

THE HANOVER HISTORICAL REVIEW



Volume 12

2017

GUIDELINES FOR SUBMISSION OF MANUSCRIPTS

The *Hanover Historical Review* (*HHR*) Editorial Board welcomes submissions of essays, document transcriptions, and book reviews of a historical nature from any discipline.

Manuscripts must be prepared in conformity with *The Chicago Manual of Style* in 12-point Times Roman font, double-spaced (including footnotes) and with pages numbered.

Submissions should consist of three hard copies delivered, plus a digital copy submitted by email attachment as a Microsoft Word document, to Professor Michael Raley (raleym@hanover.edu). Because all submitted manuscripts will be evaluated anonymously, the author's name should appear only on the title page. There should be no identifying markers (including headers and hidden texts) within the body of the paper. Please print your paper on the front sides of the pages only (single-sided).

Articles should not exceed 3,000 words without the prior approval of the *HHR* editors. Please note that submissions accepted for publication may be edited to conform to the *HHR*'s style. The *HHR* editors remain the final arbiters of length, grammar, and usage. However, they will endeavor to consult with authors with regard to any changes made in the interest of clarity and economy of expression.

The *HHR* disclaims responsibility for any statements, either as fact or opinion, made by contributors.

THE HANOVER HISTORICAL REVIEW

Volume 12

Spring 2017

Senior Editor

Mersadi's dā Curtsinger

Junior Editors

Caroline Brunner and Hannah Markisohn

Editorial Board

Jenna Auber

Caroline Brunner

Abigail Carrington

Mersadi's dā Curtsinger

Jacob Domalewski

Rebecca Duke

Meghan Lanter

James Macumber

Hannah Markisohn

Falyn Moncrief

Hope Westmoreland

Eric Woodruff

Managing Editors

Daniel P. Murphy, Professor of History

J. Michael Raley, Associate Professor and Chair, Department of History

Financial Support

Department of History and Hanover College

Printing

Carol Persinger, Mailroom Services

The *HANOVER HISTORICAL REVIEW* is dedicated to the promotion of excellence in undergraduate scholarship and writing.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword	v
Daniel P. Murphy and J. Michael Raley, Managing Editors	

President Lambert's Inaugural Address Hanover College, October 3, 2015

Education for "A Tough Mind and a Tender Heart"	3
President Lake Lambert III	

Student Essays

The Influence of Pope Gregory VII and the Gregorian Reform on Pope Urban II: Differences in Motives and Agendas with Respect to the First Crusade	11
Trent A. Taylor	
The Struggle for the Conquest of Antioch (1097-1098): Muslim and Christian Perspectives of a Critical Battle during the First Crusade	19
Mersadi's Dā Curtsinger	
The South Bend Fugitive Slave Case: How Varying Attitudes Towards Slavery Affected the Outcome	51
Claire Harvey	
Kappa Alpha Theta at Hanover College, 1882-1899	63
Jenna Auber	
The Soviet Sports Machine	71
Hannah Markisohn	

Outstanding Freshman Essays 2016-2017

World War I: The Lost Generation's Legacy in Literature	87
Sara Rutkowski	
Reinhard Heydrich's <i>Kristallnacht Order</i> : A German Cultural Catalyst	93
Eric Woodruff	

FOREWORD

The early 1990s were an exciting time for the Hanover College History Department. New hires and a revision of the curriculum had energized the faculty. Students were dynamic and energetic. The time was right for ambitious projects.

Aided by supportive colleagues and enthusiastic students, Professor Frank Luttmer took the lead in proposing a journal that would publish student papers and documents related to the field of history at Hanover College. Submissions could come from students in any department of the College. An editorial board of students would select the papers and documents chosen for the journal, and also edit and annotate them as needed. The first student editorial board was headed by Valerie C. Parsons. She was assisted by Starratt Alexander, James Bednar, Christina Hartlieb, Lisa Obringer, Erec Reichardt, David Shine, Jr., and David J. Voelker. Professor Luttmer provided support to the editors in the early stages of preparing the journal, while Professor Daniel Murphy helped oversee the final copyediting for the printer.

