Getting Away With Murder:

Runciman and Conrad of Montferrat's Career in Constantinople

Marianne M^{c}Leod Gilchrist

published in

St Andrews Institute of Mediæval Studies, *The Mediæval Journal*

vol 2, no. 1 (2012), pp. 15-36

ISBN 978-2-503-54307-9

Getting Away with Murder:

Runciman and Conrad of Montferrat's Career in Constantinople

In summer 1187, Conrad of Montferrat embarked from Constantinople for the Holy Land on a Genoese merchant ship belonging to Baldovino Erminio.[1] Finding Acre in Saladin's hands, he landed at Tyre, and took charge of its defence. His efforts there are generally held to have saved the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem from extinction. However, since the 1950s, popular English-language historiography has represented his departure from the Byzantine empire as the flight of a fugitive killer.

This accusation first appeared in Steven Runciman's *A History of the Crusades* (1951-54): 'He [Conrad] had been living at Constantinople but had been involved in a murder there; so he sailed secretly away with a company of Frankish knights to pay a pilgrimage to the Holy Places'.[2] Later popular writers have repeated and elaborated it. Geoffrey Hindley, in *Saladin* (1976), wrote, 'He had arrived from Constantinople, a fugitive from justice', and called him 'a mere adventurer'[3] – not the late King Baldwin V's paternal uncle. Percy Howard Newby's *Saladin in His Time* (1983) echoed this, describing Conrad as 'a fugitive from Byzantine justice', a 'soldier of fortune' who 'left Constantinople in a hurry because otherwise he would have been arrested for complicity in a murder'.[4] According to Robert Payne's *The Dream and the Tomb* (1984), he 'left Constantinople suddenly as a result of a blood feud'.[5] In *Holy War: The Crusades and their Impact on Today's World* (1988), Karen Armstrong (who declared herself indebted to Runciman) claimed: 'he had been involved in a murder there and hurriedly escaped as a 'pilgrim' to Jerusalem'.[6] In their 1994 BBC series and book *The Crusades*, Terry Jones and Alan Ereira, who named Runciman as one of their 'overall consultants', wrote:

> Conrad of Montferrat was […] the kind of man to get into trouble. He had set off to follow his father to Jerusalem in 1185, but his fondness for trouble got him stuck in Constantinople […] When the relatives of a man he had killed announced that they would blind him, he decided that it was time to go. He slipped away in a ship one July night with a company of Flemish [*sic*] knights.[7]

Wayne Bartlett, in *God Wills It!: An Illustrated History of the Crusades* (1999), again claimed 'he had been implicated in a murder'.[8] James Reston's *Warriors of God: Richard the Lionheart and Saladin in the Third Crusade* (2001) alluded to his 'dubious past of murder and conspiracy'.[9] To David Boyle, in *Blondel's Song: The Capture, Imprisonment and Ransom of Richard the Lionheart* (2005), he was 'a Western aristocrat on the run from his crimes': 'Conrad of Montferrat was accused of murder, carried out in Constantinople, as a result of which he had decided to disappear quietly on pilgrimage for a while'.[10]

But, despite its longevity in English-language popular history, there is no evidence for this accusation in Byzantine sources, chief of which is Niketas Choniates' *Historia*, used by Runciman in Bekker's 1835 edition. Conrad had come to Choniates' attention in 1178-79, after his father, William the Elder, Marquis of Montferrat, broke his alliance with Frederick Barbarossa (his wife's nephew), and turned to Manuel Komnenos:

> Now, this man was of Italian race, begotten by a father who held the land of Montferrat. He so far excelled in valour and intelligence that not only among the Romans was his name renowned – and he was especially good news to the Emperor Manuel, with his fortunate lineage, keen intellect, and the outstanding might of his deeds – but also he was famed far and wide among his own nation. He it was who, having been given the utmost generosity from the Emperor Manuel, raised his hand against the King of the Germans, and

> defeated in battle the Bishop of Mainz, the King's chancellor, who had descended upon Italy with great force […][11]

Conrad had captured Frederick's chancellor, Christian, Archbishop of Mainz, in battle at Camerino on 29 September 1179. Christian had previously held him hostage, so now Conrad 'bound him in fetters, and resolutely insisted that he would not release him unless the Emperor of the Romans so ordered him'.[12] He travelled to Constantinople to receive Manuel's thanks.[13] Choniates described him as 'beautiful in appearance, comely in his prime; the best and finest there could be in both manly courage and intelligence, and in the full flower of his body's strength'.[14] However, Montferrat's Komnenian alliance ended tragically in 1183, with the alleged poisoning of Conrad's youngest brother, Renier (the Cæsar Ioannes), and his wife, the Porphyrogenita Maria, Manuel's daughter, on Andronikos's orders.[15]

William the Elder sailed *outremer* to support his grandson, Baldwin V, probably at the end of May 1186,[16] leaving behind his sons Conrad, who also took the cross, and Boniface. In late 1186-early 1187, Isaac II Angelos sought to renew ties with Montferrat: 'At the time the Emperor Isaac sent an embassy to [Conrad's] brother Boniface, to make a marriage alliance between him and his [Isaac's]'s sister Theodora, [Boniface] had taken a bride and had recently celebrated his wedding.[17] [But since] he [Conrad] had lost his spouse in life to death,[18] the ambassadors thought this was a godsend, and that the second choice [of bridegroom] far surpassed the first. Indeed, the ambassadors so exalted him with the greatest promises that they went home with him'.[19] This was not before the end of March 1187. A charter, now known only from a fifteenth century transcript in Giofreddo della Chiesa's *Chronicle of Saluzzo*, places Conrad and Boniface in Asti in late March, witnessing their brother-in-law Manfred II of Saluzzo's sale of the Stura valley to Henry, King of the Romans.[20]

Soon after Conrad's arrival and the wedding festivities, news came that Alexios Vranas, the military commander who had defeated the Sicilians the previous year, had had himself proclaimed as Emperor Alexios in his home city of Adrianople. He was now marching on Constantinople to seize the throne. The threat was a serious one: Vranas was related to the Komnenoi through his mother and also by his marriage to Anna Vatatzaina, one of Emperor Manuel's nieces, and had a history of military success. Isaac turned to prayer, but Conrad spurred him to action, 'becoming as a whetstone to the Emperor for the razor of war'.[21] Choniates gave no date for the revolt, and dating it from his description of a solar eclipse is problematic.[22]

When the imperial army faced Vranas before the city walls, it was Conrad, leading his Latin troops, who commanded at the centre:

> When the sun was ablaze at its highest, the signal for battle was given, and Conrad made the first move, bearing as the distinguishing mark of his and his company's lances [a device] of Phœnician purple dye. On this occasion, he fought without a shield, and wore about his body, in the manner of a cuirass, a woven garment of linen, folded many times over and soaked considerably in salted wine. So resistant and compacted it was with salt and wine, that it was proof against all missiles: the folds of the fabric numbered more than eighteen.
>
> Having reduced the space between both armies to its narrowest, he made his stand. After the infantry drew up their lines so that the dense-packed spears rose like a tower in close array (for 'buckler pressed against buckler, helmet against helmet, and long shields clashed against each other in battle'),[23] the cavalry, lances couched, then spurred on their horses, the Emperor's division following close behind. Vranas's men could not endure even the first charge of Conrad's spear-wielding infantry, nor yet the surging onslaught of

his cavalry: they turned tail, and scattered. The remaining divisions, having got word of this, also turned to flight.

Vranas himself yelled and shouted aloud: 'Stand fast, Romans! For we fight as many against a few, and I myself shall be first to meet the enemy face-to-face!'

