

THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

GRADUATE SCHOOL

Report
of
Committee on Thesis

The undersigned, acting as a Committee of the Graduate School, have read the accompanying thesis submitted by Mildred Enquist Bergheim for the degree of Master of Arts. They approve it as a thesis meeting the requirements of the Graduate School of the University of Minnesota, and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

A. C. Krey

Chairman

Walter W. Dole

Robert V. Cram

Date _____

THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
GRADUATE SCHOOL

Report
of
Committee on Examination

This is to certify that we the
undersigned, as a committee of the Graduate
School, have given Mildred Enquist Bergheim
final oral examination for the degree of
Master of Arts
We recommend that the degree of
Master of Arts
be conferred upon the candidate.

A. C. Krey
Chairman
C. W. Howard
Clarence Perkins
Norman B. Laurie

Date AUG 22 1923

--- SUBJECT ---

"T A N C R E D."

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE
FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA.

BY

MILDRED ENQUIST BERGHEIM

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF RE-
QUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS.

OCTOBER

1 9 2 2

UNIVERSITY OF
MINNESOTA
LIBRARY

MSM

g 3453

TANCRED

"J'ai pars vous gagne'tant de batailles
Tant de pays, tant de terres conquises."

Chanson de Roland.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Chapter I	Introduction
Chapter II	Career of Tancred
Chapter III	Tancred's Place in History
Chapter IV	Tancred's Place in Literature
Chapter V	Conclusion
Chapter VI	Bibliography

CHAPTER I.

Introduction.

In certain epochs in history, time deviates from his usual, slow, meandering tread and leaps forward with rapidity; men and women remarkable in their greatness, seem to arise out of the night; movements undreamt of take form and quickly develop; the world itself is raised to the highest pitch of enthusiasm and ambition. Such an epoch was the Middle Ages; especially the eleventh and twelfth centuries, when the greatest impetus the world had hitherto known was embodied in the calling and launching of the First Crusade.

The conditions of Europe at this time were deplorable. Feudalism, approaching late adult-hood, had produced almost irremediable evil effects on society. Warfare between rulers and lords, lords and vassals was rampant, and disturbed not only the peace of Europe, but also crushed all individuality among the middle and lower classes alike reducing them practically to serfdom.

Monasticism, sister to Feudalism, although older in years, consequently in power even stronger, and its sponsor the church, had become the most powerful factors in Europe. Church and state were constantly perturbed, by the insistent effort of each to supersede the other in power. Naturally in a time of more or less disturbance refuge is sought by many. This refuge proved to be the monasteries in the eleventh century, and any great movement, in order to succeed, must receive its impetus from that source. The calling of the First Crusade proved this..

When the West received word from the Eastern Kingdom that

Constantinople was being threatened by the Turks, it was the church who answered the call and urged the people to response. Pope Urban, in his famous speech at Clermont in 1095 declared that, "Whoever shall have set out for Jerusalem, not for the sake of honor or gain, but to free the church of God, may reckon his journey as a penance," and "the vast concourse", says one who was himself present at the moving scene, "flung themselves prostrate on the ground, while Gregory, a Cardinal, made confession of sin on their behalf, and begging pardon for past misdeeds received the apostolic blessing." Such was the reaction. This spirit was prevalent everywhere; everyone was anxious to depart from the disturbed affairs at home, whether incensed purely by religious fanatism, or by adventure, profit, gain and incidentally salvation.

Out of this motley crowd rushing toward the Holy Land emerged Tancred, a youth, yet a leader, religious yet adventurous. To trace his career will be the task of the following chapters.

CHAPTER II.

The Career of Tancred.

Tancred was the son of a Lombard Prince, "Le Marquis Odon or Guillaume" and Emma Guiscard, whose family was widely renowned for their activity in warfare, not only in the Norman settlement in southern Italy, but also in northern Italy, Greece and Germany.¹ It was in southern Italy that Tancred was born about 1072. Nothing is known of his very early life except that he was well trained in arms, which was only natural to expect. His biographer, alone, speaks of his early character, "He was the son of very distinguished origin, but neither glory nor fortune suffered in Tancred a false pride or vain conceit. Ever since his childhood he surpassed the young people by his cleverness in the use of arms. He surpassed old age by serious morals, giving examples of virtue everywhere. He was an ardent admirer of true Christians and tried to become an exemplary Christian himself. Because of his character he received more and more recognition each day, but his conscience was not always at ease, for he felt knighthood and Christianity somewhat conflicting in principles. However, when the declaration of Pope Urban was announced Tancred saw his way clear and immediately began to fit out an expedition."²

Bohemund, Tancred's uncle, already famous for his many daring deeds, also fitted out an expedition for the east, large in numbers, and rich in equipment. In order to further enlarge his

1. Raoul de Caen - P.5; Balderic, P.613.

2. Raoul de Caen - P.5.

forces, he determined to make Tancred one of his first lieutenants, thereby incidentally also securing his nephew's troops.³ "Bohemund, having sent to him many riches, accompanied by flattering words, convinced Tancred to consent to fight under his orders, as a chief fights under his king, being second only to him in importance."⁴ Aside from the flattery and riches given him, Tancred had two reasons for accepting the proposition; first, the importance he would have on the expedition would be practically the same as if he had sole charge; second, he was relieved of the anxiety of providing for the expedition and of sea transportation. Thus, in 1096 the treaty with Bohemund was made, and in that year they departed for the East.⁵ The route they chose was by sea to Durazzo, and thence by land to Constantinople.⁶ On land they experienced great difficulty with the Greeks, and finally an open onslaught occurred which Tancred successfully repulsed. So great was the fear of being overcome by the Greeks that when victory was won, the Christian forces gave a celebration in their leader's honor. Not only was Tancred's rank in the expedition here emphasized, but from that time on, says Bohemund, "it seemed that to have Tancred as a partner was sufficient motive of security; that to be without him in the army was to be as in a desert."⁷

Alexius, in the meanwhile, of course, was anxiously watching the arrival of the Crusaders. Although the Italians had been successful against the Greeks, the attacks of the Greeks had not been unpro-

3. Raoul de Caen - P.8-9; Guibert, P. 496; Albert of Aix, P.204.

4. Raoul de Caen - P.9.

5. Raoul de Caen, -P. 10; Balderic, 17E; Robert the Monk, P.744.

6. Raoul de Caen - P.11; Tudehodus, 779; Guibert, 485, 486.

7. Raoul de Caen, - P.17; Robert, P.37; Balderic, P.92.

voked, of which the Emperor was conscious. The prisoners refused to obey and said to Bohemund, "the orders of the Emperor were of the highest obligation upon them, and they would commit an offence against God in violating his commands. The armies of the Crusaders were dreaded by their master like the thunders of the heaven, for he knew that ambition, and not religion, was their motive; that they preferred Constantinople to Jerusalem." Bohemund, thereupon, released the unfortunate captives, saying to his own men, "The passions ought to be curbed till they can be exerted with effect. If possible, the favor of Alexius must be obtained, or at all events our wrongs should be dissimulated till a proper season." With this thought in mind he sent messengers to Constantinople, with remonstrances against the injustice of the Greeks. Alexius disavowed the actions of his soldiers and though he inwardly feared and detested Bohemund, he expressed the most lively joy at his approach, and promised him more honors and treasures than those which he had conferred on the Latin Princes. He sent the Duke of Lorraine to meet Bohemund, and entreat him to take the oath of fealty, which the latter did. Without some appearance of confidence hostilities would have been renewed, and therefore Bohemund left the army under Tancred at Rassa, and accompanied by the Duke, went with a hand of cavaliers to the imperial city, when riches and luxuries were bestowed upon him.⁸