The inaugural issue of *The Hanover Historical Review* appeared in Spring 1993. Featuring several strong student papers and a symposium on James Agee and Walker Evans' *Let Us Now Praise Famous Men* (1941), the journal was a great success. The *HHR* flourished for the rest of the decade and into the beginning of the next century, but was published only sporadically after Professor Luttmer's illness and untimely death.

At the outset of the 2016-17 academic year, the Hanover College History Department decided to resume publication of the *Hanover History Review*, provided that we could find sufficient support for this project among our students. Twelve of our students immediately volunteered to serve on the *HHR*'s editorial board: Jenna Auber, Caroline Brunner, Abigail Carrington, Mersadi's dā Curtsinger, Jacob Domalewski, Rebecca Duke, Meghan Lanter, James Macumber, Hannah Markisohn, Falyn Moncrief, Hope Westmoreland, and Eric Woodruff. Senior Medieval and Renaissance Studies major Mersadi's dā Curtsinger agreed to serve as the Senior Editor for the *HRR* this year, while Caroline Brunner and Hannah Markisohn served as Junior Editors. Working with this group of eager and diligent students has turned out to be a great joy for us faculty members. The result of their diligent efforts may be found within the covers of this latest volume of the *HHR*.

Throughout the 2016 fall semester, the *HHR* editorial board met every other week on Thursday evenings at 7 p.m.. Because the *HHR* had not been published since 2011, our first tasks were to discuss, review, revise, and finalize the journal's Submission Guidelines. This required updating the language to include electronic submissions. Although the 2017 volume of the *HHR* contains only essays, the board members wanted to make it clear that, in the future, document transcriptions and translations, as well as book reviews of a historical nature from any discipline, will also be accepted for publication. Other concerns included word count and the need for all submissions to conform to *The Chicago Manual of Style*. Additionally, the board drafted a Call for Papers with an initial deadline of January 20, 2017. Thereafter the board members visited every history-related class being taught here on campus during the 2016 fall term to promote the

HHR and publicize the Call for Papers, the flyer for which was circulated by email attachment in addition to being printed and posted in prominent locations throughout the campus. The board members also voted unanimously to invite President Lambert to contribute an essay to this year's *HHR*, and in response he has graciously granted us permission to publish his inaugural address at Hanover College from 2015. This is fully in keeping with the history of the journal, which in 2001 published the inaugural addresses of eight Hanover College presidents, past and present, in a special edition of the *HHR* honoring the 175th anniversary of the College.

The board members also decided early upon a process by which they would review the submissions anonymously. Only Professor Raley would know the identity of the authors until the essays had been reviewed by the board members. This the board regarded as especially important at a small liberal arts college such as Hanover College, where everyone knows everyone else; beyond this, however, a few of the board members wished to submit essays for consideration, and to ensure impartiality here Professor Raley distributed these, minus their authors' names, to other members of the board for anonymous peer review.

Eight specific criteria guided the board's reviews:

1. Does the essay have a clear thesis that is supported with focused arguments and plausible evidence? (If yes, please also state the thesis.)
2. Is the thesis supported with an ample supply of primary sources, critically interpreted for the reader?
3. Is the author's argument placed within the field of current scholarship on the subject (historiography)?
4. Does the essay make a substantive contribution to our knowledge of the subject matter? In other words, does the essay advance the current scholarship in new directions?
5. Are the footnotes/endnotes correctly formatted in Chicago Style? Do they show evidence of attention to detail?
6. Is the writing style clear and fluid? Is the argument interesting?
7. Does this still seem like a paper written hurriedly for a class, or has the author carefully revised the essay for consideration by the *Hanover Historical Review* editorial board?
8. What specific revisions or additions would you suggest that the author make to improve the article pending its acceptance for publication?

Following the review process, the authors of the submissions were provided with summaries of the board members' comments. The review process, the board decided, would yield one of three ratings: (1) accept for publication as is (or with only minor editing required); (2) revise and resubmit (typically requiring more research and substantive revisions and/or additions as well as reediting the prose and reference notes); or (3) reject for publication. This year we rejected no submissions outright, though some authors chose not to revise and resubmit

their work. Those who did revise and resubmit their work were expected to pay close attention to the comments and suggestions for substantive revisions as well as for the editing of the text and formatting of the notes that had been provided by the board members in their reviews. The Junior and Senior Editors of the *HHR* took over from here, reading all essays still under consideration again and suggesting editorial grammatical and format changes for consistency and clarity. Professors Murphy and Raley oversaw the final edit of the journal, which was printed on campus by Carol Persinger.