But no sooner had he done as he said, he convinced not one member of his army to turn. Then he levelled his lance against Conrad, who was fighting without a helmet – but it did not wound the Cæsar mortally, but scraped his shoulder, and fell in vain from Vranas's hands. Conrad, grasping the shaft of his own lance tightly in both hands, thrust at the cheekpiece of Vranas's helmet, making his head reel, and casting him down from his horse. After this, the Cæsar's bodyguard, who had surrounded him, pierced him through with their spears. It was said that at first when Vranas was wounded by Conrad, he feared being finished off, and begged not to die. But Conrad replied that he had no need to fear, for he would suffer nothing disagreeable – only beheading. And so it was done at once.[24]

Some high-ranking rebels were pardoned, but Isaac was unforgiving of Vranas's popular support. He had the Propontis attacked with Greek fire, and sent Conrad's Latin troops on a punitive expedition. This degenerated into rioting and looting by the city mob, which accompanied them. Retaliatory attacks against Latin civilians followed, which may have made Conrad's position increasingly insecure, given his brother's fate five years previously.

It is unknown when Conrad left Constantinople. Frankish and Arabic sources agree that he knew nothing of Saladin's victory at Hattin (4 July) or the fall of Acre (July 9), and that he arrived off Acre shortly after its surrender.[25] This makes a September or October date

unlikely. Also, he clearly had time to organize the commune of Tyre before issuing charters on its behalf in October.[26] Choniates associated his departure with Isaac's preparations for his campaign against the Vlachs:

> But Conrad was patently dissatisfied with the favour he obtained from the Emperor, regarding it as in disharmony with his lineage and discordant with his marital affinity to the Emperor – his overweening hopes having ended only in wearing on his feet shoes not of the colour of those of the majority (I speak of the insignia of the Cæsars). Besides, at home, a short time before, he had proposed to take the cross and travel to Palestine, which had already fallen under the Saracens of Egypt, but en route had married the Emperor's sister. He assented, then, to go forth with the Emperor to help organize the proposed war, to prevent, with God's will, misfortune of the Romans at the hands of the Mysians [i.e. the Vlachs] – but he turned his mind to other matters.
>
> For with a new-built ship, compact and well fitted-out, he set his course for Palestine, and came to anchor at Tyre. He was welcomed there among his own people, who saw he was superior in ability.[27]

Choniates made no suggestion that Conrad was fleeing a murder, only that he believed he had been insufficiently rewarded. He does not seem to have received a Greek name, whereas his own brother Renier became *Ioannes* when he married Maria the Porphyrogenita; her previous fiancé, Béla of Hungary, became *Alexios*; Béla's daughter Margaret, now Isaac Angelos's child-bride, became *Maria*. Was this a slight, or had there simply not been time? The brevity of his sojourn in Constantinople raises the question whether he and Theodora *were* married, or whether the festivities preceding Vranas's revolt had been a formal betrothal only. A betrothal or an extremely brief marriage, annulled by Isaac after Conrad's departure, may explain why Choniates, usually alert to scandal, failed to

comment on his marriage to Isabella of Jerusalem in 1190.[28] Guy of Lusignan's supporters accused Conrad of having 'one wife still living in his own country, and another in the city of Constantinople, both noble, young and beautiful, and well suited to his needs', but they had political motives to prevent or discredit his marriage to Isabella.[29] It seems unlikely that Isaac's ambassadors to Montferrat were deceived about his first wife's death: Boccaccio's fable of a Marchioness of Montferrat outwitting Philip of France's advances cannot stand as evidence.[30] However, Theodora's legal status remains uncertain. Runciman claimed, 'it is probable from the tone of Nicetas's account that his Byzantine wife had also died',[31] but she was living in 1195-98 – information published by Papadopolous-Kerameus in a 1909 article.[32]

Thirteenth-century Frankish chroniclers did not accuse Conrad of murder. Robert of Auxerre wrote that 'he had recently fought vigorously against a certain member of the imperial family, who […] had desired to depose and usurp the Emperor, and slew the usurper himself', which stirred the Greeks' envy against him.[33] Similarly, Salimbene de Adam and Alberto Milioli drew on a now-lost chronicle by Bishop Sicardo of Cremona:

> In single combat, he beheaded Vranas, the attacker of the Emperor and the imperial city, and liberated Greece from that foe. However, he incurred many people's jealousy and hatred, wherefore, to escape the schemes of the Greeks, embarking on a ship, he set out to visit the Lord's sepulchre.[34]

The claim that an ungrateful emperor threatened Conrad's life first appeared in Robert of Clari's account of the Fourth Crusade. He misdated Vranas's revolt to the reign of Alexios III, using his alleged treachery towards Conrad to explain Boniface's support for Isaac's restoration:

> […] Now at this point, a high-ranking man of the city had besieged the Emperor in Constantinople, so that the Emperor dared not go out from it.

When the Marquis saw this, he asked how it was that he had so besieged him, that he dared not go out to fight him; and the Emperor replied that he had neither the heart nor the help of his people, therefore he had no wish to fight him. When the Marquis heard this, he said that he would help him in this, if he wanted; and the Emperor said he wanted it, and that he would be very grateful for it. Then the Marquis told the Emperor that he would summon all those of the law of Rome, all the Latins of the town, to have them with him in his company, and that he would wage war with these and form the vanguard; and the Emperor should take all his men with him, and follow him. So the Emperor summoned all the Latins of the town. When they had all come, the Emperor commanded them all to arm themselves, and when they were all armed and the Marquis had made all his own men arm themselves, he [i.e. the Marquis] took all these Latins with him and drew up his troops as best as he could; and the Emperor was also fully armed, and his men with him. Then what did the Marquis do but set out on his way in front, and the Emperor followed after him. Then as soon as the Marquis was outside the gates with all his army, the Emperor went and had the gates locked behind him. But as soon as Vranas, who was besieging the Emperor, saw the Marquis was advancing hard to do battle with him, he rose up - both he and his men - to go to meet the Marquis. And as they were approaching, what did Vranas do but spur himself forward, about a stone's throw ahead of all his men, to make haste and rush against the Marquis's battle-line. When the Marquis saw him coming, he spurred to meet him, and struck him with his first blow in the eye, and struck him dead with that blow; so he struck right and left, both he and his men, and they killed many. When these saw their lord was dead, they began to break up,

and turned in flight. When the traitor Emperor, who had had the gates locked after the Marquis, saw they were fleeing, he went out of the city with all his men and started to pursue those who were fleeing; and the Marquis and the others won many spoils, horses and many other things. And thus the Marquis avenged the Emperor on him who had besieged him.

When they had routed them, both the Emperor and the Marquis came back to Constantinople. When they had returned and disarmed, the Emperor thanked the Marquis most firmly for avenging him so well on his enemy, so that the Marquis asked him why he had had the gates locked behind him.

'Bah! All is well now!' said the Emperor.

'Now – by God's grace!' said the Marquis.

And it was not long after that the Emperor and his traitors plotted a great deed of treachery, because he wanted to have the Marquis killed; but an old man, who knew it, took pity on the Marquis, and came before him in the noblest manner, and told him, 'Sire, for God's sake, get out of this town, for if you linger here a third day, the Emperor and his traitors have plotted a great treachery, to capture you and have you killed'.

When the Marquis heard this news, he was not at all at ease. So that same night, he went and had his galleys prepared, and put to sea, before it was day, and left that place; and so he did not stop until he reached Tyre.[35]

Runciman used Robert of Clari's narrative in Lauer's 1924 edition, but ignored his account of Vranas's death, just as he ignored that by Choniates.