Left in charge at Rassa, Tancred led the Italians from there to Constantinople, and when the alternative was plunder, or starvation, he permitted his wretched followers to live upon the miserable and heretical provincials.⁹ When he arrived at the Bosphorus, he and one of the princes of Salernum, disguised themselves in the garb

8. Raoul de Caen P.23; Guibert P.419; Arch.of Tyre,P.659,Balderic P.92; Alexiad, P.238, 240;

9. Raoul, P.24; Balderic 94; Albert, p.204.

of common soldiers, and crossed the strait almost unnoticed. By that means Tancred escaped the disgrace of acknowledging a foreign prince to be his liege lord, which Alexius interpreted, not to a loftiness of spirit, but to hostile intentions. Yet threats were of no avail - for Tancred steadfastly refused to take the oath of fidelity, altho he remained in that vicinity until Duke Godfrey, with whom he joined his forces was ready to depart for the East.

Upon their departure they first marched into Nicomedia, where they remained for three days, then progressed to Nicea.¹⁰ They arrived at Nicea on the fourth day and there encamped when plans for a formal siege were made. The different generals followed their own principles of hostility, and perhaps attacked those parts of the fortification which were opposite to their respective posts. Hugh, the two Roberts and Stephen of Chartres, applied their engines of war against the East. Godfrey was on the north, and Bohemund and Tancred were on the south.¹¹ On the second day, Kiliij Arslan, leader of the Turks, was forced to retire and leave Nicea to its fate.¹² Tancred was recognized as having killed the first Turk and as having put to flight a great many of the enemy, which seemed to enhance the important part he was filling in the expedition.¹³ When the city surrendered, Alexius was there to receive it, and to solicit the chiefs who had not sworn fealty to him, to do so at that time.¹⁴ No one declined but Tancred, who said, "My blood relation, Bohemund, swept off

10. Raoul de Caen - P.32; Wm. of Tyre, P.664; Fulcher, P.387; Guibert, P.491.

11. Raoul de Caen - P.35-36; Albert P.204,205.

12. Raoul de Caen - P.37; Gesta, P.5; Albert P.205,206; Wm.of Tyre, P.667; Alexiad, P.245.

13. Raoul. P.37

14. Raoul, P.39; Raymond, P.142; Wm.of Tyre, P.672; Balderic, P.97; Guibert, P.493.

his feet by your power, has induced me, O Emperor, to cross again on your border. If your promises, if your presents, if your friendship, might have captivated me, easy approach to you would have been afforded me, but inasmuch as those things displease me, it would be folly to seek your companionship. Because of this I have made it a point to remain as far removed as possible. If you help us capture Jerusalem, and then should want a ruler for one of your provinces you may call on me, and I will then administer the law of Christ. At present I am duty bound to the service of Bohemund, but unlike he, will not yield to your wishes."¹⁵ The reproach of the surrounding nobles served only to quicken his pride, and turning to Alexius he exclaimed, "If you were to give me as much money as this vast place could hold, and would add as much as you have given to other chiefs, I would not take the oath you request."¹⁶ A relative of the Emperor replied with such violence that Tancred threatened to punish him, had not Bohemund and Alexius intervened.¹⁷

The final result as to whether or not Tancred took the oath is undetermined by most authors, although his biographer says he did not.

On the ninth day after the capture of Nicea, the Crusaders departed from the vicinity of the city, and took the road to Antioch. After a few days' march the army separated by mutual consent into two bodies, and took different routes. In one division were Bohemund, Tancred, Robert of Normandy, and Stephen of Chartres; in the other, Raymond, Godfrey, Adhemar and Hugh.¹⁸

15. Raoul, P. 40.

16. Alexiad, P. 250.

17. Raoul, P. 45; Alexiad, P.250.

18. Raoul, P. 47; Wm. of Tyre, P.672; Albert, P.215; Alexiad P.251.

Kilij Arslan was not dispirited although his capital was lost, but summoned his forces together again, and met the advancing Normans on the banks of a river in the valley of the Gorgon. There at Doryleum were the Christians attacked by the Turks. Robert of Paris, and Tancred's cousin were both killed, and only because Bohemund drew him to the rear lines did Tancred escape injury. Tancred, as usual, was courageous and during the heat of the battle fought as a common soldier rather than in the sheltered position of leader until Bohemund drew him back, and made him fight in command, not under command. The Christians, with the aid of reinforcements, defeated the enemy, and three days later, the army, again reunited, recommenced its march and entered the mountainous country of Phrygia, arriving finally at Antiochetta.¹⁹

Here Godfrey and Bohemund sent their seconds in command, Baldwin and Tancred, to explore the surrounding country, and to try the fortune of war with the Moslems. These lieutenants directed their march toward Iconium, but the inhabitants had already deserted the city, and from there on desolation alone marked the path of the Turks. Baldwin and Tancred became separated among the rugged steeps of Cilicia and the latter went on to Tarsus, which was surrendered to him immediately. His standard was placed on one of the city's towers, in token of victory; but the fate of the inhabitants was reserved for the decision of Bohemund, and the grand army. A few days later, the appearance of some troops at a distance changed the sullen submission of the citizens into clamorous hostility. Tancred, too, thought that they were one of the numerous flying squadrons of the enemy, but he told the people that the righteousness of his

19. Gesta Francorum, P.6; Raoul, P.53-54; Albert, P.212.

cause would give him victory, and even if he should fail, Bohemund would punish their attempt to violate the treaty. He descended into the plain to meet the troops but found that they were Baldwin's soldiers who had caused the alarm. Their wanderings in the Cilician mountains had ended in the plains around Tarsus. The Turks, who had lately been so loud in their rejoicings, now sank into lamentation; and the Italians willingly gave to their famished brethren some of those provisions which they had levied from the people.²⁰

Jealousy immediately seized the ambitious heart of Baldwin, on beholding the standard of Tancred, and declared that as his troops composed the most numerous division he was entitled to command. To this arrogance, Tancred mildly replied that as he had taken Tarsus without cooperation he was justified in retaining it. Unable to resist altogether the power of the conquerors, and yet greedy of plunder Baldwin proposed that the city should be delivered to general spoilation, but Tancred declared that his religion forbade him from injuring his brethren in the faith: the people of Tarsus had chosen him as their lord, and he would never remove from them his protecting shield. Finally it was agreed that the citizens should determine whose dominion they would submit to; and they declared the dominion of Tancred preferable.