What struck us as faculty members was the seriousness and dedication with which these twelve students and also the authors of the articles appearing in this volume approached their tasks. Certainly each of them was already sufficiently burdened with college assignments, athletic commitments, club and student senate responsibilities, rehearsals for campus musical organizations, and part-time employment, and yet each gave willingly and freely of his or her time to make this project come to fruition. In the process, these students not only performed a worthy public service, but they also learned a great deal about the anonymous peer-review process employed by academic publishers. The writing and research skills of these *HHR* board members and authors no doubt improved, and they also developed a deeper sense of professionalism.

For all of these reasons and many more personal ones, we have thoroughly enjoyed working with these fine students. We hope that you will share our enthusiasm as you read the articles published within these covers (or within this .pdf file if you are reading the digital version).

Daniel P. Murphy and J. Michael Raley, Managing Editors

**PRESIDENT LAMBERT'S INAUGURAL ADDRESS
HANOVER COLLEGE, OCTOBER 3, 2015**

Education for “A Tough Mind and a Tender Heart”

Inaugural Address
President Lake Lambert III
Hanover College
October 3, 2015

In the year 1963, President John F. Kennedy was assassinated; Betty Friedan published *The Feminine Mystique*; Iron Man made his debut in Marvel comics; dogs and fire hoses attacked civil right marchers in Birmingham; the zip code was introduced; and deliberations were underway for the introduction of the Hanover Plan. It was a time when our society was exploring new and sometimes radical ideas, and it was in this context that the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. gave particularly wise advice to those who would shape the nation and the world in a book of sermons with the title *The Strength to Love*.

While Dr. King may be better known for his “I Have a Dream Speech” made in that same year, within *The Strength to Love* is a sermon that I have returned to and taught repeatedly for most of my career as a college professor and administrator. I have also recommended it to others and advocated for its inclusion in a required freshman seminar. In that sermon, I have found and sought to share with others what I want the ultimate outcomes to be for a liberal arts education. King’s title for the sermon may say it all. The first chapter and the first sermon in that book bear the title “A Tough Mind and a Tender Heart.”

King’s biblical text for the sermon was from the Gospel of Matthew, Chapter 10, verse 16: “Be ye wise as serpents, and harmless as doves.” In this section of Matthew, Jesus is warning his disciples about the perils they will face when he sends them out into the world. The language of the biblical text is almost apocalyptic, warning of hardship and persecution.

By 1963, King himself was no stranger to hardship and persecution. He had been jailed repeatedly, was regularly threatened, and had his house bombed. His opponents on one end of the political spectrum branded him a communist and a destroyer of American ideals, and his other opponents were increasingly convinced that he was not radical enough, labeling him an “uncle Tom,” a sell-out, or even worse. It was in that context that King, drawing only loosely on the scripture, claimed that the work ahead—the work ahead against racism, poverty and violence—could only be accomplished by those who combine seemingly opposite attributes. King named these a tough mind and a tender heart.

A tough mind, said King, was the opposite of soft mindedness. A soft mind is easily manipulated; a soft mind always fears change; a soft mind pre-judges situations and in so doing is prejudiced. In contrast a tough mind thinks critically, analyzes facts before making decisions, and refuses to take anything—including religion or political ideology—at face value. In perhaps my favorite sentence from the sermon, King states, “A nation or civilization that continues to produce soft minded men purchases its own spiritual death on an installment plan.”

President Lambert

But King is also fearful about what a tough mind alone will do to a person. He fears a “cold and detached” rationality and the experience of being so attuned to facts and details that individuals are depersonalized. And so he insists that a tough mind must be joined by a tender heart. To be tough minded and hard hearted is to be a monster, incapable of love and friendship, possessing the intellectual power to do great good or great harm but with no moral compass for guidance.

Together, says King, a tough mind and a tender heart are powerful; they are effective; and they have the ability to transform people and communities towards a greater good. King saw this juxtaposition as essential in his fight against segregation and legalized racism. He also believed it was a deep religious truth, and I would push it further to say that it was for King a philosophy of life.