His favourite sources were the family of manuscripts known as the Old French Continuations of William of Tyre – all post-1230 in their present form. In the footnote for the paragraph mentioning the 'murder', he cited two editions: the *Chronique d'Ernoul et de*

Bernard le Trésorier and the Colbert-Fontainebleau *L'Estoire de Eracles Empereur et la Conqueste de la Terre d'Outremer*. However, both describe Vranas's death in battle in terms broadly compatible with Choniates, albeit with romance-influenced embellishments.[36]

According to the *Chronique d'Ernoul et de Bernard le Trésorier*, which correctly identified the Emperor as Isaac:

> […] When the Emperor saw that Vranas was coming upon him with an army, he begged the Marquis who was in Constantinople to stay longer with him in Constantinople […] and be his man; and the Marquis tarried there.
>
> When the day came on which Vranas came before Constantinople to besiege it, Vranas was in the first rank of battle. The Emperor would not go out to meet Vranas, because he was of great lineage in the city [and lest they would lock the gates behind him. Thus he kept himself always within the city.] When the Marquis came, he armed himself and went out against Vranas, mounted on a very fine horse. He asked who was this Vranas, and they pointed him out, and he spurred towards him. And when he was close to Vranas, he spurred his horse to a gallop and struck Vranas full in the body, and cut him down dead, and turned back to Constantinople.
>
> When those who had been besieging Constantinople saw that their lord was dead, they turned in flight. When the Emperor saw this, he ordered Conrad to his palace, and kept him there with him, because he did not want those in the city whose kinsman he had slain to do him harm or evil. There Conrad remained with the Emperor until that hour when it was time for him to go to the land of Outremer, to defend the city which God had preordained He would leave to the Christians.

[…] Now I shall tell you of the counsel and aid that God sent to Tyre. Conrad the Marquis, who was in Constantinople, came to the Emperor and told him: 'Sire, my knights and men who are with me wish to go to Jerusalem to the Holy Sepulchre, and I can no longer hold them back; but they have promised me that when they have made their pilgrimage, they will return to me, for I cannot leave you'. And he convinced the Emperor that he would not be leaving, because he wanted neither city nor the Emperor himself to know that he was going to away; for he knew well that if they knew in the city that he was going to leave, the kinsmen of Vranas, whom he had slain, who were in the city, would ambush and kill him. The Emperor had a ship equipped, and well victualled and armed, and the Marquis's men went aboard, and when they had the weather, embarked.

At the point they set sail, the Emperor and the Marquis were at the Boukoleon. When the Marquis saw the ship pass the Boukoleon, he came to the Emperor and told him: 'Sire, I had forgotten I need to tell my men something they must ask my father'. So the Marquis went and got on a boat and went after the ship. When he reached the ship, he boarded her. And when she was under sail, the Lord God gave her good weather and a good wind; and so they did not stop sailing until they came off Acre.[37]

The Colbert-Fontainebleau *L'Estoire de Eracles* retained Robert of Clari's misidentification of the Emperor as Alexios III, and mistakenly claimed that Conrad's ship was Pisan.[38] The later Lyon Manuscript (*c.* 1248) shared these errors, and romantically replaced Robert's old man with Conrad's bride, Theodora:

Because he had slain Vranas, Vranas's kindred threatened to kill him. He himself was so valiant that the Emperor Alexios [*sic*] mistrusted him most

> harshly. He wanted to put out his eyes. His wife found this out, and informed him of it, because she loved him much, and begged him to take care that he came to no harm.[39]

Nevertheless, whatever their fictional additions, these accounts agreed with Choniates that Conrad killed Vranas *in battle*; so, too, did secondary works such as Ilgen's biography and Usseglio's history of his family.[40] Where, then, did Runciman find the murder allegation?

The closest verbal parallel is in Roger of Howden's *Chronica*: 'The Marquis Conrad, brother of the aforementioned William, Count of Jaffa, having committed homicide in the city of Constantinople, fled thence, leaving his wife, the niece [*sic*] of the Emperor Isaac of Constantinople'.[41] The ablative absolute, '*facto homicidio*', is eye-catching. Roger had written, more accurately, in his *Gesta Regis Henrici II*, that Conrad 'previously slew a leading nobleman during a rebellion in Constantinople; and, having left his wife, the Emperor Isaac's sister, came to the city of Tyre'.[42] Runciman privileged Roger's *least* accurate account over Greek and French descriptions of Vranas's rebellion, and left a misleading footnote.

The footnote error is most easily explicable. Runciman described his research methods to an American interviewer, David Plante:

> I've got a rather fitful memory. When I go into a library and don't happen to have a notebook on me and I see somewhere in a book something that is of great interest, I think that I shall certainly remember it. A month or two later, I want to use the material. I remember exactly what it looked like on the page, but I can't remember which book it is in. In the end, I'll locate it.[43]

It is easy, then, to see how he could make a mistake.

Runciman's attitude towards historiography raises other questions: 'I wasn't drawn to it [history] by a scientific desire for knowledge. Oh, no. I was drawn by romantic imaginings'.[44] He lamented the rise of analytical history at the expense of history as

literature: '[…] historians are now terrified of telling a story, as though that were fiction, and not history'.[45] His own aspirations were to the epic: 'Homer as well as Herodotus was a Father of History'.[46] Why, then, did Choniates' Homeric tale of Conrad's victory fail to appeal to him? He said that 'the most useful trait that the historian can possess is an imaginative sympathy'[47] – yet he withheld that from Conrad.

As Robert Irwin observed, Runciman made his sympathetic characters 'men who would not have been out of place in Bloomsbury'.[48] He characterized Isabella's previous husband, Humphrey of Toron, as 'a charming youth, gallant and cultured', whose 'beauty was too feminine to be respected by the tough soldiers around him': a description from the *Itinerarium Peregrinorum*,[49] but glossed sympathetically, perhaps reflecting his own friendships among the 1920s *jeunesse dorée*.[50] By contrast, he portrayed Conrad as a 'grim middle-aged warrior',[51] later re-emphasizing 'the grimness of the ageing Piedmontese to whom she [Isabella] had been forcibly united'.[52] This novelistic interpretation is repeated by the same writers who repeat his murder allegation: Jones and Ereira claimed 'he certainly didn't make poor Isabella happy' – although her feelings are unrecorded.[53] Boyle called him 'brutish', and a 'grizzled old warrior': as he was probably still under fifty, this is revealingly inconsistent with Boyle's claim that Richard I (in his forty-second year) died 'in his prime of life'.[54] However, Runciman could have chosen evidence to depict Conrad as another of his cultured, 'charming' noblemen, had he wished. Besides Choniates' praise for his talents and looks, an anonymous chronicler described him as 'extremely clever both in natural mental ability and by learning, amiable in character and deed', and fluent in several languages.[55] His family dominated Occitan-speaking chivalric culture in northern Italy: his brother Boniface made Montferrat a famous centre of *trobar*,[56] and one of his sisters married Albert of Malaspina, himself a troubadour.[57] He himself became the hero of Bertran de Born and Peirol's crusade songs: the 'valiant and noble Marquis'.[58] Why, then, did Runciman make

'grimness' the keynote of his characterisation?

His interpretation of Conrad may have been soured by Boniface's leadership of the Fourth Crusade. He regarded the Crusades in general as 'a vast fiasco', 'nothing more than a long act of intolerance in the name of God, which is the sin against the Holy Ghost',[59] but in particular, he blamed the Fourth Crusade, which he ascribed to 'deliberate malice',[60] for the eventual Ottoman conquest of Constantinople:

> It was the Crusaders themselves who wilfully broke down the defence of Christendom and thus allowed the infidel to cross the Straits and penetrate into the heart of Europe. The true martyrs of the Crusades were not the gallant knights who fell fighting at the Horns of Hattin or before the towers of Acre, but the innocent Christians of the Balkans, as well as of Anatolia and Syria, who were handed over to persecution and slavery.[61]

'There was never a greater crime against humanity',[62] he claimed: an assertion which – so soon after Hitler and Stalin's industrialized slaughters and the atomic bomb – seems, at best, naïve. Relying on Choniates, he ignored Boniface's earlier career, with potential for a morally more complex characterisation, to depict him as one of the 'greedy cynics' in charge.[63] However, by simultaneously ignoring Choniates' positive portrayal of Conrad, he did the latter a disservice.