The ambition of Baldwin was incompatible with justice and while Tancred suspected no wrong, the former intrigued with the Christians and with the Turks in the city. He told them that Bohemund and Tancred were men of small consequence, and not to be compared to Godfrey or himself. If the people would elect Baldwin as their chief they should be honored and rewarded by the Duke of Lorraine; other-

20. Raoul, P. 69, 70.

wise their city would be condemned to destruction, a doom which no power of the Italian lords could reverse.²¹ These threats and promises prevailed, and Baldwin's banner was set up to float from the citadel. Tancred concealed his mortification, and retired to the neighboring town of Azara, then in possession of the Crusaders, and carried his troops to conquest. The town of Mamistra fell before him, and he entered as victor.²² Meanwhile, Baldwin, with a host of five hundred men, followed the steps of Tancred, and in a few days arrived near Mamistra. Richard, prince of Salernum, urged his kinsman to seize this occasion to revenge his wrongs on Baldwin, which he determined to do. He sent his archers into the plain against such of Baldwin's troops as were in their tents, and to destroy the horses which were in pasturage; he, himself, led five hundred of his heavily armed warriors against his rival. The force of Tancred, however, could not successfully cope with that of his antagonist. After some ineffectual exhibitions of bravery, the baffled Italians retreated

21. Baldwin also asserted here that his brother Godfrey was generalissimo, but that was an artifice to gain consequence with the people of Tarsus. The whole tenor of the Crusade shows, that whatever respect was paid to Godfrey was not a tribute to power, but to superior virtues and talents. The Duke of Lorraine never attempted to convert that superiority, which was yielded to his merits, into a real dominion until 1099 at Jerusalem. The operations of the army were directed by a Council of Chiefs, of which the Count of Blois and Chartres was the president. It was the celebrated Benedetto Accolti who furnished Tasso with the idea that Godfrey was supreme commander. Accolti wrote in the fifteenth century an account of the First Crusade. The work was very popular for a time, and it is a reasonable conjecture of Dr. Joseph Wharton, that Tasso took from it the hint of his fine subject. See Chapter VI of Thesis.

Raoul, P.75-79; Fulcher, P.337; Guibert, P.164; Balderic, P. 38; Robert the Monk, P. 767; Wm. of Tyre, P. 703.

22. Raoul, P. 82-87; Guibert, P. 164; Balderic, P. 38; Albert, P. 349.

into the city. Feelings of charity and peace succeeded this sanguinary encounter and the next morning deputies sent by both parties made peace. Baldwin hastened to return to the grand army; while Tarsus was left with Tancred, who carried his conquests as far as Alexandretta - capturing Barisan and Hersen on the way. From there he went into the mountains, from whence he saw Bohemund and Raymond looking for provisions. He joined them, and later with them returned to the main army rear Antioch.²³ ✓

The capital of Syria was only four miles in circumference, and extended over both elevated and level land.²⁴ It was surrounded by a wall, and, in those places where the mountainous nature of the land presented no natural defense, the height of the artificial bulwark was more than sixty feet. The plan of attack was agreed upon by the Crusaders, and camp was formed round the eastern, northern, and western sides, part of the west and all of the south were left open to the besieged. The city had five gates, and by this arrangement the gate of the bridge, the gate of St. George, belonged to the Turks. Bohemund and Tancred, who commanded all the Italians, were opposite the entrance to the East called the Gate of St. Paul.²⁵ The two Roberts, Stephen of Chartres, and Hugh Vermandois, with the Normans, the French, the Flemish and the English extended from the camp of Bohemund, in a northerly direction, to a gate called the Gate of the Dog. Raymond, Adhemar and Godfrey guarded the rest of the wall. So unskillful were the operations of the besiegers, however, that, at the end of three months, Antioch stood firm and uninjured. The vicinity of Antioch was exhausted for provisions, and the wintry season

23. Raoul, P.87; Raymond, P. 142; Wm.of Tyre, 676-680; Albert,215-220

24. Raoul, P. 101; Wm. of Tyre, P. 688, 689.

25. Raoul, P. 103; Wm. of Tyre, P. 689.

prevented any commerce between the camp and distant lands, and semi-starvation set in. Finally, with the consent of the Council, Bohemund, Tancred and Robert of Flanders, with all the cavalry of fifteen thousand foot soldiers, made a predatory excursion into the Turkish territories.²⁶ Raymond and Adhemar remained to guard the camp.

Godfrey was oppressed by illness so could offer no assistance. The Turks took the occasion to attack the Christians, but the bravery of the latter rose with their dangers and set off the attack. Eager for complete revenge, they pursued the enemy too soon, and would have been annihilated had not Bohemund and Tancred, with part of the troops, just returned at that time with provisions. Tancred, it is said, routed seven hundred Turks alone, with a small garrison, and killed three enemy spies, while Bohemund with the rest of the forces, stood as a guard to protect the camp.²⁷

Camp conditions, however, became worse. Pestilence and starvation caused many desertions. William Carpenter and Peter the Hermit, two warriors, tried to flee, but Tancred saw them, caught them, and took them to the tent of Bohemund. Pardon was at length granted to both, but only on the condition that there should be no enmity toward Tancred.²⁸

The famine was so productive of crimes that the Crusaders at length reached the stage of sullen desperation which the extreme of misery so often produces. Furthermore, dire threats were sent to the Crusaders by the Caliph of Egypt, and finally announced an attack.²⁹ Bohemund, with the aid of Tancred, and Raymond, however, were pre-

26. Albert, P. 231-2; Wm. of Tyre, P. 693.

27. Raoul, P. 108.

28. Gesta II; Robert 48; Balderic 103; Guibert, 501.

29. Raoul, P. 127; Gesta 567; Albert 234; Wm. of Tyre, 695.

pared to meet the attack, and upon the enemy's advance rushed upon them and defeated them.³⁰

Meanwhile, news arrived that Pisa and Genoa were sending provisions and that the vessels had reached the mouth of the Orontes. Bohemund and Raymond marched to the coast in all haste with a small band of troops. The Turks, ever on watch for occasions of hostility, prepared an ambushade of four thousand men to attack the Christians returning with provisions. Bohemund and Raymond were badly defeated, and returned to camp empty-handed. The Crusaders were infuriated at the news and never in the history of the Christian army did the men fight with such ferocity and impetuosity. Godfrey, Robert, and Tancred are the most daring, and do not hesitate at any measure of cruelty for their own defense. Tancred asked his biographer not to publish his deeds, but we are led to believe that he was one of the most courageous, and least fearing of all knights. The Turks were driven back, and shut in the city completely, unable to obtain provisions, wood or other necessaries.³¹

The late successes gave courage to the Councils of the Princes, and they resolved that the gates of George on the west between the mountains and the Orontes should be blockaded. The coffers of Raymond were opened and he paid for the construction of the works. He had already accepted the dangerous office of guarding a tower which the Christians had built as a fortress near the gate of the bridge, but because of his coldness, and severity of temper, had become unpopular. By means of distributing money among the soldiers, and building this fortification, he hoped to gain favor. Tancred was

30. Balderic, P.105; Guibert, P.504; Albert P.237; Wm.of Tyre,P.697-

31. Raymond, P.147; Balderic, 106,107; Albert, 237. (698

Guibert, P.505-506; Wm. of Tyre, P. 699.

chosen as guard of this fortification, as most fit for that position of honor, for the army had found that the firmness of the young warrior was equal to his bravery, that he was as vigilant in defense, as prompt in attack.³² He readily accepted the offer partly for honor, no doubt, but also for the remuneration, for Raymond had just previously opened his coffers to the rest of the men, and we are inclined to believe that Tancred also received his share.