Members of the Board of Trustees, faculty, staff, students, alumni, honored guests as well as my family and friends, I am greatly honored to accept the call to be the 16th president of Hanover College. I have accepted this call because, I believe, my vision of an education for a tough mind and a tender heart is also woven deeply into the history and mission of Hanover, and I also believe this vision has enduring value in animating and guiding the work of the college in the future. Without question, we live in a challenging time for liberal arts education and small liberal arts colleges, but I also have every confidence that Hanover will thrive and excel as we build upon the foundation laid by those before us.

When our founder John Finley Crowe crossed the Ohio River from his native South, he combined a tough mind and a tender heart, knowing that he would need to be on free soil to advance the abolitionist cause. He could have stood on this very point, peering back across the river, and observed slaves working in bondage to their masters. In 1833 when James Blythe was inaugurated as the first president of this college he described in his own inaugural address the intellectual advances of his day and the need for their continued development. He affirmed the need for tough minded people to leave the college and go into the world. But near the conclusion of his address, he also affirmed the tender heart, stating, “We hold it to be a sound principle, that the college which does not make the cultivation of the heart a primary object had better never have been founded. Such will prove a curse to the world.” Instead, Hanover College has existed for almost two centuries not as a curse to the world but as a blessing, and this college continues to bless the world by sending out graduates who have developed tough minds and tender hearts through their education here.

Neither critical thinking nor moral formation are easy today, and they may be harder now than in the time of John Finley Crowe or James Blythe. Critical thinking can become a mirror that we hold up to ourselves and our decisions, easily convincing ourselves and others that our prejudices are well thought and that our decisions are based on facts even when they are not. Schooling—whether it be preparatory work up to the 12th grade or even higher education—is not a guaranteed inoculation against lazy thinking and soft-mindedness. Too much of schooling is focused on answering rather than questioning; too much focus is on memorization instead of problem-solving; and too much focus is on dismantling into parts and not enough attention is

given to creativity and the building of something new. The traditions of liberal learning and critical thinking run deep in the West, stretching back at least to the questions Socrates asked of his Athenian pupils and his insistence that they question the accepted wisdom and traditions of the day, but we seldom use that same critical questioning to examine the traditions of education that we have inherited. We think we are honoring tradition when we teach the same things and the same ways as we were taught them, but we most honor the past when we think critically and make thoughtful decisions about what to value, what to improve and what to set aside.

To speak about the education of the heart is also contested—by those who do not see it as the role of education, by those who fear indoctrination, and by those who rightfully challenge whose values should be valued. But no education is truly value-free. We express our values through the courses we teach because we teach those courses rather than others; we express our values by the questions we ask and by those we do not; we express our values by the ways we engage our students in conversation with us and with each other, by their engagement in the community, by their connections to the broader world. We teach our values through our coaching on the field and court, our mentoring in and out of the classroom, and in our holistic approach to student development. Our students are not just brains on legs, and so our athletics programs, student activities and residence life experience support our mission in essential ways.

The formation of a tender heart and a tough mind is only possible in relationship, and so pedagogy and our very ways of knowing are different here. We can enter into relationship with one another as fellow learners and into relationship with what we study or practice, or we can be distant from both, remaining “objective.” Sociologist Parker Palmer has argued that what he names as “objectivism” is the hidden curriculum in most schooling. To be in relationship is highly subjective and allows us to be open to conversion and personal change, but we can also “want to know in (objectivist) ways that allow us to convert the world” rather than ourselves, to manipulate the world and other people for our personal benefit and as a means to power or advantage. How we come to know thus shapes what we know and why that knowledge is valuable. A tough mind is not formed one way and then a tender heart another. They go hand in hand in a holistic approach to learning as a transformative relationship.

By reframing the mission of liberal arts education as transformative relationships that form of tough minds and tender hearts, I also seek to challenge the divide between so-called liberal arts and professional study. In this dichotomy academic programs like education, engineering, computer science, and business are contrasted with history, English, chemistry and mathematics. However, if we see Hanover’s purpose and pedagogy joining the head and heart, we may come to understand that we have made for ourselves a false choice in these old debates. Determining the liberal arts identity of an institution by the “what” of the curriculum—what the subjects are and how prominent that may be—begins the discussion of liberal learning with the wrong premise. Ultimately, the defining characteristics of Hanover should not be the “what” of the curriculum but the “why,” or the purpose, and the “how,” or pedagogy of our collegium.