Runciman's use of Roger of Howden reveals another influence. He knew Roger's works and the *Itinerarium Peregrinorum et Gesta Regis Ricardi* in William Stubbs's Rolls Series editions. Although no admirer of Richard I,[64] Stubbs absorbed and endorsed his chroniclers' contempt for the *poulain* nobility and for Conrad. In a footnote to Roger of Howden's *Chronica*, he called Conrad 'the evil genius of the Third Crusade'.[65] In his preface to the *Itinerarium Peregrinorum*, he claimed it must have taxed Richard 'to have pretended a

regard for one so faithless and selfish as Conrad of Montferrat',[66] and drew on a Machiavellian, Renaissance Italian stereotype in comparing him to Guy of Lusignan:

> Guy of Lusignan was a brave soldier, a good commander, an honourable and generous enemy, and faithful friend; but he had two great faults in the eyes of the native Franks, he was without wealth or powerful connexions, and he was devoid of that craft which in them took the place of strength and honest dealing. Conrad of Montferrat, although at first objected to as an adventurer, soon convinced them that his character was much more to their liking. He was strong in the relationship of the emperors of both East and West; whilst Guy came of a family which, though honourable for antiquity, possessed as yet only a third-rate fief, and that by a very questionable title: he was rich, ruthless in enmity, faithless in friendship, cunning and unscrupulous enough to pass for an Italian of a later age; and withal, a famous captain by sea and land.[67]

Certainly, the succession dispute dangerously divided the Franks; but Guy was equally culpable in clinging to the crown, which he held through marriage, after his wife and daughters' deaths. He was the real fugitive, banished from Poitou for participating in killing Patrick, Earl of Salisbury, in 1168.[68] Nevertheless, Stubbs even blamed Conrad for his own assassination: 'the character of Conrad was such, and the persons whom he had injured so many and various, that it is a wonder he was not disposed of earlier than he was'.[69] What caused such hostility?

Behind Stubbs and Runciman lies the influence of a novelist who, more than any historian, shaped Conrad's negative image: Walter Scott. As Runciman told Jonathan Riley-Smith in *Interviews with Historians* (Institute of Historical Research, 1996): 'I think most historians have started by being romantic children […] And that starts one's imagination working […]' His childhood reading of Scott kindled his interest in Byzantium: 'I think one

ought to write a study on the works that inspire you by irritating you, and certainly Walter Scott, I thought, got mediæval history pretty wrong, and I didn't believe that Byzantium was as he depicted it in *Count Robert of Paris*'. *Count Robert of Paris* – 'a dreadful book' in Runciman's estimation[70] – is one of Scott's lesser-known novels. It is unlikely the future historian would have read it without already knowing *The Talisman* (1825).

In *The Talisman*, Scott followed Enlightenment historians in idealizing Saladin, but, by making the Franks' 'official enemy' a hero, he was forced to find villains elsewhere. He resorted to Gothic genre stereotypes, as Charles Mills had chided him for doing in *Ivanhoe* (1819): 'when he wants a villain to form the shadow of his scene, he as regularly and unscrupulously resorts to the fraternity of the Templars as other novelists refer to the church, or to Italy, for a similar purpose'.[71] The treacherous Italian of post-Reformation drama had been revived in late eighteenth- to early nineteenth-century Gothic fiction, which painted Italy as 'a country of incest and intrigue, violence and hypocrisy, whose Church was Anti-Christ, […] and whose intellectuals were typified by the fiendish Machiavelli'. To its population of 'malignant marquisses scheming in gloomy castles'[72] Scott added Conrad, whom he consistently misspelled as 'Conrade of Montserrat', misreading 'f' as 'long s'. He also included another evil Templar – a fictional Grand Master, Giles Amaury – who murders Conrad.

Scott made Richard say:

> '[…] Oh, ay, Conrade of Montserrat – who knows not the popinjay? Politic and versatile, he will change you his purposes as often as the trimmings of his doublet, and you shall never be able to guess the hue of his inmost vestments from their outward colours. A man-at-arms? Ay, a fine figure on horseback, and can bear him well in the tilt-yard, and at the barriers, when swords are

> blunted at point and edge, and spears are tipped with trenchers of wood instead of steel pikes […]'[73]

Later, he is described as 'a voluptuary and an epicurean', and a '"double-faced traitor"',[74] 'generally accused of versatility, of a narrow and selfish ambition, of a desire to extend his own principality, without regard to the weal of the Latin kingdom of Palestine, and of seeking his own interest, by private negotiations with Saladin, to the prejudice of the Christian leaguers'.[75] Scott never acknowledged that Conrad's 'own principality' *was* the Latin Kingdom: Queen Isabella and the resident nobility do not exist in *The Talisman*. He also inserted anachronisms suggestive of the Fourth Crusade: Conrad's brother Enguerrand (Boniface renamed) arrives with 'a gallant band of twelve hundred Stradiots, a kind of light cavalry raised by the Venetians in their Dalmatian possessions'.[76]

Shortly before his death in 1832, in a revised introduction to *The Talisman*, Scott defended his treatment of Conrad:

> Considerable liberties have also been taken with the truth of history, both with respect to Conrade of Montserrat's life, as well as his death. That Conrade, however, was reckoned the enemy of Richard, is agreed both in history and romance. The general opinion of the terms upon which they stood, may be guessed from the proposal of the Saracens, that the Marquis of Montserrat should be invested with certain parts of Syria, which they were to yield to the Christians.[77]

For him, then, Conrad's dispute with Richard ('a name so dear to Englishmen')[78] was reason enough to vilify him; but his 'proposal of the Saracens' comes from *King Richard*, a fanciful fourteenth-century romance discussed in his 'Appendix to the Introduction'.[79] He knew the poem from parts in the Auchinleck Manuscript, then in the Advocates' Library in Edinburgh, and from his acquaintance with George Ellis, author of *Specimens of Early English Metrical*

Romances (1805). While omitting its 'most astonishing and monstrous' incidents, such as cannibalism,[80] Scott quoted Richard's accusations from Ellis's summary of it – which he misattributed to Mills's *History of Chivalry*:

> 'The Marquis, he said, was a traitor, who had robbed the Knight Hospitallers of sixty thousand pounds, the present of his father, Henry; that he was a renegade, whose treachery had occasioned the loss of Acre; and he concluded by a solemn oath, that he would cause him to be drawn to pieces by wild horses, if he should ever venture to pollute the Christian camp by his presence […]'[81]

One wonders whether the misattribution was by error or malice: he had accused Mills of being 'not, it may be presumed, aware that romantic fiction naturally includes the power of such invention, which is indeed one of the requisites of the art'.[82] The danger was that Scott's reputation as an antiquarian lent his inventions credibility. Consciously or subliminally, *The Talisman* has pervaded later portrayals of Conrad in English-language history and fiction.[83]

In turn, Runciman's influence pervades the work of later popular writers, who perpetuate his depiction of Vranas's death as murder, and Conrad's voyage as a wanted criminal's flight. Most of these authors have a background in literature, not history, which affects their research method and relationship with texts.[84] They treat Runciman's *A History of the Crusades* as a canonical text – a substitute primary source. Like him, they accept the Old French Continuations' romance-tinted fables for the sake of storytelling, with clearly defined heroes and villains. Armstrong repeated the folk-tale of the heiress of Botron being weighed in gold, including Runciman's speculation on her weight.[85] She and Reston revived the Old French Continuations' erroneous claim that Reynald of Châtillon captured Saladin's sister, since exaggerated further as murder on film.[86] Boyle quixotically aimed at the 'rehabilitation as serious history' of the Blondel legend, 'one of the most romantic stories in

the English [*sic*] tradition'.[87] Runciman's 'court' and 'baronial' parties have become 'hawks' and 'doves', with deliberate contemporary political resonances, despite their existence being undermined by modern academic scholarship.[88] Meanwhile, critical editions, translations and analyses of the main primary sources have become available: Choniates was published in English in 1984.[89] However, the publication dates of popular works mislead the general reader into believing that they reflect recent research.

