogha the Commander of the Persian Army. The interview is graphically described by Raoul de Caen. Peter, a man short of stature, of a tawny complexion and a lean face, in a shabby gown, with naked feet, and mounted upon a pony poorly harnessed, approached the Saracens’ camp. They thought he had come as a suppliant, but, standing erect, the hermit ordered the Persian general to withdraw the army or, if he refused, to appoint an equal number of champions, three or six, to decide to whom the city should belong. The Persian emir, thinking he had the invaders in his power, returned a haughty and

menacing answer. The courage of the host was again revived by one of those visions which were frequent amongst these credulous devotees. A Provençal peasant named Pierre Barthelemi came to the Bishop of Puy, who was with the besieged army in Antioch, announcing that the apostle St. Andrew had appeared to him several times, revealing to him that the head of the lance which had pierced the side of the Saviour at the crucifixion lay buried in the Church of St. Peter, at that time used as a mosque. The saint actually took him to the spot and told him that by obtaining this weapon the victory of the Christian host would be secure. Twelve men dug all day at the place pointed out; nothing was found till the evening, when Pierre himself descended into the hole and promptly struck upon the lance-head. This find was received with great enthusiasm, and the lance was borne in front of the troops in a vigorous sally in which the Mohammedan army was scattered. The Provençals attributed the victory to the favour of St. Andrew and the holy lance. Count Bohemund, who was more a politician than a devotee, pointed out the incoherency of the story, which was supported by Raimond, Count of St. Giles and the Provençals. In denouncing the imposture Bohemund was seconded by the Dukes of Normandy and Flanders. Great quarrels ensued, when Pierre was called upon by the Council to submit his pretensions to the ordeal of fire. He was to make his way nine paces through two rows of flaming bushes. It was assumed that if his story were true he should come through the fire safe and sound; after three days' fasting and praying, Pierre, clad in a tunic and drawers, passed through the flames. Raoul de Caen says that though he got through he fell down all burned, and died the next day, on which the people saw that he was an impostor, who had got what he deserved. Guibert tells us that Pierre went twice through the fire, obviously an embellishment of the story. Foulcher de Chartres tells us that the man died after twelve days, when people recognised that he was an impostor. The Provençals would not give him up so easily. Raimond d'Aigles, who was present both at the finding of the lance-head and the man's death-bed, says that on his emerging from the flames the people crowded upon him and trampled him so that his back and his ribs were broken, which was the real cause of his death. Pierre himself, when asked to explain some burns noted upon

his legs, averred that Christ had appeared to him while in the middle of the flaming way and took him by the hand, saying : "Since you have doubted about the discovery of the lance when St. Andrew revealed it to you, you will not get through without injury ; but you will not see hell." Raimond assures us that in his last hour Pierre swore that he had told nothing but the truth. The Count of St. Giles retained his faith in the genuineness of the relic, and kept the lance-head with him till it was accidentally lost.

This story vividly displays the stupid credulity of the Middle Ages. They could only test an imposture by making use of a delusion. In those days, when portents and miracles were rife, it was thought a fair deduction that God would suspend the ordinary laws of combustion to save an innocent person, and that the usual action of fire on the skin was a proof of guilt. The steadfast believers in Pierre's stories might have wondered why the Divine protection was withdrawn after he had passed through the flames, so that he was fatally injured by the crowd immediately after.

During the first twenty years of the kingdom of Jerusalem the Franks held only a few fortified towns ; the country was ravaged by the Moslems. They were even abetted and sheltered by the Syrian Christians, who did not disguise their hatred of the new-comers, whose rule only made their condition worse. Baldwin, who succeeded Godfrey, had made himself master of the towns by the coast ; but even the road between Jerusalem and the seaport of Jaffa was so insecure that it could not be traversed without an escort. In 1119 Hugo de Paynes formed a brotherhood which took the name of the Poor Knights of Christ from the Temple of Solomon. Taking as their rule *Estis monachi virtutibus, milites actibus*, they soon earned great praise for the austerity of their lives and their bravery against the Saracens. They gained largely from the pilgrims whom they protected, and the order received rich endowments in all Christian lands. They are said to have possessed more than nine thousand residences in Christendom. Their ranks were reinforced by banished or excommunicated knights who took the vows of pilgrimage as an atonement for heinous sins. Brought to the front, their turbulent spirits were expended in warfare against the infidel. The sovereign who had banished these offenders might be content to get rid of

them, but the Church did not wish transgressors to escape her anathemas without penances, so she was displeased with those military monks of the temple who lightly absolved their wild companions in arms or buried them with holy rites when they fell in combat. The force of events made the Templars lose the bigotry of the early Crusaders in Palestine ; in Syria they came into contact with the Mohammedans and soon learned the falsehood of the calumnies against them. Christians and Mussulmans had disputes about their varying faiths, and though they seldom made converts, they infused doubts into one another's minds.