The Turks were now completely blockaded, and the usual supplies provided by the Armenians and Syrians from the mountains were intercepted by Tancred and were turned to the benefit of the Christian camp. The peace of the camp was disturbed, however, by the news of the preparations which the Sultan of Persia was making for the relief of the besieged.³³ Alarm grew and finally a general council was called, at which Bohemund declared the necessity of a change of measures in the capture of Antioch, and suggested that the city should be rewarded to the person first entering its gates. Because of the proximity of danger it was decided to adopt Bohemund's suggestion; furthermore, Jerusalem and the Holy Land were the places for which the Crusaders had left Europe, and it would be dishonorable to the Crusading cause, if the army should perish because of lack of generosity to an individual. Bohemund then revealed his friendship with Phirouz, leader of the enemy, and revealed his plans, which on the part of Phirouz were betrayed.³⁴ The plans were carried out, however; the city was taken and

32. Raoul, P.147; Guibert, P.506; Wm. of Tyre, P.702.

33. Albert, P.244; Wm. of Tyre, P.704.

34. Raoul, P.309 says that Bohemund sent Tancred and his troops away from Antioch at the time of these proceedings; and that Tancred did not know about them, until Antioch was taken. Tancred was highly indignant and declaimed strongly against Bohemund's jealous and selfish temper. We must remember, however, that Raoul is very partial to his hero, and allow sufficiently for that.

Guibert P. 509-10; Robert, P.54; Balderick, P.108;

Wm. of Tyre, P.705-7. All verify the fact that Bohemund and Phirouz were friends and worked together.

Bohemund's standard erected. Victory and conquest, nevertheless, did not mean safety for the Crusaders were called to war again in a few days after they had entered the city, for the Oriental peoples had been notified of their brethren's attack and came down in hordes to take revenge. Furthermore, famine and pestilence were at their worst, desertions were numerous, despondence and despair reigned everywhere. Something had to be done to revive the failing spirits of the Crusaders in order that they might successfully meet the enemy. One resource not yet resorted to was tried, and that was religions in the form of religious fanaticism. It seemed to work, and prophetic stories began to develop; oaths of faith were taken, and Tancred was among the first to promise his allegiance to the cause, saying that he would attack Jerusalem alone, if allowed sixty men in his train.

When this fanaticism was at its height a Provençal clerk, named Peter Bartholemy, assured the chiefs that St. Andrew had appeared to him in a vision, and shown him the lance of Christ. The Saint had commanded him to tell the army that that weapon would ward off all attacks of the enemy, and that the Count of Toulouse would support it. Great excitement was caused, and search for the relic immediately began. ³⁵ It was found near a monastery. Hope now succeeded despair, courage, cowardice; and faith, fanaticism. Tancred, like Bohemund doubted the validity of the lance, yet his religious fervor was none the less. In the three day fast preceding the actual battle with Kerhogha, leader of the infidels, Tancred was one of the leaders in prayer and confession. In the battle array, he, with Godfrey, conducted the seventh and eighth divisions of the army.

35. Raoul, P.189; Gesta, P.19; Guibert, P.517; Wm.of Tyre, P.720.

Bohemund had charge of the reserve. The Christians opposed no stratagem to the maneuver of the Turks, but the battle was fought man to man, lance to lance, The reserve corps was attacked and Bohemund was almost lost when Tancred rushed forward and rescued him. This act of bravery turned the battle and the Christians won. Victory at last was theirs, yet they did not immediately proceed to Jerusalem - for the summer was so dry there was danger of further privations, that they decided to tarry there in Antioch until November. ³⁶

November arrived; the people, more religious than selfish, were ardent in their wishes for the completion of the pilgrimage; Raymond, however, led them to new wars of ambition, and attempted to surprise the town of Marra. He did, and with the aid of Tancred, Bohemund, and the Counts of Normandy and Provence, captured it; and shortly afterwards also, captured Alhara. Dissension then arose between Bohemund and Raymond as to who should control the cities. ³⁷

It was the wish of Raymond that Marra should form part of bishopric of Alhara; but Bohemund refused to deliver up such quarters of the town as he had conquered, unless his compeer would resign the gate and towers which he held at Antioch. The days of departure passed, and yet no conciliation was effected between the contending chiefs. The other princes were slow in acceding to popular wishes, but they disdainfully refused the bribes of Raymond, and his ambitious projects were annihilated by his own soldiers who garrisoned Marra. In his absence they rebelled, and declared that Marra should not, like

36. Raoul, P. 168-174; Gesta P. 21; Raymond P. 154-5; Balderic P. 120; Albert P. 255, 258; Guibert, P. 521; Wm. of Tyre P. 723-726.

37. Raoul, P. 182; Guibert, P. 527; Balderic, P. 125; Albert, P. 267; Robert, P. 69; Wm. of Tyre, P. 733-4.

Antioch, be the occasion of delaying the march. As the Count of Toulouse was immovable by reason or justice, Tancred, with a few men, went to the gates near the iron bridge of Antioch, and under the language of friendship were admitted. They immediately assumed a military appearance, drew their swords, and slew the soldiers of the Count of Toulouse; and Bohemund became sole lord of the city (Antioch) which his artifice had won.³⁸

Raymond then left the city and gathered his forces with Robert of Normandy, and marched toward Jerusalem. It is singular that Tancred should march with Raymond, yet as Bohemund remained in Antioch, he must choose some different leader. To be on Raymond's expedition, no doubt, promised to be the most remunerative, so Tancred decided to join that expedition.³⁹ A short time later, however, because he did not receive all he had hoped for from Raymond, Tancred entered the service of Godfrey.⁴⁰

The Christian army crossed the plain of Beritus, went through the country of Sidon, and when they arrived at Jaffa they left their maritime route, and marched to Ramula. On the third day after their arrival at Ramula, the soldiers took the road to Jerusalem, and soon reached Nicopolis, from which the Holy City could be seen.⁴¹ Tancred however, forged ahead. As he approached the vicinity of Bethlehem, deputies from the people of that city came to him, asking him to come and deliver them from the infidels. With his small force of men,

38. Raoul, P.186-188; Raymond P.160-161; Balderic, P.126; Wm. of Tyre, P. 735.

39. Raymond, P.161,165; Robert, P.70; Wm. of Tyre, P. 734.

40. Albert, P.269; Wm. of Tyre, P.739; This is the probable account; no doubt Raymond d'Agiles considers the accusation by Tancred of Raymond as caluminous. P.162. The rest of the Latin historians say nothing about it.

41. Raoul, P.209; Raymond, P.173; Balderic P.129-131; Albert P. 274.

Tancred hastened to Bethlehem, and defeated the Turks, driving them out. After putting up his standard in the town, he proceeded on his way to Jerusalem, and reached the outskirts of the city before the main army had reached Nicopolis.

As he came within clear view of Jerusalem, he offered a prayer; then planted his banner near the Tower of David, and climbed up Mount Olives, for rest and meditation, no doubt, but also for the very practical reason of securing a better perspective of the city. On the Mount he met a hermit who told him that the enemy was very near, and that he should warn the army of danger. Before Tancred had time to descend the mountain, five horsemen, coming out of the town, by the gate of Josaphat, advanced toward him. Alone, but armed, he repulsed them and pursued them to the gate of Jerusalem, where, with reinforcements he took possession of a tower at the Gate of St. Etienne. This tower, from then on, bore the name of Tancred.⁴²

The valleys and rocks on the south and east gave Jerusalem an impregnable appearance; and the Christians resolved to attack the more accessible sides of the north and west. The northern line from the northeast to the northwest corners, was occupied by the two Roberts, Tancred and Godfrey.