In popular historical fiction, too, Runciman's murder allegation, itself shaped by earlier literary stereotypes, has affected Conrad's image. Graham Shelby's novels of Outremer, *The Knights of Dark Renown* (1969) and *The Kings of Vain Intent* (1970), drew heavily on Runciman in their overall narrative and interpretation. In *The Kings of Vain Intent*, he depicted Conrad as the epitome of the Gothic Italian villain: a vampiric-looking poisoner and, in the expanded, more explicit American edition, a sexual sadist who flogs and rapes Isabella into unconsciousness.[90] Even the most hostile sources, such as the *Itinerarium Peregrinorum* or Ambroise's *L'Estoire de la Guerre Sainte*, did not go so far. The author claimed that the main events, including 'the assassination of Regent Conrad', were 'based on established historical record':[91] what he did *not* make clear was that the *characterisations* were not. More recently, Judith Tarr's historical fantasy *Devil's Bargain* (2002) depicted Conrad as 'but a marquis with pretensions'[92] (unaware that, dynastically, he was one of the best-connected men in Europe), 'mistrustful', never without a weapon to hand, even when sleeping, and '"too deeply in love with himself"'.[93] Like Shelby, she described him as dark. Although there is no surviving detailed description of Conrad himself, his father and at least two of his brothers are known to have been blond;[94] but the stereotype of the swarthy Italian villain persists.

Runciman's misrepresentation of Conrad of Montferrat's career in Constantinople seems, at first glance, a minor flaw in a large book: a brief passage, peripheral to the main

narrative. However, its uncritical reiteration for more than fifty years reveals how popular historiography and historical fiction reinforce each other in perpetuating literary stereotypes and outdated interpretations. In this instance, they have prevented a more dramatic story, one of Choniates' *tours-de-force*, reaching a wider audience: that the narrative choices made by an influential Byzantinist were responsible for this is regrettable indeed. It was Runciman, *not* Conrad of Montferrat, who got away with murder.

Note on Translations:

Translations from French, Latin, and Greek are my own. I wish to thank Dr Ruth Macrides, Senior Lecturer in Byzantine Studies, University of Birmingham, for her generosity with her time and advice regarding Niketas Choniates.

Notes:

[1] 'Regni Iherosolymitani Brevis Historia', in *Annali Genovesi di Caffaro e de' suoi Continuatori*, ed. by Luigi Tommaso Belgrano, Fonti per la Storia d'Italia, 11, 2 vols (Genoa and Rome: Istituto Storico Italiano, 1890), II, pp. 127-49 (p. 144).

[2] Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades*, 3 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1951-54), II (1952), p. 384.

[3] Geoffrey Hindley, *Saladin* (London: Constable, 1976), pp. 134 and 144.

[4] Percy Howard Newby, *Saladin in His Time* (London: Faber and Faber, 1983), p. 125.

[5] Robert Payne, *The Dream and the Tomb* (New York: Stein and Day, 1984, and as *The Crusades: A History*, London: Hale, 1986), p. 208.

[6] Karen Armstrong, *Holy War: The Crusades and their Impact on Today's World* (London: Macmillan, 1988; updated edition, 1992), pp. xi and 255.

[7] Terry Jones and Alan Ereira, *Crusades* (London: BBC, 1994), pp. vii and 127. 'Flemish' may be a misreading of Runciman's 'Frankish' in *A History of the Crusades*, II, 384. Paul L.

Williams also described Conrad as 'a Flemish knight' in *The Complete Idiot's Guide to the Crusades* (Indianapolis: Alpha, 2001), p. 188.

[8] Wayne B. Bartlett, *God Wills It!: An Illustrated History of the Crusades* (Stroud: Sutton, 1999), p. 167.

[9] James Reston, Jr., *Warriors of God: Richard the Lionheart and Saladin in the Third Crusade* (New York: Doubleday, and London: Faber and Faber, 2001), p. 67.

[10] David Boyle, *Blondel's Song: The Capture, Imprisonment and Ransom of Richard the Lionheart* (London: Viking, 2005), p. 60.

[11] Niketas Choniates, *Nicetae Choniatae Historia*, ed. by Jan-Louis van Dieten, Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae, 11, 2 vols, (Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1975) I, p. 382. Runciman used Immanuel Bekker's edition from the *Corpus Scriptorum Historiæ Byzantinæ* (Bonn: Ed. Weber, 1835), hereafter Bekker, in which this passage appears on p. 497. There are no significant textual differences between these editions affecting Conrad's depiction.

[12] Choniates, *Historia*, I, 382 (Bekker, 497).

[13] Roger of Howden, *Gesta Regis Henrici Secundi Benedicti Abbatis*, ed. by William Stubbs, Rolls Series, 49, 2 vols (London: Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer, 1867), I, pp. 243-44.

[14] Choniates, *Historia*, I, 201 (Bekker, 262).

[15] Ibid., I, 259-60 (Bekker, 337).

[16] See Aldo A. Settia, ''Postquam ipse marchio levavit crucem': Guglielmo V di Monferrato e il suo ritorno in Palestina (1186)', *Bollettino Storico Bibliografico Subalpino*, 98 (2000), pt 2, pp. 451-72. Baldwin died later that summer.

[17] If Boniface's wedding was recent, this was probably a second marriage: his son, William, by a lady of the del Bosco family, was born in the 1170s. See Leopoldo Usseglio, *I Marchesi*

di Monferrato in Italia ed in Oriente durante i secoli XII e XIII, ed. by Carlo Patrucco, 2 vols (Casale Monferrato: Società di Storia, Arte ed Archeologia per la Provincia di Alessandria, 1926), I, pp. 153-56, and Roberto Maestri, *Bonifacio di Monferrato ed i suoi rapporti in Oriente con la Repubblica di Venezia* (Turin: Marco Valerio, 2005), pp. 17-19, for discussions of Boniface's marriages.

[18] Her identity is unknown. Ralph of Coggeshall's description of Count Meinhard II of Görz (Gorizia) as Conrad's nephew (*Chronicon Anglicanum*, ed. by Joseph Stevenson, Rolls Series 66 (London: Longman and Co., 1875), p. 54) implies she was a daughter of either Meinhard I of Görz or Otto I of Dachau and Valley.

[19] Choniates, *Historia*, I, 382-3 (Bekker, 497-498). For the sake of clarity in English, I have adjusted the sentence structure in this passage.

[20] Giofreddo della Chiesa, *Cronaca di Saluzzo*, in Monumenta Historiæ Patriæ: Scriptores, ed. by Gustavo Avogadro et al., 5 vols (Turin: Fratres Bocca, 1848), 3, col. 880-81; Giovanni Battista Moriondo, *Monumenta Aquensia*, 2 vols (Turin: Typographia Regia, 1789-90), II (1790), col. 348, doc. 95, misdates it to 1183. See also Usseglio, II, 111-112, and Walter Haberstumpf, *Regesti dei Marchesi di Monferrato (secoli IX-XVI)*, Studi sul Monferrato, 8 (Alessandria: Circolo Culturale 'I Marchesi del Monferrato', 2009), p. 26, doc. 130. Henry was in Lodi on 24 March, and Casale Monferrato by 6 April, so was probably in Asti at the end of March. See Karl Friedrich Stumpf-Brentano, *Die Reichskanzler, vornehmlich des X, XI und XII Jahrhunderts, nebst einem Beitrage zu den Regesten und zur Kritik der Kaiserurkunden dieser Zeit*, 2 vols (Innsbruck: Wagner, 1865-83), II (1883), 418, nos 4604-06, and Brand, *Byzantium Confronts the West* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1968), p. 274, and n. 6 on p. 383.