Many of the Templars belonged to the country of the Albigeois, against whom the Pope had directed a bloody crusade followed by a cruel inquisition, and the suspicion of heresy long clung to the order. It was said that in their secret rites the initiated were made to deny Christ and spit upon the cross, and that they believed in two gods, one inferior to the other ; they were accused of filthy immoralities, and it was undeniable that they led luxurious and licentious lives in their endowed seats. They were even accused of having treacherously connived with the Turks to cause the siege of Damascus to miscarry. <sup>(6)</sup> It is a question in history which will never be solved whether there was any truth in these accusations of impiety which wrecked them in the popular mind, and which were taken advantage of by Philip the Fair to suppress the order, with the consent of the Pope. Some historians have explained that the denial of Christ was at first simply a trial of obedience of the neophyte, or that it was a rehearsal of the denial of St. Peter, or that it was a ceremony gone through to fulfil a promise of a grand master of the Order, made in captivity to a Sultan. In any case, they admit that the ceremony had lost its significance ; what had been done as a play was in the end treated as a serious matter, and this goes far to imply easy indifference to the Christian spirit, if not a pronounced scepticism. <sup>(7)</sup>

Western Europe had entered into the Crusades in the entire belief that they were doing the will of God ; thus they counted on the Divine assistance. The ecclesiastics attributed the first disasters to the sins of the pilgrims, although we learn that these misfortunes had induced some of the captives to turn to the faith of Islam. The taking of Jerusalem was, naturally,

held to be the fulfilment of the Divine protection ; but when Jerusalem was lost, and the tide of war kept steadily against the Christians, the Templars, their mission gone, idle and discontented in their rich endowments, began to entertain misgivings whether God was really on their side. Such doubts were boldly expressed in the verses of a Provençal poet<sup>(8)</sup> After the news came that Bibars, the Sultan of Egypt, had taken the town of Cæsarea and the Castle of Arsouf in 1265, the poet thus exclaims : “ Ah, Lord God, what has become of so many knights, so many servants, so many citizens, who were within the walls of Arsouf? These accursed Turks have sworn not to leave in these places a single man who believes in Jesus Christ. They say that they will make a mosque of the Church of St. Mary. Well, if God, whom all that should displease, consents, and finds it good, we must also be satisfied. He is very foolish who seeks to quarrel with the Turks when Jesus Christ permits everything to them. What wonder that they have conquered Franks and Tartars, Armenians and Persians, and that they beat us Templars every day. God, who formerly watched, now sleeps while Mohammed puts out his whole strength and helps his servant Malek-Daher [Bibars].”

The historian of the Hospitallers<sup>(9)</sup> believes that the order existed in Jerusalem as a charitable brotherhood to relieve pilgrims even before the taking of that city. In the next generation the hospital took a military character. Although it soon became richly endowed, the Hospitallers never attracted the same suspicion and odium as the Knight Templars, and on the fall of the latter order the Hospitallers came into possession of much of their rich endowments.

The kingdom of Jerusalem took no root in Eastern soil. The defenders of the Holy Sepulchre were reinforced by penitents and devotees who came in Genoese or Venetian galleys, eager for fighting, difficult to hold in, breakers of truces, bold raiders, the terror of the Mecca pilgrims. The Syrian Christians, who had hailed the coming of the first Crusaders, soon found that they had gained nothing from changing the yoke of the Mussulman for the feudal rule of the Franks and the supremacy of the Western Church. The children of the first Crusaders who stayed in Palestine grew up a weaker race in that hot climate. While the Mohammedans were engaged in a death struggle with the Frankish invaders, the Emperor



Alexius was busy regaining some of his lost territory in Anatolia. The Turks were driven from the islands of Rhodes and Chios, and the Greek dominion was extended along the coast from the Hellespont to the Syrian Gates. In the prosecution of the Emperor's claim of sovereignty the Byzantine troops came to blows in Cilicia with Bohemund and Tancred, the Norman rulers of Antioch.