"There the wild Crusaders form,

There assembled Europe stands,

Heav'n they deem awakes the storm,

Hell the paynims' blood storm demands."

Carlyle.

The besiegers were ignorant or careless of the superior number of the enemy, and on the fifth day of the siege had made no

42. Raoul, P. 210.

progress. The leaders resolved that every species of military machine should be erected, but as wood was almost thirty miles away, the process was slow. Tancred, assisted by Gaston of Bearn secured the wood, and erected a catapult and several towers.⁴³

While preparations were being made for a renewed attack, dissension again ruled in the camp. Tancred, greatly concerned, said: "As no devotion to God is so acceptable as charity to man," and offered friendship to Raymond again. After this example of virtue, all minor feuds were hushed and concord and piety reigned throughout the camp.⁴⁴ Religious zeal did not only infuse courage and vigour into the infirm and young, but even the women took arms. The conflict raged through the day, and at the hour when the Savior of the world had been crucified, a soldier leaped upon the fortifications, his brother Englebert followed and Godfrey was the third Christian to enter on the ramparts. Tancred and the two Roberts burst open the gate of St. Stephen and let the army enter.⁴⁵

The massacre of the Saracens, upon the capture of the Holy City, did not proceed from the inflamed passions of victorious soldiers, but from remorseless fanaticism. Benevolence to Turks, Jews, infidels and heretics was no part of the piety of the day; the Christians believed that they were the ministers of God's wrath on disobedient man. The Latins, on the day after the victory, massacred three hundred men to whom Tancred and Gaston de Bearn had promised protection, and had given a standard as a warrant for their safety. Though the religion of Tancred was as cruel as that of his comrades, though his deadly sword had explored every corner of the mosque of

43. Raoul, P.216-217,220; Robert P.74; Wm. of Tyre, P.750.

44. Gesta, P. 576; Wm. of Tyre, P. 760.

45. Raoul, P. 234-236.

Omar, yet he respected the sacredness of his word, and nothing but the interposition of the other chiefs prevented him from retaliating on the murderers. The slaughter continued, however, until the enemy was practically wiped out.⁴⁶

Jerusalem was in the hands of the Christians, the sepulchre was redeemed, and the blood of the Moslems atoned for profanation. On the eighth day after the capture of the Holy City the princes assembled for the august purpose of electing a monarch. Godfrey was considered most worthy, although by his biographer, Tancred is placed almost on a par, but because of his capture of Bethlehem, and his youth was not elected. Godfrey, however, kept Tancred with him to help rule the principality of Jerusalem.⁴⁷

Count Eustace and Tancred assisted Godfrey in organizing the government of Jerusalem and served as his first men. Shortly after Godfrey was elected messengers from Neopolis came to Jerusalem asking for aid in capturing that city. Tancred and Count Eustace answered the call, and with a large force of knights and footsoldiers returned to the city with the messengers. The inhabitants surrendered immediately without any difficulty and Tancred and the Count entered victoriously.⁴⁸ While there, Duke Godfrey sent word to them to hasten to the city of Ascalon, for the Emir of Babylon had already recruited his forces in that vicinity. The two leaders left Neopolis and entered the mountainous region through which they had to pass in order to reach Ascalon. The mountains were filled with Saracens, and the

46. Raoul, P.238-239. John of Malmsbury, P.443, charges Tancred with having appropriated relics in the Temple of Saliman, and later restoring them, but Raoul refutes this, saying that only for the protection of the temple did Tancred endeavor to control it, not for gain.

47. Raoul, P.257. All writers agree on the choice of ruler.

48. Gesta, P.766; Guibert P.554; Albert P.299; Wm. of Tyre, p.775.

Christians had to fight almost every step of their way. Finally they came to Caesarea, captured that and proceeded to Ramla where they also were victorious, but the size of the enemy's forces was appalling. Tancred became alarmed and sent a messenger to Jerusalem to inform Godfrey that there was great danger, and that he should send all the forces he could recruit to Ascalon. Duke Godfrey, the Patriarch, bishops, and the other leaders assembled two days later at the river, which flows by Ascalon. The lines were drawn up; Godfrey on the left side, the Count of St. Gilles on the right side; the Count of Normandy, the Count of Flanders, Tancred, and all the rest rode in the middle. The Christians were victorious, and the leaders returned to their respective places of residence.⁴⁹

Tancred, instead of returning to Jerusalem with the rest, marched toward Neopolis again, having in mind Tiberius, where he ultimately hoped to establish a kingdom of his own. On the way he captured the castle of Bezan, in order to have a fortification in that region on which he could depend. Upon reaching Neopolis he was recalled by Godfrey, as the Emir of Babylon had returned to Babylon with a large number of Pagans. Tancred returned to Ascalon, and this time, the only leader, with his forces alone, took the city and defeated the Turks so badly that no fear of their appearance in that vicinity again was ever necessary.⁵⁰

From Ascalon Tancred proceeded to his coveted territory around Tiberius, and captured Caypha, and planted his standard there. From Caypha he proceeded to Tiberius, which, with very little difficulty he also captured. He now established his headquarters in these

49. Raoul, P.258-264; Gesta, P.766.

50. Raoul, P.260; Guibert, P.234; Balderic, P.111; Robert the Monk, P. 871, 874.

two cities and ruled much of the surrounding territory. It seemed that Tancred's ambition might come true that he should have a kingdom all his own.

Godfrey had reigned not quite one year when he died. At his death there arose a struggle for supremacy between the clerical and secular powers. The claims of the church to the possession of all divine and human authority were transferred from the west to the east. Godfrey, Bohemund, and Baldwin had been invested with rule over several states,⁵¹ and the artful churchman contended that as God had been the conqueror of Jerusalem, God was its king, and that he, as Heaven's vicegerent, should be received as governor. The humble and religious Godfrey had renounced to the ambitious prelate the whole town of Jaffa, the sepulchre, the tower of David, and many other parts of Jerusalem; and the strange condition had been added, that if Godfrey should die without children, the two cities were to go unreservedly to the patriarch. The king left no instructions, but his promises to the church could not affect his people, and they thought a warrior would make a better ruler than a churchman. Tancred offered the throne to the prince of Antioch, but Bohemund, about that time, lost his liberty in endeavoring to extend his power into the Armenian territories.⁵² A fruitless attempt was made by the enemies of the Bouillon family to invest the count of Toulouse with royal honors; but most of the Crusaders preferred Baldwin, the Count of Edessa, and the latter was elected.

