
Francia. Forschungen zur westeuropäischen Geschichte
Herausgegeben vom Deutschen Historischen Institut Paris
(Institut historique allemand)
Band 5 (1977)

DOI: 10.11588/fr.1977.0.49085

Rechtshinweis

Bitte beachten Sie, dass das Digitalisat urheberrechtlich geschützt ist. Erlaubt ist aber das Lesen, das Ausdrucken des Textes, das Herunterladen, das Speichern der Daten auf einem eigenen Datenträger soweit die vorgenannten Handlungen ausschließlich zu privaten und nicht-kommerziellen Zwecken erfolgen. Eine darüber hinausgehende unerlaubte Verwendung, Reproduktion oder Weitergabe einzelner Inhalte oder Bilder können sowohl zivil- als auch strafrechtlich verfolgt werden.

Entgegnung

Auf die Rezension seines Buches (*Joscelyn III and the Fall of the Crusader States 1134–1199*) durch Frau Dr. Marie Luise Bulst-Thiele in *FRANCIA* 3 (1975, ersch. 1976) S. 782–784, entgegnet Prof. Robert L. Nicholson (University of Illinois at Chicago Circle).

The remarks contained in this document constitute a refutation of some of the errors of facts and an exposure of the misunderstandings of the exact meanings of English words appearing in the review of my book »*Joscelyn III and the Fall of the Crusader States 1134–1199*« by Mrs. Bulst-Thiele in a rather issue of *FRANCIA*.

(1) The reviewer declared, immediately following the sentence »Baldwin III granted to the Count in 1161 Hārim (p. 30) during whose defense he fell in captivity in 1164 for 12 years«, »This seems to be – contrary to N.'s assertion – the first certain information about him.« This statement is clearly erroneous. Both Delaville LE ROULX's *Cartulaire générale de l'ordre des Hospitaliers de S. Jean de Jérusalem (1100–1310)* (Paris, 1894), I, No. 137, p. 12 and RÖHRICHT's *Regesta Regni Hierosolymitani (MXCVII–MCCXCI)* (Oeniponti, 1893), p. 206, p. 51 support the proposition that Joscelyn II confirmed the donation to the Hospitallers of the village of Cisembourg in 1141. This donation had been made at an earlier time by Baldwin II, King of Jerusalem. The confirmation was made with the permission and consent of his wife Beatrice and son Joscelyn III in 1141. This is the first certain information about Joscelyn III and pertains to the year 1141, twenty-three years before his capture by the Moslems in 1164!

(2) The sentence immediately following the second one cited in (1) reads as follows: »The assertion that young Joscelyn led the defense of Tell Bashir in 1150 contradicts the statement of William of Tyre (17, 10) who lets him, after the capture of his father, be brought up by his mother and to have the fortress surrendered to Emperor Manuel through Baldwin III.« This statement shows a lack of careful reading on the part of the reviewer and, above all, a confusion of chronological sequences and the events identified with them. The first set of developments, which I discuss on p. 23 and which rests on the sources of Grégoire Le Prêtre, »*Chronique*«, pp. 165–66 and »*Continuation*«, pp. 332–33, Ibn al-Qalānisī, p. 301, and Ibn al Furat, An 545, 32 v^o, declares, to use my own words, »The spirited defense of Tell Bashir made by the young Joscelyn III, his father's soldiery, and the citizen population finally obliged Mas'ūd I to withdraw into his own country.« The second set of developments, which I discuss on pp. 23–26, rests on the sources of William of Tyre, Bk. XVII, chaps. xvi

and xvii, pp. 785–86, which is dated in the year 1150, ›The Chronography of Bar Hebraeue‹, Michael the Syrian's ›Chronique‹, Guiragos de Kantzag, Behâ Ed-Dîn's ›Saladin‹, Sěmpad's ›Chronique‹, and Vartan Le Grand's ›Extrait‹ (all these sources are cited in footnotes 56, 57, 58, 59, and 60) pertain to the l a t e r decision of Beatrice to surrender the castle of Tell Bashir to Emperor Manuel and to accept the Emperor's offer to protect her and her children. Beatrice did this in the face of the reality that, even though she and her children were still p h y s i c a l l y in possession of Tell Bashir, she could not hope to retain it »... in the midsts of the surrounding Turkish sea...« This s e c o n d set of developments occurred a f t e r the first set of developments! In short, there is no contradiction such as the reviewer alleged!