As the Franks were losing ground in Palestine the Pope, Eugenius III, charged the celebrated St. Bernard to preach a new crusade. Beyond the purity of his life, his eloquence and learning, there must have been some great reserve power of character which made the Abbot of Clairvaux the oracle and champion of the Catholic Church, the arbiter between rival popes and worldly potentates. His Life has been written by three of his contemporaries, one of whom was his secretary, who attributed to him numerous miracles. A great assembly was held at Vezelai like that held fifty years before at Clermont. A scaffolding was erected in the plain from which Bernard addressed the multitude; King Louis VII, with many of his nobles, took the cross from the hands of the Abbot. The report of some miraculous cure increased the enthusiasm of the multitude and of the people, and confirmed their faith in the predictions of the saint, who promised signal victory and conquest for the arms of the French king. Bernard was able to write to the Pope: "The Crusaders are multiplied beyond counting; in the cities and castles for seven women you may scarcely find one man; everywhere you will find widows whose husbands are alive." A man of much superior capacity to Peter the Hermit, St. Bernard had sense enough to refuse the request that he should take command of the Crusades. France was again aflame, and the movement passed to Germany. As before, it began with a massacre of the Jews in the Rhine country. St. Bernard went on to Germany, and although he did not understand the language of the country, he succeeded in inducing the Emperor, Conrad III, to take the cross. At the same time the holy man stirred up the Saxons to make a religious war against the heathen Wends.

It is said that the Pope, who wanted Conrad's assistance for other purposes, was aghast at the success of his missionary. The King of France left the Abbot Segur, who tried to dissuade him from the Crusades, in the charge of affairs at home.

Louis himself took the march with an army said to amount to 260,000, Conrad with 100,000 infantry and 60,000 horse. These figures are probably not founded upon accurate numeration, though it is averred that the Greeks counted 900,000 Crusaders who crossed the Hellespont. Had the Christian princes acted in unison, there was no power in the East which could have resisted them, but the Greek Emperor, Manuel, was terrified by the march of these hordes so near his capital, and had to guard his western territory against the Norman King of Sicily. Advancing through a desolated country, the unwieldy hosts of the Germans were thinned by hunger and exhaustion and finally cut off by the Turks. Conrad, escaping to Constantinople, met the French King advancing, but Louis refused to profit by the other's experience. The Greeks were accused of giving false intelligence and even of a secret alliance with the Turks. After some bloody defeats the King of France was glad to escape from the Cilician shores with the rest of his knights, leaving the plebeian crowd to the mercy of the Seljuks.

These miserable failures aroused loud murmurs against St. Bernard. His biographer<sup>(10)</sup> consoles himself with the thought that if the Eastern Church was not delivered by the expedition it at least served to fill the celestial Church with pious souls. The saint defended himself after a lofty fashion: "If it is absolutely necessary that people should do one of two things, murmur against God or myself, I prefer that the murmurs of men should fall upon myself rather than upon the Lord." His biographer tells us that at the time when the first report of the rout of the crusading army was spreading through France a man brought his son who was blind, imploring St. Bernard to restore his sight. The holy man, putting his hand upon the child, prayed to the Lord that if it was really His word which Bernard had uttered, or if the Holy Ghost had really inspired him when he preached the Crusade, God should deign to prove this by opening the eyes of the blind. On which the child cried out, "What ought I to do now? for I see."

The Crusaders regarded the Greeks as false and treacherous allies, while the Greeks were alarmed at the cupidity and ambition of the Franks. This chronic hatred ended in an army of the Franks with a Venetian fleet taking Constantinople and establishing a new kingdom there. The Greek empire,

deprived of its capital, was broken into three pieces, and fifty-six years elapsed before the plunderers were expelled. Thus the fourth Crusade, ostensibly for the recovery of the Holy City, ended in the pillage and weakening of the Byzantine empire.