Almost 30 years old, Bruce Kimball’s groundbreaking history of liberal education illuminated this point. In *Orators and Philosophers*, Kimball describes two traditions of liberal

learning, indicated by the book's title. The philosophers—with roots in Athens and guided by the Enlightenment—focus on learning for its own sake and ultimately formed the modern research university to advance their ideals. The philosophical tradition defines the liberal arts as the “freeing arts” suitable for a free people and the free pursuit of knowledge with rationality, skepticism, tolerance and egalitarianism among its crucial values; Kimball names it the “liberal-free ideal.” The tradition of the orators with its roots in Rome and then later the Protestant Reformation focuses on learning for the good and service of society. The orators understand the liberal arts as that set of knowledge, skills and values necessary for the civic good, for vocation broadly understood. While there are certainly overlaps, the orators' ideals largely shaped the denominationally formed, small liberal arts college, but since the early twentieth century the values of the philosophers as well as the approach and divisions of the research university have consistently sought to infiltrate, displacing the liberal arts tradition of the orators and seeking to define the liberal arts within a narrow set of arts and sciences disciplines.

But if we stand with the orators—as I think we must—the civic purposes and relational pedagogies of liberal learning become much more important than what is to be studied. For the orators, the liberal arts has room for history, biology, business or athletic training as well as for a general education program including the works of both Plato and Michael Porter. It is an education for tough minds and tender hearts that prepares students for service in the world. In the Reformed theological tradition that shaped Hanover, we can say that it is an education for vocation—a calling. An important part of that service can be through one's employment, but a Hanover education must equip students not only to make a living but also to make a difference as leaders and individuals of character. Hanover is and will continue to be a place where callings are heard and where callings are responded to, where young men and women are transformed so that they might—with tough minds and tender hearts—become agents of transformation in the world—in their workplaces, in their communities, and in the natural environment and global society that connect us all.

We send our graduates into this world, and as educators and as an educational institution we exist in it as well. And so we must be a college that not only propagates an education for tough minds and tender hearts, but we must be a college of tough minds and tender hearts. The cultural and economic forces around us are threatening, and Hanover can easily be seen as a lamb amidst wolves. Too easily nostalgia and sentimentality might paralyze us and allow us to be devoured. Because of our tender hearts, we can become disillusioned when we fail to practice or fail to achieve our ideals. We can also turn the tough mind against the tender heart to identify hypocrisy, inconsistency, and failure. We are constantly challenged by ourselves and others about how we can hold tight and continue to seek our highest ideals when we know already that we will fail to achieve them. How then do we ensure that the perfect does not become the opponent of the good, an enemy of the realistic, and a threat to the possible? Cynicism, anger, and resentment are caustic forces that eat away at both our hearts and our minds, and they can devour the institution and systems we attempt to build.

Education for “A Tough Mind and a Tender Heart”

I believe a tough mind and a tender heart guard against utopian expectations just as they hold up the unrealistic ideals that we should always be seeking. A tough mind and a tender heart foster hope—not a glib optimism that everything is going to be OK (it won’t), not a cynicism that says that I should take care of myself because there is nothing else to believe in (there is), not a utopian fantasy that we will find or craft a perfect learning community (we can’t), and not a despair that nothing can be done to bring about improvement or change (it is possible).

When I next stand in front of a crowd on this spot, it will be graduation day. Graduation is an occasion when we celebrate hope. We celebrate promise. We celebrate what is yet to come. We see in our graduates all of these things, and that is why it is hard not to leave graduation smiling. While today no diplomas will be distributed and no tassels will be moved, I want this day too to be a day of hope. It is a day to celebrate and remember the great hope of our founder who began our institution with a vision and a small log cabin; it is a day to remember the hopes of alumni—alive and departed—who left our bluff on the Ohio to make a difference in the world; it is a day to remember the hopes of our current students who are just hearing the callings that will lead them into the world; and it is a day to remember all of our shared hopes for Hanover College, its vocation today, and what it might yet become.

At the conclusion of his inaugural address in 1833 James Blythe offered a prayer, and today I make it my own as I too accept the call to be the president of Hanover College: He said, “I pray that God may so enlighten and strengthen me, that I may neglect no duty, nor ever make a covenant with sin or error.” And to those words I add this: I pray that God will grant us all the tough minds and tender hearts we will need to prepare Hanover College for its next two hundred years.