[21] Choniates, *Historia*, I, 383 (Bekker, 498).

[22] Choniates, *Historia*, I, 384 (Bekker, 500). The total eclipse over the empire was on 4 September, which seems too late to fit Conrad's itinerary (see below, nn. 25-26). See Brand, *Byzantium Confronts the West*, Appendix 1, pp. 273-74, and Van Dieten, *Niketas Choniates: Erläuterungen zu den Reden und Briefen nebst einer Biographie* (Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1971), pp. 77-79. Possibly Choniates changed its date or conflated optical phenomena (a solar halo or rings caused by atmospheric conditions) with the later eclipse (stars visible in daytime) for dramatic purposes.

[23] Homer, *Iliad*, XIII. 131, XVI. 215.

[24] Choniates, *Historia*, I, 386-7 (Bekker, 503-05).

[25] *Die Lateinische Fortsetzung Wilhelms von Tyrus*, ed. by Marianne Salloch (Leipzig: Hermann Eichblatt, 1934), p. 73, and n. 163; *Itinerarium Peregrinorum et Gesta Regis Ricardi*, ed. by William Stubbs, Rolls Series, 38 (London: Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts, and Green, 1864), p. 122 [hereafter, *Itinerarium Peregrinorum*]; 'Regni Iherosolymitani Brevis Historia', *Annali Genovesi di Caffaro e de' suoi Continuatori*, I, 144-5; *Chronique d'Ernoul et de Bernard le Trésorier*, ed. by Louis de Mas Latrie (Paris: Libraire de la Société de l'Histoire de France, 1871), pp. 180-82; *L'Estoire de Eracles Empereur et la Conqueste de la Terre d'Outremer*, Recueil des Historiens des Croisades: Historiens Occidentaux, 5 vols (Paris: Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, 1844-95), II (1869), pp. 74-76; *La Continuation de Guillaume de Tyr (1184-1197)*, ed. by Margaret Ruth Morgan, Documents Relatifs à l'Historie des Croisades, 14 (Paris: Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, 1982), pp. 60-61; Ibn al-Athir, *The Chronicle of Ibn al-Athir for the Crusading Period from 'al-Kamil fi'l-Ta'rikh'*, trans. and ed. by D. S. Richards, 3 vols (Ashgate: Farnham, 2007), II, pp. 328-29. Roger of Howden, in his *Gesta Regis Henrici Secundi*, I, p. 261, assigned Conrad's arrival to the same day as the Battle of Hattin, 4 July,

which is too early, before Acre fell. William of Newburgh dated his arrival off Acre to 13 July in *Historia Rerum Anglicarum*, in *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II, and Richard I*, ed. by Richard Howlett, Rolls Series, 82 (London: Longman and Co.), 4 vols, I (1884), p. 262.

[26]See *Regesta Regni Hierosolymitani MXCVII-MCCXCI*, ed. by Reinhold Röhricht (Innsbrück: Wagner, 1893), pp. 177-78, nos 665-68; *Documenti sulle Relazioni delle Città Toscane coll' Oriente Cristiano e col Turchi fino all' anno MDXXXI*, ed. by Giuseppe Müller, Documenti degli Archivi Toscani, 3 (Florence: M. Cellinie, 1879; reprinted Rome: Multigrafica, 1966), nos 23-25, pp. 26-31; Louis Méry and F. Guindon, *Histoire des Actes et des Deliberations du Corps et du Conseil de la Municipalité de Marseille*, 2 vols (Marseille: Feissat and Demonchy, 1841), I, pp. 190-94; Maurice Chéhab, *Tyr à l'Epoque des Croisades*, 2 vols (Paris: Adrien Maisonneuve, 1975-79), II (1979), pp. 242-45; Hans Eberhard Mayer, 'On the Beginnings of the Communal Movement in the Holy Land: The Commune of Tyre', *Traditio*, 24 (1968), pp. 446-53. A September-October arrival would be too late: see David Jacoby, 'Conrad, Marquis of Montferrat, and the Kingdom of Jerusalem (1187-1192)', *Atti del Congresso Internazionale 'Dai Feudi Monferrini e dal Piemonte al Nuovi Mondi Oltre gli Oceani'*, ed. by Laura Balletto, 2 vols (Alessandria: Biblioteca della Società di Storia, Arte e Archeologia per le Province di Alessandria e Asti, 1993), I, p. 190 (reprinted in *Trade, Commodities and Shipping in the Medieval Mediterranean* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1997), no. IV).

[27] Choniates, *Historia*, I, 395 (Bekker, 516-17).

[28] See John Meyendorff, *Byzantine Theology: Historical Trends and Doctrinal Themes* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1987), pp. 197-99, on divorce if a marriage was 'non-existent in practice'. Given Isaac's overtures to Saladin, retaining Conrad as a brother-in-law,

even *in absentia*, was politically inconvenient: see Baha al-Din ibn Shaddad, *The Rare and Excellent History of Saladin*, trans. and ed. by D. S. Richards (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001), pp. 121-22; letter to Philip II, attributed to French envoys, in Roger of Howden, *Gesta Regis Henrici*, II, pp. 51-53, and Ralph of Diceto, *Opera Historica*, ed. by William Stubbs, Rolls Series, 68, 2 vols (London: Longman and Co., 1876), II, pp. 58-60, and merged with Conrad's letter of 20 September 1188 to the Archbishop of Canterbury (Ralph of Diceto, pp. 60-62) in Roger of Wendover, *Liber qui dicitur Flores Historiarum ab anno Domini MCLIV annoque Henrici Anglorum regis Secundi primo*, ed. by Henry G. Hewlett, Rolls Series, 84, 3 vols (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1886-1889), II (1887), pp. 436-37. For secondary sources, see Charles M. Brand, 'The Byzantines and Saladin, 1185-1192: Opponents of the Third Crusade', *Speculum*, 37 no. 2 (April 1968), pp. 167-81 and *Byzantium Confronts the West*, pp. 177-78; Paul Magdalino, 'Isaac II, Saladin and Venice', in *The Expansion of Orthodox Europe: Byzantium, the Balkans and Russia*, ed. by Jonathan Shephard (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), pp. 83-106. Savvas Neocleous. 'The Byzantines and Saladin: Opponents of the Third Crusade?', *Crusades*, 9 (2010), 87-106, takes an opposing view.

[29]*Itinerarium Peregrinorum*, p. 122; Ambroise, *The History of the Holy War: Ambroise's 'L'Estoire de la Guerre Sainte'*, ed. and trans. by Marianne Ailes and Malcolm Barber, 2 vols (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2003), I, p. 66, lines 4124-29.

[30] Giovanni Boccaccio, *Il Decamerone*, Day 1, Novel 5, told by Fiammetta. While Philip's journey to Genoa *en route* to the East fits 1190, Conrad had not travelled as 'standard-bearer of the Church' ('gonfaloniere della Chiesa'): this description better fits Boniface in the *Fourth* Crusade. If Philip flirted with the wife of a Marquis in 1190, she was probably Boniface's wife. Philip's epithet, 'the One-Eyed' ('il bornio'), is not attested elsewhere. In any case, the story is a generic folk-tale of Oriental origin, to which their names and titles

became attached: see Marcus Landau, *Die Quellen des Decamerone* (Stuttgart: J. Scheible, 1884), p. 26.

[31] Runciman, *A History of the Crusades*, III, 27, n.1.