The Pope Honorius III had exacted a vow from the Emperor Frederick II before his coronation that he should undertake a crusade for the delivery of Jerusalem. When Frederick succeeded to the Kingdom of Naples and Sicily the papal curia, sometimes swayed by religious and sometimes by political motives, saw with dismay the patrimony of the Church shut in on both sides by the domains of the successor of the German Emperors, with whom they had perpetual contentions. Frederick had, by espousing for his second wife Isabella, the heiress of the Kingdom of Jerusalem, acquired a title to that lost possession. Certainly in delaying to fulfil his vow the Emperor might plead that the popes gave him work enough to do in stirring up his Italian subjects against him. The old enthusiasm had passed away; men were no longer ready to take the cross, and the Emperor had a serious illness, which increased his reluctance. At last the impatient Pope Gregory IX launched upon him an excommunication with an interdict against any place where he might reside. The next year Frederick sailed with a large fleet for the Holy Land followed by the curses of the Pope, who denounced him as a pirate and a friend of Mohammed because he had not solicited to be freed from the ban of excommunication.

The Emperor had none of the religious zeal of the early chiefs of the Crusades. He was known to indulge in philosophical questions most displeasing to the Church, now, not without cause, jealous of heresies, and scepticism. The Court of Frederick had become a centre of Arabian culture and religious indifference. <sup>(11)</sup>

The Emperor knew Arabic, and had learned dialectics from a Mussulman of Sicily. At his Court might be seen astrologers from Bagdad in long robes and Jews employed by the Emperor to translate works of science from the Arabic. He corresponded with sages in different parts of the Mohammedan world.

On landing his army in Palestine Frederick received tidings that the papal troops had entered his Neapolitan territory, and messengers came from the Pope forbidding all with him to obey his orders. This made him willing to make a treaty with the

Saracens, for which the occasion was favourable. There was strife between Alkamil the Sultan of Egypt and the Emir of Damascus. Envoys were sent, presents exchanged—falcons and horses and costly clothes from the Emperor, and an elephant, camels, Arab mares, monkeys, and precious stones from the Sultan. After much negotiation a treaty was signed by both sovereigns by which Alkamil agreed to evacuate Jerusalem and the towns and villages around and leave to the Christians a narrow stretch of country along the coast from Jaffa to Beirut. The mosque of Omar was to be respected, the Mussulmans not to be molested in the exercise of their religion, and the Syrian dominions of the Sultan were to be protected even against the Christian principality of Antioch. On March 17th, 1229, Frederick entered Jerusalem, and next day he was crowned in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. On the 19th there came the Archbishop of Cæsarea, the Pope's legate, who laid the Holy City under an interdict, to the great indignation of the pilgrims.

The Emperor scandalised his orthodox followers by open mockery of sacred subjects. He visited the mosque of Omar, and the Mussulman guardian who accompanied him was able to repeat pleasantries disagreeable to the zealots of either religion. What little time Frederick spent in Jerusalem was employed in friendly discussions with Arabian *savants* on mathematics and philosophy. In thus winning back the Holy City forty-two years after it was taken by Saladin, the German Emperor had, without drawing the sword, accomplished what Frederick Barbarossa, Richard Cœur de Lion, and Philip Augustus had with dire loss and bloodshed striven for in vain, and by establishing friendly relations with the Mohammedans of the Levant and the Barbary coast he restored to Europe the rich trade of the East. Yet neither of the votaries of these warring religions were satisfied. The Christians said Frederick had gained too little, the Mussulmans that Alkamil had granted too much. Jerusalem remained a frail and insecure possession in Christian hands for fifteen years, until in 1244 the Carismian Turks displaced from the shores of the Caspian by the Mongols swept over Asia Minor. The military orders were destroyed in one battle, Jerusalem was taken, the grown-up inhabitants slain, and the young men and children led into captivity.

In 1249 King Louis IX, generally called St. Louis, succeeded,

not without persuasion, in leading the chivalry of France and some noblemen from England into an invasion of Egypt. This expedition, called the seventh Crusade, though it might be called the tenth, ended in the King with all his nobles being made prisoners. They had to pay a heavy ransom to be free.