Baldwin resigned Edessa to Baldwin of Bourg and hastened to take possession of the throne of Jerusalem. All the barons received

51. When Daimbert arrived from the west, Arnold prudently gave up his place as patriarch.

52. Albert, P. 307-308.

him with acclamations, and the patriarch, not thinking it politic to display his mortification, pretended fear and retired to the sanctuary of Mount Sion. But after some show of his power and abilities, friends determined to reconcile Baldwin and Daimbert, in which they were successful, and the patriarch poured the oil of consecration on the head of Baldwin and crowned him with the regal diadem.⁵³ Tancred, however, the other opponent to the new king, was not so soon appeased. He had retired from Jerusalem before the coronation, and would not return upon royal summons to do homage for some territories which he had acquired from the Turks. He haughtily replied that he knew no judge of Jerusalem. A second and third summons were unanswered; but in a short time afterwards, he proposed to confer with the king near a river between Jaffa and Azotus. The remembrance of animosities in Cilicia embittered subjects of present altercation, and the agreement of the princes to delay the conclusion of the conference, prevented an outbreak of open hostilities.⁵⁴

Meanwhile, as the people of Antioch were entreating Tancred to administer the affairs of their country during the confinement of Bohemund (then a prisoner of Danisman) he surrendered his smaller possessions to Baldwin on condition that they should be restored to him if he returned within a year and three months, and finally left the kingdom of Jerusalem.⁵⁵ Tancred, however, was by no means reconciled, as will be shown by his later actions.

During Bohemund's absence from Antioch 1101-1103, Tancred did little in the way of acquiring new territory. He and Daimbert

53. Fulcher, P. 402, 406; Albert, P. 301, 307; Wm. of Tyre, P.776-780.

54. Raoul, P. 265; Albert, P. 308.

55. Raoul, P. 265-275; Fulcher P.402,406; Albert, P.307; Wm. of Tyre, P.776-80.

were negotiating, however, how to secure revenge against Baldwin and in any politic move that Tancred undertook, Daimbert is almost invariably involved.

In 1101, news was brought from Joppa to Antioch, that the King of Jerusalem had been badly defeated at Ascalon and Babylon, and those of his forces who escaped alive fled to Joppa; and begging Tancred to forget all past enmity and send aid to Baldwin. Before the former had time to muster his troops, which he finally decided to do, more cheerful news was brought to him saying that the Saracens had been vanquished and that it was unnecessary for the Prince of Antioch to render his services.⁵⁶

In this same year, Tancred conquered or reconquered the Cilician towns of Mamistra, Odone and Tarsus for Antioch, and in 1103 captured Laodicea. He later imprisoned Raymond of Toulouse, at Tripoli, and only gave him his liberty on stringent conditions; and he caused the restoration of the deposed patriarch of Jerusalem, Dago- bert, if only for a brief time, by refusing to aid Baldwin I on any other terms.

When Bohemund was set free, Tancred had to surrender Antioch to him, but he soon found fresh work for his busy hands. In 1104 he joined with Bohemund and Baldwin of Bourg (now Count of Edessa) in an expedition against Harrow, in which they were badly defeated, and Baldwin was taken prisoner. Bohemund and Tancred just barely escaped.⁵⁷

Tancred, however, really profited by this defeat, for he took over the government of Edessa in Baldwin's place, and from there was able to extend his territory just as he had from Antioch. In 1105

56. Raoul, P.266; Fulcher (Ryan) P.115-120.

57. Raoul, P. 287; Fulcher (Ryan) P. 130.

Bohemund surrendered to him, his principality, while he returned to Europe for reinforcement, in order that he might take revenge on Alexius.⁵⁸ Ruler now of two northern principalities, Tancred carried on vigorous hostilities against his Mohammedan neighbors, especially Ridwan of Aleppo, and in 1106, succeeded in capturing Apamea.⁵⁹

In 1107 while Bohemund was beginning his last expedition against Alexius Tancred wrested the whole of Cilicia from the Greeks; and he steadfastly refused, after Bohemund's humiliating treaty at Durazzo in 1108, to agree to any of its stipulations with regard to Antioch and Cilicia.⁶⁰

In 1108 Baldwin II escaped from prison, but upon his return to Edessa, the gates were closed to him, for Tancred now had control and refused his entrance. Peace between the two leaders was not established until five hundred of Tancred's men had been killed by the forces of Joscelin who fought for Baldwin.

In 1105 Raymond of Toulouse died in the city of Tripoli and his nephew, William of Jordan, succeeded him.⁶¹ Tancred found a new foe. He seized Tortosa, and gave it to William, a natural son of his Crusading companion, Robert, Duke of Normandy. A cloud of Turks menaced the Latins of Syria, and those who were on the Orontes implored a union of the Christian princes. The union was made and the enemy was defeated, but with that quick versatility which distinguished the politics of the states of Palestine, the Count of Tripoli soon afterwards assisted the Emperor Alexius in his never-ceasing wish of

58. Raoul, P. 282, 288; Fulcher (Ryan) P.129; Stephen, P. 112.

59. Raoul, P. 290; Albert, P. 642; Fulcher (Ryan) P. 132.

60. Raoul, P. 292-295.

61. Raoul, P. 283; Fulcher (Ryan) P. 134.

stamping the mark of feudal tenure on the principality of Antioch. But he died while the negotiations were pending, and his death rendered them abortive.⁶²

Tancred's chief work, however, from now on, was directed against the Emirs of northern Syria. He pushed the Turks back, and in 1111 recaptured Apamea, and captured Chezer; then returned to Aleppo. Before his conquest was completed, however, Tancred died. His end was that of a warrior, for he died of a wound which he had received from an enemy. In his last moments, with more disinterestedness than delicacy he called his wife and Pontius of Tripoli before him, recommended their marriage. As he had no children to emulate his virtues and chivalry he confided the government of Antioch to his kinsman, Roger, son of Richard, Count of Capua, and Seneschal of Apulia.⁶³

62. Fulcher (Ryan) P. 151; Albert, P. 675; Wm. of Tyre, P. 806, 807.

63. Fulcher (Ryan) P. 158-160; Wm. of Tyre, P. 806-807.

CHAPTER III.

Tancred's Place in History.

Historically, Tancred should be given a place of relative importance. Although not a leader of first rank in the Crusade, his accomplishments were by no means secondary. Starting out as first lieutenant to Bohemund, by the time of his death in 1112 he had ruled Edessa and Antioch both, and had spread his influence far and wide. From 1099 to 1100 he assisted Godfrey in ruling Jerusalem, and helped capture several neighboring towns. When Godfrey died, Tancred played a distinct part in the election of his successor, and although he failed to prevent his enemy, Baldwin, from getting the throne, the part he played in the politics of the Holy City was not ended. He and Dagobert were close friends, and touches of intrigue between those two arise quite frequently; of not sufficient consequences, however, to be of much historical importance.

Thus, in view of the actual part Tancred played in the sequence of historical events between the years 1095 - 1112, he is entitled to a distinct place in that period of history; and should be remembered for his accomplishments, not his original rank.

CHAPTER IV.

Tancred's Place in Literature.

As a figure in literature Tancred has won a place of prominence. Not only is he immortalized in Tasso's "Jerusalem Delivered," where his idealism of character is fully portrayed by a man of unusual literary ability, but also in "Tancred," a two volume work by the Earl of Beaconsfield, where Tancred is the leading figure in a very romantic background. To have an Englishman immortalize a Norman hero on an Eastern enterprise makes his treatment all the more valuable. The other work in which Tancred is a distinct figure is "God Wills It" by Dr. Wm. S. Davis, the most recent work and with the exception of Sir Walter Scott's "Count Robert of Paris" which deals wholly with the Constantinople episode is the only book in English which interprets the First Crusade in fiction. Dr. Davis in his preface says, "In this Crusade united Feudalism and Papacy won their greatest triumph. Notwithstanding the self-seeking of a few, the mass of Crusaders were true to their profession; they sought no worldly gain, but to wash out their sins in infidel blood," which serves as a keynote to his whole interpretation of the First Crusade. Tancred, although not the chief character, for Richard and Mary are the leading characters in a plot which goes through life, love and death, is everywhere portrayed as the brave and courageous knight.