[32]Theodora was involved in the conversion of the Dalmatios Monastery into a women's convent: see Brand, *Byzantium Confronts the West*, p. 119, citing Athanasios Papadopolous-Kerameus, ed., 'Synodika grammata Ioannou tou Apokaukou', *Byzantis*, 1 (1909), 3-30 (p. 19).

[33] Robert of Auxerre, *Roberti Canonici S. Mariani Autissiodorensis Chronicon*, ed. by Oswald Holder-Egger, Monumenta Germaniæ Historica: Scriptores, 26 (Hannover: Societas Aperiendis Fontibus Rerum Germanicarum Medii Ævi (Gesellschaft zur Erschließung der Quellen der Deutschen Geschichte des Mittelalters), 1882) pp. 219-87 (p. 250). [Subsequent series reference: MGH SS.]

[34]Salimbene de Adam, *Cronica Fratris Salimbene de Adam Ordinis Minorum*, ed. by Oswald Holder-Egger, MGH SS, 32 (Hannover and Leipzig: 1905-13), p. 4, and Alberto Milioli, *Alberti Milioli notarii Regini Liber de temporibus et ætatibus et Cronica imperatorum*, ed. by Oswald Holder-Egger, MGH SS, 31 (Hannover: 1903), pp. 336-668 (p. 644), dated after October 1186. Both misname Theodora 'Irene'. Salimbene, Alberto, and Sicardo also seem partly indebted to the *Historia Peregrinorum*: see *Quellen zur Geschichte des Kreuzzuges Kaiser Friedrichs I*, ed. by Anton Chroust, MGH Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum: nova series, 5 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1928), pp. 116-72 (pp. 120-22), and *The Crusade of Frederick Barbarossa: The History of the Expedition of the Emperor Frederick and Related Texts*, trans. and ed. by Graham A. Loud (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010), pp. 11 and 139-41. This is favourable to Conrad, but does not mention his earlier adventures in Constantinople.

[35] Robert de Clari, *La Conquète de Constantinople*, ed. by Philippe Lauer, Les Classiques Français du Moyen Age, 40 (Paris: Édouard Champion, 1924), pp. 33-34.

[36] Runciman also referred in the footnote to the *Itinerarium Peregrinorum*, and the Arabic writers Baha al-Din and Ibn al-Athir, but this was for material later in the paragraph, so can be set aside here.

[37] *Chronique d'Ernoul et de Bernard le Trésorier*, pp. 128-29, and pp. 179-80.

[38] *L'Estoire de Eracles Empereur et la Conqueste de la Terre d'Outremer*, II, 24-25 and 74-75.

[39] *La Continuation de Guillaume de Tyr*, p. 59. Peter W. Edbury has discussed the relationship between the manuscripts in 'The Lyon *Eracles* and the Old French Continuations of William of Tyre', *Montjoie: Studies in Crusade History in Honour of Hans Eberhard Mayer*, ed. Benjamin Z. Kedar, Jonathan Riley-Smith, and Rudolf Hiestand (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1997), pp. 139-53, and 'New Perspectives on the Old French Continuations of William of Tyre', *Crusades*, 9 (2010), 107-13. The Lyon Manuscript is the longest extant version because of its compiler's insertions, not – as Morgan had argued – because it is the unabridged original.

[40] On Conrad in Constantinople, see Theodor Ilgen, *Der Markgraf Conrad von Montferrat* (Marburg: N. G. Elwert, 1880), pp. 69-74 and *Il Marchese Corrado di Monferrato*, trans. by Giuseppe Cerrato (Casale Monferrato: Carlo Cassone, 1890), pp. 65-70, and Usseglio, II, 79-83.

[41] Roger of Howden, *Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Houeden*, ed. William Stubbs, Rolls Series, 51, 4 vols (London: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1868-71), II (1870), pp. 320-21: 'Interim Conradus le Marchis, frater supradicti Willelmi comitis Joppen, facto homicidio in

civitate Constantinopolitana, fugam iniit, relicta uxore sua, nepte [*sic*] Ysakii imperatoris Constantinopolitani'.

[42] Roger of Howden, *Gesta Regis Henrici Secundi*, I, 261: 'Qui seditione in civitate Constantinopolis nobilissimum quondam interfecit; et relicta uxore sue, sorore Ysakii imperatoris, venit ad civitatem Tyri […]'.

[43] Quoted in David Plante, 'Profiles: Historian Sir Steven Runciman', *The New Yorker* (3 November 1986), p. 77.

[44] Plante, 'Profiles: Historian Sir Steven Runciman', p. 67.

[45] Ibid., p. 77.

[46] Runciman, *A History of the Crusades*, I, xii.

[47] Plante, 'Profiles: Historian Sir Steven Runciman', p. 80.

[48] Robert Irwin, 'Saladin and the Third Crusade: A Case Study in Historiography and the Historical Novel', in *A Companion to Historiography*, ed. by Michael Bentley (London: Routledge, 1997), pp. 139-52, p. 146.

[49]*Itinerarium Peregrinorum*, p. 120.

[50] Friends included Stephen Tennant and Cecil Beaton, who photographed him with his parakeet, Benedict. See obituary, 'Sir Steven Runciman', *The Daily Telegraph*, 2 November 2000.

[51] Runciman, *A History of the Crusades,* III, 26.

[52] Ibid., III, 56.

[53] Jones and Ereira, *The Crusades*, p. 141.

[54]Boyle, pp. 63, 90, and 270.

[55]'ingenio et scientia sagacissimus, animo et facto amabilis' and 'omnibus linguis instructus, respectu cuius facundissimus reputabatur elinguis', in 'Brevis Historia Occupationis et

Amissionis Terræ Sanctæ', *Die Chronik des Propstes Burchard von Ursberg*, ed. by Oswald Holder-Egger and Bernhard von Simson, MGH SS in Usum Scholarum, 15 (Hannover and Leipzig: Hahn, 2nd edn, 1916), pp. 59-64 (p. 64), and in *Corpus Historicum Medii Ævi*, ed. by Johann Georg Eccard (Eckhart), 2 vols (Leipzig: Johann Friedrich Gleditsch, 1723), vol. II, col. 1349-54, col. 1353.

[56] Much has been written on this, from Giosuè Carducci onward: see *Carducci e gli Aleramici di Monferrato: Studi su Carducci e il Monferrato*, ed. by Roberto Maestri, Atti sul Monferrato, 6 (Alessandria: Circolo Culturale 'I Marchesi del Monferrato', 2009); Giulio Bertoni, *I Trovatori d'Italia: Biografie, testi, traduzioni, note* (Modena: Umberto Orlandini, 1915); *Poesie Provenzali Storiche relative all'Italia*, ed. by Vincenzo De Bartholomaeis, Fonti per la Storia d'Italia, 71 (Rome: Istituto Storico Italiano, 1931), I; Raimbaut de Vaqueiras, *The Poems of the Troubadour Raimbaut de Vaqueiras*, ed. and trans. by Joseph Linskill (The Hague: Mouton, 1964); *Dalla Provenza al Monferrato: Percorsi Medievali di Testi e Musiche – Atti del Convegno (Rocca Grimalda-Ovada, 26-27 giugno 2004)*, ed. by Sonia Maura Barillari, L'Immagine Riflessa/Quaderni: serie miscellanea, 9 (Alessandria: Orso, 2007).

[57] Albert's only confirmed surviving work is *Ara.m digatz, Rambaut, si vos agrada*, a *tenso* or 'flyting' with Raimbaut de Vaqueiras: Bertoni, no. 3, pp. 211-15; Vaqueiras, pp. 108-116.