The impulse to new Crusades was evidently losing its force. There were signs that better days were coming, yet the feudal lords still made the lives of the people miserable with their oppressions, and the clergy made the future terrible with their threats of an inferno in describing which Dante displayed his vivid and cruel imagination. The misery, insecurity, and oppression of the times were manifested in brain excitement and motor restlessness; but people showed a receptivity to other forms of excitement than the blind rush to Jerusalem.

During the captivity of King Louis an unfrocked Cistercian gave out that he had received a commission from the Virgin to preach a Crusade to the poor and humble. His followers were called Pastoureaux, or shepherds. The ferment spread, so that in a short time he gathered together a multitude said to amount to about one hundred thousand, moving along in company with a banner bearing a cross and a lamb. "He assumed a priestly character, preaching, absolving, annulling marriages. At Amiens, Bourges, and Paris itself he was received as a Divine prophet."<sup>(13)</sup> The Queen Blanche, who was regent, at first tolerated the religious movement. The new prophet declaimed loudly against the idleness and greed of the clergy, and his followers began to lay violent hands on the priests and to plunder the monasteries, on which the governing classes turned against them, slew many, and dispersed the rest. A similar insurrection broke out seventy years after, which was distinguished by a massacre of the Jews.

Other examples of these epidemics of religious lunacy in the Middle Ages are furnished by the Flagellants in Italy, Germany, and Poland, the Bianchi in Italy, and the dancing mania which broke out at Erfurt in 1237, at Utrecht in 1278, and at Aix-la-Chapelle in 1374. These nervous maladies, propagated on the wings of thought, convulsing the mind by exciting the senses, have been described by Hecker in his learned work on *The Mental Epidemics of the Middle Ages*.

For the thirteenth century Christendom had its own wars to engage its attention: the popes were more anxious to prose-

cute their feuds with the house of Hohenstaufen than to succour the Eastern Christians now separated from the Latin Church ; the Venetians and Genoese were at war for the trade of the East.

On the other hand, the zeal of the Mohammedans was in no way abated. Bibars, the Sultan of Egypt, vigorous, untiring and unrelenting, took it for his life work to expel the Christians from Syria. He stormed the castles of the Templars and Hospitallers, who disdained to help one another. In 1267 he took Antioch, which had been for a hundred and seventy years in Christian hands. The men were cruelly put to the sword, and the women and children sold as slaves.

The report of these disasters stirred Louis to a new Crusade, directed against Tunis, in which the King died of the plague, leaving a warning to his people against further foolhardy enterprises and gaining from the Church the honours of sainthood.

In 1271 a new Crusade was started by Prince Edward of England, afterwards Edward I. With 300 English knights and 500 Crusaders from Friesland added to the Templars and Hospitallers, he formed an army of 6,000 men. Marching upon Nazareth, he caused all the Mussulman inhabitants to be slaughtered. The Sultan Bibars advanced to meet him, when the English prince retreated within the walls of Acre. After having made a narrow escape from the dagger of an assassin, on a truce being concluded, he left for England in 1272.

As the times became more enlightened the clergy found an increasing difficulty in stirring on men fated to destruction to new Crusades. People began to question whether these disastrous expeditions were really a duty enjoined by the Christian religion. We can only wonder at the slowness of their doubts, the obstinate perseverance of Europe, "that no instruction should have been drawn from constant and adverse experience, that the same confidence should have repeatedly grown from the same failures, that six succeeding generations should have rushed headlong down the precipice that was open before them, and that men of every condition should have staked their public and private fortunes on the desperate adventure of possessing or recovering a tombstone two thousand miles from their country" (Gibbon).

The taking of Acre by the Mohammedans in 1290 closed the struggle for supremacy in Asia between Christianity and Islam, which had lasted for well nigh two hundred years and cost the lives of millions of men.

During the Crusades hostilities were carried on with shocking inhumanity. War between the different States of modern Europe and America has been refined into a series of combats between regular soldiers, wearing a distinctive uniform, who direct missiles against one another at such a distance that the enemy can scarcely be descried. Even while the work of destruction is going on surgeons are employed to traverse the field and attend the wounded, often caring for both parties alike. Prisoners are subject to no further hardship than being detained till peace is declared; but when European troops meet adversaries of different civilisation and colour hostility assumes a harsher spirit. We know what savage reprisals were made by our troops during the Indian Mutiny. Unquestionably the provocation was great; but the continuation of unsparring massacres and wholesale executions after the first grief caused by the treachery of the Sepoys make us see that the fury of the Crusaders may still be traced in their descendants. The Crusaders had been taught by many senseless stories to regard the Mussulmans as something more hateful than wild beasts; their foreign dress, their dark complexion, their strange language, and their rival religion heightened the abhorrence with which the pilgrims had been taught to regard them.