The following passage is a good example of Tancred's bravery and fearlessness:

"Prince Tancred had bounded into the arena.

"Felony!' his shout, 'the Emir had
a pointed weapon. Sir Musa is run through,
Physicians - aid!'"

Later on in describing Richard's journey to Jerusalem, Dr. Davis says:

"With Prince Tancred Bohemund's valiant newpew."....
indicating his bravery.

Also, "As their troops climbed the foothills that lay south of the city, the eagle eyes of Tancred fell upon three men who were stealing from grave to grave Finally, with the aid of Tancred the three were made captives."

Disraeli, the Earl of Beaconsfield, on the other hand, tends to emphasize Tancred's pious nature, rather than his bravery; yet we must not attribute all the characteristics which Disraeli gives to Tancred, as especially peculiar to our hero, for the author had quite another purpose in writing his book, than the immortalization of a Crusader. Disraeli, during his visit in the Near East in 1828, conceived the idea of writing a book in which he could exalt his own ideas on nationality, religion and politics. "The power of the individual and the necessity for spiritual faith are the themes of Tancred; the aristocracy, whether territorial or mercantile, and a strong and spiritual church are the agencies to which must be entrusted the social reforms of the coming generation." These ideas, Disraeli expresses through Tancred and although he uses him for his personal interest, it is interesting to note that Tancred was chosen for this task instead of any of the other leaders in the First Crusade. His immortalization in literature, no doubt, made him more

familiar to Disraeli than many of the other participants in that holy expedition, and this perhaps accounts for his choice. At least because of him this Norman hero became a figure in English literature.

Sir Walter Scott in his "Count Robert of Paris" uses Tancred as one of his minor characters, and brings him in only occasionally and then only in connection with fighting, where bravery seems to be his outstanding characteristic; yet that in a human not an idealistic degree.

The fourth work, doubtless the greatest in which Tancred plays a part, is Tasso's "Jerusalem Delivered." Tancred, like Godfrey, is here immortalized by the author's idealistic delineation of their characters.

For example:

"Tancredi next, nor 'mongst them all was one,
Rinald except, a prince of greater might,
With majesty his noble countenance shone,
High were his tho'ts, his heart was bold in fight,
No shameful vice his worth had overgone,
His fault was love, by unadvised sight.
Bred in the dangers of adventurous arms,
And nursed with griefs, with sorrows, woes and harms."⁶⁴

As all epics, "Jerusalem Delivered" tends to portray life in the idealistic terms, yet the author must be given credit for his sincerity. It must be remembered that at the time of the First Crusade Tancred was but a youth of 24; with perhaps average training yet literature seems quite unanimous in portraying him not as an

64. Tasso, "Jerusalem Delivered," p. 11.

ordinary youth, but a mature youth, quite unusual in his conception of the seriousness of life.

The greatest tribute that history or literature can pay to any character is to regard him as important enough, and honored enough shortly after his death to immortalize him in almost contemporary writings. This is what Pelerin Richard did for Tancred in his "La Chanson D'Antioche," a two volume work, wherein Tancred is the character spoken of by far the greatest length. His departure from Europe, his arrival at Constantinople, his irritation at Alexius, and so on, through his rule at Antioch to his death are described in this poem. The following is an example of Tancred's influence - in which he describes to the rest of the crusading leaders the distress of the Christians.

"Dist Tangres li Puillous: 'Entendez envers mi,
La jus, outre cel mont, avons grant noise oi,
Dist le dus de Buillon: 'Jo l'entend autresi
✓ Ce dist le quens de Flanders: 'Baron alomes - i!'
Et dans Hues li marnes: 'Jou men vois, seaes - mi,
'Ansiens de Ribemont, Roos de Bougens
'Et Gerars de Gornai, Gerars de cerise,
'Cel remenront en l'ast, ne se movrant de ce!'"

In general, it is safe to say, posterity has been very kind to Tancred. The lasting impression he seemed to convey in literature was that he was a noble character, of noble principles and ideals, a character very worthy of immortalization. His purpose was interpreted as true to his profession; and his achievements, as achievements not for himself as an individual, but for Christendom in general.

CHAPTER V.

Conclusion.

Both the historical views of Tancred and the literary views have been presented, but do they coincide? If not, which is correct? Or is a compromise between the two necessary to do justice, truthful justice to Tancred? Tancred has nowhere been proven to have possessed characteristics obnoxious to a person professing to be a leader on a Christian enterprise. It is true that he was accused of being mercenary; and in some instances the accusation was correct, yet this fault was not carried to excess, as, for instance, it was in the case of Raymond of Toulouse; Tancred merely reflects human instincts - not necessarily premeditated crime.

Raoul and Fulcher, Tancred's most intimate contemporaries treat Tancred very kindly, and most of the general accounts speak of him only incidentally with no particular character delineation, so it seems quite safe to conjecture that Tancred was one of the most sincere leaders on this holy enterprise. Although he was but a youth, yet he displayed much wisdom of mind, and nobleness of character, and pure unselfishness played just as big a part with him as with any of the rest of the leaders. A person may possess these qualities and still deviate from constancy in application, as is shown occasionally by Tancred's impulsiveness and impetuosity. No one can deny that he made an honest endeavor (outwardly at least) to be a true crusader until 1099; yet endeavor does not always indicate complete success, only relative as a rule.

At least Tancred should be paid the tribute that he is worthy of study and immortalization if not for himself as an individual alone, for his typification of the period in which he lived, and of the enterprise in which he took part.

The discrepancies between characteristics attributed to him in literature and those in history, are due to the difference in purpose between the two forms of written expression. With qualifications, therefore, it may be said that the literary and historical interpretations of Tancred coincide sufficiently for all practical considerations, which proves to posterity that Tancred is worthy of the better type of delineation, which he had been accorded, and is worthy of study for his own sake, as well as of the movement in which he participated.

CHAPTER VI.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

I. Bibliographical Guides.

1. Chevalier, A., "Repertoire des Sources Historiques du Moyen Age."
2 vols. Paris, 1877-86 2nd edition 1905-07.
2. Gross, C., "Sources and Literature of English History."
New York and London, 1900. 2nd edition revised 1915.
3. Molinier, A., "Les Sources de l'histoire de France."
Vol. I, II. Paris 1901-1906, Alphonse Ricard.
4. Paetow, L. J., "Guide to Study of Medieval History."
Berkley, 1917.
5. Potthast, Aug., "Bibliographeca historica medii aevi."
2nd edition. 2 volumes, Berlin 1896.