[58]Bertran de Born, *L'Amour et la Guerre: L'Oeuvre de Bertran de Born*, ed. by Gérard Gouiran, by 2 vols (Aix en Provence and Marseille: Université de Provence, 1985), I, pp. 671-91, and *The Poems of the Troubadour Bertran de Born*, ed. and trans. by William D. Padden, jr., Tilde Sankovitch, and Patricia H. Stäblein (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press, 1986), pp. 409-21; Peirol, *Peirol, Troubadour of Auvergne*, ed. and trans. by S. C. Aston (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953) pp. 157-60.

[59] Runciman, *A History of the Crusades*, III, pp. 292 and 401.

[60] Ibid., III, 397.

[61] Ibid., III, 399.

[62] Ibid., III, 109.

[63] Ibid., III, 398.

[64] Stubbs described him as 'a bad son, a bad husband, a selfish ruler and a vicious man', and wrote that 'Richard was no Englishman that we should be concerned to defend him on national grounds': *Itinerarium Peregrinorum*, pp. xvii-xviii.

[65] Roger of Howden, *Chronica*, II, 194, n. 3.

[66] *Itinerarium Peregrinorum*, pp. xxiii.

[67] Ibid., pp. cxxiv-v.

[68] Roger of Howden, *Chronica*, I, 273-74.

[69] *Itinerarium Peregrinorum*, pp. xxii-iv

[70] Quoted by Anthony Bryer, 'James Cochran Stevenson Runciman (1903-2000)' in *Byzantine Style, Religion and Civilisation: In Honour of Sir Steven Runciman*, ed. by Elizabeth Jeffreys (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), p. xlvi.

[71] Charles Mills, *The History of Chivalry, or, Knighthood and its Times*, 2 vols (London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, Brown, and Green, 3rd edn, 1825), I, pp. 337-38, unnumbered footnote. On Scott and the Templars, see also Malcolm Barber, *The New Knighthood: A History of the Order of the Temple* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994) pp. 323-331.

[72] Kenneth Churchill, *Italy and English Literature 1764-1930* (London: Macmillan, 1980), pp. 5-6, and 17-18, and Roderick Cavaliero, *Italia Romantica: English Romantics and Italian Freedom* (London and New York: I. B. Tauris, 2005), pp. 51-54.

[73] Scott, *The Talisman* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1912), p. 99.

[74] Ibid., pp. 166 and 372.

[75] Ibid., pp. 148-49.

[76] Ibid., p. 365.

[77] Ibid., *Introduction*, p. xvii.

[78] Ibid., *Introduction*, p. xvii.

[79] *Der Mittelenglische Versroman über Richard Löwenherz*, ed. by Karl Brunner, Wiener Beitrage zur Englischen Philologie, 42 (Vienna and Leipzig: Wilhelm Braumüller, 1913); for the Auchinleck MS text, see *King Richard*, ed. by David Burnley and Alison Wiggins, in *The Auchinleck Manuscript* (Edinburgh: National Library of Scotland, 5 July 2003) http://auchinleck.nls.uk/mss/richard.html (Version 1.1, 7 April 2006).

[80] Scott, *The Talisman*, *Introduction*, p. xviii.

[81] Ibid., pp. xx-xi, quoting George Ellis, *Specimens of Early English Metrical Romances*, 3 vols (London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, and Orme, and Edinburgh: A. Constable and Co. 1805), II, 230.

[82] Scott, *The Talisman, Introduction*, p. xvii.

[83] For further reading on Scott's influences and his influence, see Jerome Mitchell, *Scott, Chaucer and Medieval Romance: A Study in Sir Walter Scott's Indebtedness to the Literature of the Middle Ages* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1987), with pp. 177-82 specifically on *The Talisman*; Fiona Robertson, *Legitimate Histories: Scott, Gothic, and the Authorities of Fiction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994); Elizabeth Siberry, *The New Crusaders: Images of the Crusades in the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000), pp. 112-30; Henry Adalbert White, *Sir Walter Scott's Novels on*

Stage, Yale Studies in English, 76 (Yale: Yale University Press, 1927), pp. 183-86 and 244-45 on dramatisations of *The Talisman*.

[84] Although Hindley was a social historian, Newby, Payne, Armstrong, and Jones studied English literature. Reston, who studied philosophy, is a journalist and novelist, and Boyle is an economist.

[85] Armstrong, *Holy War*, pp. 242-43, taken from Runciman, *A History of the Crusades*, II, 406. This is another of Runciman's misleading footnotes: erroneously naming the heiress 'Lucia', he again cites the *Chronique d'Ernoul* and the Colbert-Fontainebleau *L'Estoire de Eracles*, neither of which gives her name – actually Cécile (*Documenti sulle Relazioni delle Città Toscane coll' Oriente Cristiano e col Turchi*, 83-84, no. 53). Morgan calls the story 'folklorique': *La Continuation de Guillaume de Tyr*, p. 46, n. 1.

[86] Armstrong, *Holy War*, p. 248; Reston, pp. 23-25; Ridley Scott, *Kingdom of Heaven* (2005). Judging by his DVD commentaries, Scott has convinced himself of the truth of the script's inventions, including the lady's murder.

[87]Boyle, p. xxviii. It is a *French* legend, from the later thirteenth-century *Récits d'un Ménestrel de Reims*, ed. by Natalis de Wailly (Paris: Societé de l'Histoire de France, 1876), pp. 41-45.

[88]Armstrong, *Holy War*, pp. 242-44; Reston, p. 36. Ridley Scott's *Kingdom of Heaven* is also predicated on these 'party lines', which Runciman, in turn, derived from Marshall W. Baldwin, *Raymond III of Tripolis and the Fall of Jerusalem (1140-1187)* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1936). The premise has been discredited in Peter W. Edbury, 'Propaganda and Faction in the Kingdom of Jerusalem: The Background to Hattin', in *Christians and Muslims in Twelfth-Century Syria*, ed. by Maya Shatzmiller, (Leiden: Brill, 1993), pp. 173-89, and Bernard Hamilton, *The Leper King and His Heirs* (Cambridge:

Cambridge University Press, 2000). Armstrong's account of writing *Holy War* in *The Spiral Staircase* (London: Harper Collins, 2004), pp. 287-96, suggests that it served as personal therapy, as she sought historical surrogates for her own feelings of victimhood.

[89] These include: Margaret Ruth Morgan, *The Chronicle of Ernoul and the Continuations of William of Tyre* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973), and her edition of *La Continuation de Guillaume de Tyr*; *The Conquest of Jerusalem and the Third Crusade: Sources in Translation*, trans. and ed. by Peter W. Edbury (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998), and 'The Lyon *Eracles* and the Old French Continuations of William of Tyre' in *Montjoie*; *Chronicle Of The Third Crusade: A Translation of the 'Itinerarium Peregrinorum et Gesta Regis Ricardi'*, trans. and ed. by Helen J. Nicholson (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1997); Niketas Choniates, *O City of Byzantium, Annals of Niketas Choniates*, trans. and ed. by Harry J. Magoulias (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1984).

[90] Graham Shelby, *The Kings of Vain Intent* (New York: Weybright and Talley, expanded US edn, 1970), pp. 105-07.

[91] Ibid., p. 307; p. 222 in the shorter UK paperback edition (London: Collins Fontana,1972).

[92]Judith Tarr, *Devil's Bargain* (New York: Roc, 2002), pp. 142-43.

[93] Ibid., pp. 149, 159.

[94] Otto and Acerbo Morena, and Continuator, *Annales Laudenses*, ed. by Phillip Jaffé, MGH SS, 18 (Hannover: Hahn, 1863), pp. 582-659 (p. 641); William of Tyre, *Willelmi Tyrensis Archiepiscopi Chronicon*, ed. by Robert B. C. Huygens, Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediævalis, 63-63A, 2 vols (Turnhout: Brepols, 1986), II, p. 978; Choniates, *Historia*, I, 171 (Bekker, 222).