Let us take two instances of the savage hatred of the combatants. After the capture of Antioch Raimond d'Aigles records an incident, which, as he observes, "was for us very agreeable and truly delicious." Some Turks seeking to escape amongst the hills to the north had their retreat cut off and were turned again to flight with such impetuosity that they dashed over the precipices. "It was," Raimond goes on, "a true joy for us to see them thus fall; but we had to regret the loss of 300 horses which perished at the same time." Geoffrey de Vinsauf, in his *Itinerary of Richard I*, tells us that the King resolved that the hostages, whose ransom Saladin was slow in paying, should all be hanged, except a few nobles who might ransom themselves or be exchanged for Christian captives. "King Richard, anxious to destroy the

Turks root and branch, and to punish their wanton arrogance, as well as to abolish the law of Mohammed, and to vindicate the Christian religion, on the Friday after the assumption of the blessed Virgin Mary, ordered 2700 of the Turkish hostages to be led forth from the city and hanged. His soldiers marched forward with delight to fulfil his commands."

It now and then happened during the Middle Ages that the prelates of the Church tried to reconcile hostile princes and to abate the fury of war amongst the Christians, but in this struggle it was the clergy who kept up the crusading spirit and increased the animosity of the combatants. The Bishop of Puy, the Pope's legate at the siege of Antioch, advised that they should cut off the heads of the Saracens and sticking them upon lances, expose them to the defenders of the ramparts.

The abbot Guibert Nogent gives a story which throws a curious light upon the military surgery of the times. Baldwin, the brother of Godfrey and the second King of Jerusalem, had received a severe wound in trying to save one of his soldiers. The surgeon who attended, seeing that the wound in the abdomen was a deep one, was afraid to endeavour to close the outer edges by plasters, fearing an internal abscess. To relieve his uncertainty he asked the Prince that one of the Saracen prisoners should be delivered up to him upon whom he might inflict a similar wound, for, the Abbot remarks, to propose such an experiment upon a Christian would be a crime. The surgeon desired to kill the prisoner after having given him the wound, in order that by opening his body he might at ease compare it with the injury which the King had received. Baldwin, however, declared that he would never consent to cause the death of any man, even of the most odious race, merely to seek through so many uncertainties to save another life. The persevering vivisector then requested the French Prince to have a bear given to him whom he could hang up by the forepaws and then give the beast a similar wound in the abdomen which he might compare with that of his royal patient. The experiment was made and the surgeon came to the conclusion that it would be dangerous to try to close up the lips of the wounds at once. No doubt he received the thanks of the King for his scientific treatment.

This took place six hundred years ago, yet only the other day it was announced that as the results obtained by experi-



ments in animals are so uncertain as to be virtually worthless, it has been proposed to the Ohio legislature that it should be made legal to practise vivisections on criminals condemned to death!

It has been wisely observed by Emilio Castelar that "those who look upon life from one side, upon time from one age, the doctrines of one religion only, humanity from one people, will never understand the human mind." So let us try to realise the feelings and thoughts of the Mohammedans when the sudden inundation from the West burst upon their territory. The bravery with which they defended their country gained for the Turks the unwilling admiration of the Crusaders. "What brave men! how skilful in war! if they were only Christians!" It was fortunate for the Crusaders when the first army of the Franks entered Phrygia that the power of the Seljuks was greatly broken. Asia Minor was divided amongst emirs warring against one another, and the Sultan of Egypt even coveted the alliance of the Christians against the Turks. The Armenians were awaiting the coming of the Crusaders as their deliverers. After the taking of Antioch and the defeat of Kerbogha the towns on the march through Palestine submissively gave provisions to the invaders, but the massacre of the inhabitants of the Holy City caused a burst of indignation through the whole of the Mohammedan world. As an Arab chronicler wrote, "the tidings of that terrible catastrophe reached Bagdad in the month of the Ramadan, consecrated to fasting and austere penitence. The couriers who brought the dreadful news implored the assistance of the Caliph and his Emir in the most touching terms. The inhabitants of the capital insisted on a speedy succour, shed tears without ceasing, and ran about the streets uttering cries of lamentation." The Sultan of Egypt promptly marched upon Jerusalem, but was defeated by Godfrey and his army destroyed. Had he waited a few months, till the bulk of the Crusaders had left for Europe, he might have been more successful. At any rate, his overthrow struck terror amongst the Mussulman population from Cairo to Samarkand.