II. Collection of Sources.

1. "Recueil des historiens des Croisades."
Paris 1841, Vol. I, II, public par les soins de l'Academie.
2. Guizot, M. "Collection Des Memoires."
Paris, Chez. J.L.J. Briere, 1826.
3. "Patrologiae cursus completus."
Series latina, 221 vols. Paris 1844-1864.
Edited by J. P. Migne

III. Original Sources.

1. Raouel de Caen, "Gesta Tancrede." Translation by Guizot, Collection XXIII, pp. 1-294, Paris 1825.
Raoul, a Norman too young to go on First Crusade, entered the service, and friendship of Tancred about 1108 in Antioch, through which he learned much about the First Crusade and Tancred's view of events. Raoul is naturally partial to Tancred, yet he is the most complete source on Tancred up to 1105.
2. Anonymous, "Gesta Francorum," Recueil des historiens des croisades." Paris 1841, Vol. I.
The author of this work is not known. Although he was, no doubt, a member of Bohemund's party to the Holy Land, his account is very unbiased and impartial. As a general source for the First Crusade, it is the best; and in that sense it is good for the career of Tancred.
3. Fulcher of Chartres "Historia Hieros olymitana."
Recueil historiens des croisades, Paris 1841, Vol. I, Sister Ryan's Translation.
Fulcher was a priest who was present at the Council of Clermont in 1095 and later accompanied Robert II, Duke of Normandy on the First Crusade in 1096. Having spent some time in Italy, and having taken some part in the fighting on the way to the Holy Land, he be-

came chaplain to Balderic, who was chosen king of Jerusalem in 1108. He lived with Balderic both at Edessa and Jerusalem. His work covers the period between 1095 and 1127 and is one of the most valuable sources of information on Tancred, especially after the year 1100.

4. Raymond of Argiles, "Historia Francorum qui ceperunt Jerusalem."

Recueil des historiens des croisades, Paris 1841. Vol. I. (Krey, A. C. Translation) The First Crusade.

Raymond was a Provençal clerk and follower of Raymond of Toulouse on the First Crusade. Although his account is honest it is biased against Tancred and Bohemund, yet, aside from the "Gesta Francorum," it is the best general account on this subject.

5. William of Tyre, "Historia rerum in partibus transmarinis gestarum." Recueil des historiens des croisades, Hist. Occid. I, Paris, 1844.

William of Tyre was born about 1130 in Palestine, but was educated in the West. In 1170 he was tutor of the future Baldwin IV. Later he was employed on many important missions and negotiations, both in the West and in the East so he

was well acquainted with contemporary history. His account of the Second and Third Crusades are, therefore, better and more authentic than that of the First or the period in which Tancred played part. He used as sources here the work of the Anonymous, of Fulcher of Chartres and of Albert of Aix. He therefore adds little to the development of Tancred's career, yet serves as an additional check on the weighing of evidence.

6. Albert of Aix,

"Historia Hierosolymitanae expeditionis."
Recueil des historiens des croisades,
Hist. Occid. Paris 1844. Vol. I.

Nothing is known of the life of Albert of Aix except that he was chosen canon of the church of Aix-la chapelle in 1100. Albert never visited the Holy Land, his sources are secured from intercourse with returned crusaders and current information, and from earlier writings. His value for Tancred lies in the fact that he can also be used as a check to verify facts.

7. Anna Commena,

"Alexiad."
Krey, A.C. (Translation) "The First Crusade." 1921.

Anna was born in 1083 in Constantinople

and is the daughter of the Eastern Emperor Alexius. Her work consists rather of a family panegyric than of scientific history. She regards the crusades as a danger, and portrays them with that in mind of no real value, except in giving the Byzantine point of view, Anna's work is included here for that reason, and because, as is indicated in the thesis proper, she casts at times, some interesting reflections on some events. Her attitude toward Bohemund and Tancred is hostile.

*8. Balderic of Dol,

"Gesta episcoporum - Cambracensium."

Recueil des historiens des croisades.
Vol. I. Hist. Occid. 1844.

Balderic's work was written after 1107, and added but little more to the Gesta account. Nothing more, it seems, is known of the life of Balderic except that he was first Abbot of Bourgeiul, and later Archbishop of Dol.

*9. Guibert of Nogent,

"Gesta Dei per Francas."

Recueil des historiens des croisades,
Hist. Occid. IV, pp. 115-263.

Guibert born in 1053, was chosen the head of the Abbey of Notre Dame de Nogent in 1104. It was in seclusion then that he wrote his work, which is largely paraphrase of the "Gesta."

*10. Robert the Monk,

"Chronicon."

Recueil des historiens des croisades,
Vol. I. Hist. Occid. 1844.

Robert the Monk is generally identified as Abbot of Saint Remi of Rheims in 1094, and later forced to retire to the priory of Senuc.

*These three accounts add little to previous accounts; they serve only as a means of verifying evidences, and perhaps, here and there adding a few original, though minor, touches to the life of Tancred.

**IV. Secondary Sources.

1. Archer, L. A.
Kingsford, Charles, "The Crusades."
New York, G.P. Putnam Sons, 1902.
2. Conder, C. R., "The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem,"
1099-1291. The Committee of Palestine
Exploration Fund, 24 Hanover Square,
London, 1897.
3. David, C. W., "Robert Curthose."
Cambridge, Harvard University Press,
1920.
4. Keightly, Thomas. "Crusades."
London, J. W. Parker, 1840.
5. Kugler, Bernard, "Boemund und Tankred," Lubingen, 1862.
6. Krey, A. C., "The First Crusade."
Princeton University Press, Princeton
1921. (Introduction).

7. Michaud, Joseph F., "The History of the Crusades."
translated by W. Robson, London,
G. Routledge and Company, 1852.
8. Mills, Charles, "History of the Crusades."
Lea & Blanchard, Philadelphia, 1844.
9. Munro, Dana, "The Middle Ages."
Century Company, New York, 1921.
10. Proctor, George. "Crusades."
Lindsey and Blakiston, Philadelphia,
1854.
11. Röhricht, Reinhold, "Beitrage zur Geschichte Der Kreuzzuge!"
Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, Berlin,
1874.
12. Stevenson, W. B., "Crusaders in the East."
Cambridge Press, 1907.
13. Von Sybel, Henrich, "The Crusades." Edited by Lady Duff
Gordon.
Chapman and Hall, London, 1893.
14. Hagenmeyer, Heinrich, "Chronologie de la Premiere Croisade."
E. Leroux, Paris, 1902.
15. Encyclopedia Britannica, Vol. VII, p. 524-535 by Ernest Backer
at St. John's College, Oxford.

**Not until I had gathered all my material from the original sources and had weighed the evidence, did I turn to the secondary accounts for information and then only to secure a general background for the period, and to check up, if possible, facts I had already gathered, as a means of verification, it was, therefore, unnecessary, in listing these accounts to evaluate them.

V. Literature on Tancred.

1. Davis, W. S. "God Wills It."
Macmillan Company, New York.
2. Scott, Sir Walter, "Count Robert of Paris."
Macmillan Company, New York.
3. Disraeli, Earl of "Tancred."
Beaconsfield, Vol. I, II, London.
4. Tasso, T., "Jerusalem Delivered."
translated by E. Fairfax, edited
by H. Morley, Rev. Ed. Colonial Press,
New York, 1901.
5. Richard Pelerin, "La Chanson D'Antioche."
Paris, 1248. Published in 1848 by
J. Techener, Place Du Louvre,
Paris.