(3) The reviewer observes that »In 1180 he (Joscelyn III) began to acquire possessions in the area of Acre (R 579, 587, 588); these were purchases confirmed by the king, no »grants« and formed the basis of his later seignury.« The words »no grants« are erroneous. It is true that I do label each of these acquisitions on page 76 as grants. But it is also true that I make very clear that Joscelyn III gained each one by p u r c h a s e. Reliable English dictionaries define the legal definition of grant as »transfer of real property«. There is n o t h i n g about this definition which says or implies the transfer is a gratuitous one. There is n o connotation of the word »gift« in it. The legal definition of the word g r a n t is totally devoid of any monetary considerations. In short, the reviewer's understanding of the accurate meaning of the word »grant« is faulty. Lastly, my clear statement about Joscelyn III's acquisition of these lands by p u r c h a s e removes from the mind of the reader any possible misconceptions such as the reviewer has about the circumstances of the acquisition.

(4) The observation of the reviewer that »King Guy did not come twice before Tyre«. I declare on page 181 that such was the case. The reviewer's statement is false. The sources both Latin and Moslem, which are listed in footnotes 360 and 361 on page 181, show clearly that there were t w o such approaches on the part of King Guy. Furthermore, Professor Runciman, who ist one of the world's authorities on the Crusades, supports me to the hilt. He writes as follows in his book ›A History of the Crusades‹, Vol. III, p. 21: »In April (1187) Guy came *again* with Sibylla to Tyre and again demanded to be given control of the city. Finding Conrad as obdurate as before, he encamped in front of its wall.« I short, there were t w o visits by Guy, not o n e as the reviewer alleged. And Runciman cited, just as I did, Ernoul E r a c l e s and Behâ ed-Dîn!

(5) In reference to the reviewer's observation that »N describes most localities, in most cases villages or *casalia* as Towns« the following observations are in order: It is true that Latin language dictionaries define »casalia« as »villages«. But it is equally true that an excellent English language dictionary declares that »town« is synonymous with »village«. And it is common knowledge that the word »town« in its use in the United States today by both scholars and non-scholars has little or no numerical significance attached to it and the words »town« and »village« are often used interchangeably.

(6) The reviewer declares that »It is equally uncertain if, as indicated by Er-

noul and taken over by N, Joscelyn received a revenue fief of 1,000 besants from the customs duties of the port of Acre. This donation, not a confirmation, is attested in 1183 by Baldwin IV (R. 625)«. I made no such statement on page 28, which refers to this matter, to the effect that it was a confirmation. My exact words are as follows: »King Baldwin III made Joscelyn III his direct vassal possibly as early as the late summer of 1150, endowing him with lands outside Acre as well as revenues from the harbor of Acre itself.« The word »endow« has the same meaning as the word »donation«. »Endow« ist defined »to furnish with money of its equivalent, as a permanent fund for support«. Secondly, Ernoul's statement gains credence from the fact that Joscelyn III succeeded in recovering Burj-ar-risas during the Moslem year 551 (February 25, 1156 to February 12, 1157). All this required military strenght of considerable dimensions on his part. And this strength in turn had to be derived from a considerable financial base. Is it not logical to believe that this financial base was derived from the endowment given to Joscelyn III in the early 1150s by Baldwin III?

(7) The reviewer's statement that »His (Joscelyn III's) participation in the battles at Hārim, Montgisard (1177) and Hattin (1187) where he fell again in captivity from which he managed to escape, is supported by evidence« leaves the impression that my declaration that Joscelyn did escape from Hattin is wrong. The reviewer failed to point out, as I did in footnote 336, pp. 160–162 that the sources are in disagreement on this question, for one of them says that he did escape from the battle of Hattin. I analyzed all the sources relating to this problem and demonstrated the errors in the sources declaring that he was captured. The reviewer in her flat declaration presents no evidence of any analysis of the sources.

(8) The reviewer cites Riley-Smith's book »The Feudal Nobility and the Kingdom of Jerusalem« as one that ought to have been included in my biography. This book was published in 1973, when my own monograph was being published. In short, I had no opportunity to peruse this book prior to the publication of my own book.

Robert L. NICHOLSON