Bohemund ruled at Antioch, and Baldwin, the brother of Godfrey, the King of Jerusalem, gained the principality of Edessa across the northern Euphrates; but when the petty States of Syria and Anatolia were united under the vigorous

rule of Zenki, Neureddin, and Saladin the fortune of war favoured the Crescent. In the history of the Crusades there is no more striking figure than Saladin ; his valour, his generalship, his magnanimity, his generosity to the vanquished, made him famous over the East and the West. Dante puts him in the limbo of his *Inferno* in the same circle as the sages of antiquity.

There was more religious toleration in the domains of Islam than in western Europe. About seventy years before the first Crusade Mahmud of Ghazni, who sought to extend the faith into India, went no further than plundering the Hindu temples and breaking the idols. There is no record that he put any Hindu to death save in battle or in storming a fort. It was even said that he questioned the Divine message of the Arabian prophet, and that he professed doubts of a future state. A vein of scepticism had accompanied the military conquests of Islam, and descended even to the fourth century of the Hegira. There were a number of sects in Asia Minor and in Persia, some of which altered, others rejected, the Mussulman faith. Certainly Omar Khayyám, the astronomer poet of Persia, who lived at the time of the first Crusade (dying in 1123) would have been burned by the Inquisition had he dared in Europe to commit to writing those materialistic verses which in an English dress are now so much admired.

Some writers of history have allowed much influence to the intercourse of the Crusaders with the higher culture and civilisation of the Mussulmans ; but the bitterness of the prolonged struggle for the possession of the Holy Land was a powerful cause of alienation. The course of trade for the products of the East, however restricted, would have much better helped the exchange of thought. It was through Spain, not from Palestine, that Arabian philosophy entered Europe. For two centuries the Arabs had cultivated the science of the Greeks ; it seemed as if Islam were capable of allowing sufficient liberty for a rational philosophy. It was by translations from the Arabic that the philosophy of Aristotle taught in the schools of Cordova passed to the universities of Europe. But with Averroes Arabian science came to an end (A.D. 1198).

Rather a commentator than an original thinker, his name was denounced by the Church as the leader of the free thought. Although the triumph of the Catholic faith in Europe seemed

to be absolute, there were still some philosophers who cautiously confided their rationalism or their unbelief to one another.

There is no surer way to stiffen men in their belief than to get them to fight about their cause. The fierce manners of the Crusaders and the massacres of Antioch and Jerusalem were told in every mosque, and were the burden of grief and ire amongst the Mecca pilgrims. Volunteers came from all parts of the domain of Islam to combat the Christian invaders. The Catholic priests represented the Mussulmans as idolaters; but the rigid monotheism of the Mussulman was offended by the doctrine of the Trinity, the worship of the Virgin Mary, the miraculous part assigned to the saints, and the idolatrous reverence paid to the holy cross and the images and statues in the churches. And so the followers of the prophet clung closer to his revelation. It was in the twelfth century, the age of the Crusades, that, as Renan tells us, "Islamism triumphed over the undisciplined elements which raged in her bosom, and this by the advent of the Ascharite theology more severe in its conduct and by the violent extermination of philosophy. Since that age never has a doubt been produced nor a protestation raised in the Mussulman world."

From what I have seen, heard, and read of the Mohammedans of our day I believe that free thinkers are rarer amongst the Mussulmans than amongst the followers of any other religion.

(<sup>1</sup>) Guibert de Nogent, *Histoire des Croisades*, Liv. iv, p. 148. *Jacques de Vitry*, Liv. 11, chap. iv.—(<sup>2</sup>) *Alexiados*, Lib. x, Venetiis, 1729.—(<sup>3</sup>) Kugler, *Geschichte der Kreussüge*, Berlin, 1891, p. 19, treats Peter's dream as a legend, which gives a supernatural origin to the first Crusade. He quotes Anna Comnena to show that the hermit did not succeed in reaching the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. In the passage appealed to the Princess leaves it to be understood that Peter, after enduring many hardships from the Turks, had failed to attain his object, and fearing to go the same road alone, desired to take with him a powerful force which would insure his safety. For this somewhat insufficient motive Peter incited the Franks to make an armed pilgrimage to Jerusalem. But under the conditions there was nothing supernatural in Peter's dream. The story is related by several writers much more likely to be well informed than Anna Comnena, whose narrative is not free from errors. It is given by Albert d'Aix, a contemporary, and by Jacques de Vitry, nor is it contradicted by any Western writers who left histories of the Crusade.—(<sup>4</sup>) Peter was at the taking of Jerusalem. He returned to France in 1102 and founded the Abbey of Neufmontier, near Huy, in Flanders, where he died at an advanced age.—(<sup>5</sup>) See *Entwicklung und Untergang des Tempelherrenordens*, von Dr. (ph.) Hans Prutz, Berlin, 1888; *The History of France*, by M. Michelet, translated by G. H. Smith, pp. 312-330; Kugler's *Geschichte der Kreussüge*, Berlin, 1891, kap. xi.—(<sup>6</sup>) *Histoire de la Poesie Provençale*, par M. Fauriel, Paris, 1846, tome 11, p. 138.—(<sup>7</sup>) *Les Hospitaliers, en terre sainte et à Chypre, 1110-1310*, par. H. Delaville le Roulx, Paris, 1904, chap. ii.—(<sup>8</sup>)—*Vie de St. Bernard*, Livre Troisième, par. Geoffroi, Moine de Glairvaux, chap. iv.—(<sup>9</sup>) *Renan Averroes et Averroïsme*, Paris, 1866;

chap. ii, sec. xiv.—<sup>(11)</sup> Hallam's *State of Europe during the Middle Ages*, vol. iii, chap. ix, London, 1834.—<sup>(12)</sup> Michaud's *History of the Crusades*, translated by W. Robson, London, 1852, vol. iii, p. 57; *Die Kreuzzüge und die Kultur ihrer Zeit von Otto Henne am Rhyn*, Dritte Auflage, Leipzig, 1903, p. 510.

---

*Recidivism regarded from the Environmental and Psycho-pathological Standpoints.* By J. F. SUTHERLAND, M.D., F.R.S.E., Deputy Commissioner in Lunacy for Scotland.

PART I.

	PAGE
1. Introduction . . . . .	341
2. Statistics of crimes and offences, and of Recidivism in Scotland and England for 1903 (with <i>cartes graphiques</i> ) . . . . .	344
3. Age, sex-ratio, frequency of conviction for different crimes and offences at certain age periods . . . . .	355
4. Education . . . . .	357
5. Occupation . . . . .	358
6. Interchange of crimes, and of crimes and offences, infrequent . . . . .	360
[7. Prevalence and significance of insanity, from the psycho-pathological standpoint, among the authors of the different crimes, and the dominant mental factors governing those crimes—to wit, malice, avarice, and lust . . . . .	
8. Geographical distribution and <i>loci</i> of Recidivism . . . . .	
9. International statistics . . . . .	
10. Criminal anthropology . . . . .	
11. Criminal anthropometry (with <i>cartes graphiques</i> and polygon of observations and theory), normal distribution . . . . .	
12. Criminal Physiognomy . . . . .	
13. Degeneracy . . . . .	
14. The causation of Recidivism—	
(a) <i>Inherent</i> (internal): Bad heredity and degeneration, both of the genetic and toxine-induced kind, <i>plus</i> an unfavourable antenatal environment—mental warp and weak-mindedness . . . . .	
(b) <i>External</i> : Post-natal environment—the most potent factor of all—embraces slum dwellings, with a noxious moral and material atmosphere, alcoholic excess, poverty, lack of employment, and low wages, parental neglect, illiteracy, and truancy . . . . .	
15. Jurisprudence and penology . . . . .	
16. Prophylaxis and treatment . . . . . ]	

*Introduction.*

RECIDIVISM is the French coined term most appropriate to express the persistent, reiterated lapses of the same individual, in that small section of habituels found in every country, both