Thank you.

References:

Blythe, James. “Inaugural Address.” Cincinnati: McMillan and Clopper, 1833.

Kimball, Bruce A. *Orators and Philosophers: A History of the Idea of Liberal Education*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1983.

King, Martin Luther, Jr. *Strength to Love*. New York: Harper and Row, 1963.

Palmer, Parker J. *To Know as We Are Known: Education as a Spiritual Journey*. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1983.

STUDENT ESSAYS

The Influence of Pope Gregory VII and the Gregorian Reform on Pope Urban II: Differences in Motives and Agendas with Respect to the First Crusade

Trent A. Taylor

Pope Gregory VII (1073-1085) initiated what historians now call the Gregorian Reform, which in fact was a multifaceted movement with several complex components. Pope Urban II (1088-1099), his successor, was heavily influenced by Gregory's actions. In their recent research, historians have offered continued insight into the influential relationship between Gregory and Urban. These modern studies both confirm this influence and even go as far as to claim that Urban's reforms were superior to those of his predecessor. John Julius Norwich points out that "Urban II was a staunch upholder of papal supremacy on the Gregorian model, except that he possessed all the polish and diplomatic finesse that Gregory VII had so disastrously lacked."¹ It is clear that Norwich ultimately believes that Urban was actually more successful in the way he carried out these reforms. He is far from the only historian to hold such a view. I. S. Robinson, for example, notes that "Urban II cast his net much more widely than Gregory VII. The papal synods of Urban II's wandering pontificate brought the churchmen of Latin Christendom in direct contact with the supreme judicial authority of the pope on a scale hitherto unknown."² Although Urban promised to follow through with Gregory's ecclesiastical reform movement, however, the surviving documents from this period suggest a more complex picture. Indeed, a thorough analysis of Gregory VII's and Urban II's unique and differing motivations for their respective agendas reveals that it is impossible to look at the two as carbon copies of one another, despite the underlying influence that clearly was present.

We begin with an analysis of some primary source statements directly from Urban II. These statements are associated with his promises to continue the Gregorian Reform movement and showcase Gregory VII's substantial influence on Urban's papacy. When Urban finally became pope, he professed a total commitment to follow in Gregory's footsteps saying, "Believe about me just as about the blessed Gregory. I want to follow wholly in his footsteps."³ This quote from Urban sheds light on the subject, because it recognizes that Urban not only looked at Gregory as "blessed" (language typically used by pontiffs to refer to their deceased predecessors), but that he also wanted to follow "wholly" in his footsteps. Although Urban did continue to promulgate reform legislation, however, it is an over exaggeration to assert that he "wholly" followed in Gregory's footsteps. In a very real sense, as will be shown in greater depth below, Urban II went beyond the efforts of reform that had been started by Gregory VII as he

¹ John Julius Norwich, *Absolute Monarchs: A History of the Papacy* (New York: Random House, 2011), 119.

² I. S. Robinson, *The Papacy, 1073-1198: Continuity and Innovation* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 125.

³ Herbert Edward John Cowdrey, *The Crusades and Latin Monasticism, 11th-12th Centuries* (Farnham, UK: Ashgate Publishing, 1999), 80-81.

tailored the movement to his own goals and, more specifically, the preaching of the First Crusade.

Urban II made many other strong claims about his commitments to Gregory. However, one of his more detailed quotations is worth mentioning. When speaking about Gregory, Urban said, “Desiring completely to follow in his footsteps, I spit out everything which he spat out; what he reproached, I reproach. But what he deemed valid and Catholic I embrace and approve, and I believe and confirm altogether, in all respects, what he in the end believed about each side.”⁴ This detailed quotation provides more solid evidence of Urban’s dedication to the reform movement. However, it is important to pay close attention to the end of the quote, which mentions Gregory’s beliefs about “each side.” Raging at the time was the so-called Investiture Controversy (1075-1122), that infamous struggle between popes and emperors over the right to choose and also “invest” bishops with their temporal and spiritual powers which ultimately ended with the compromise known as the Concordat of Worms (1122) whereby secular rulers were given a voice in the selection of bishops and awarded them their temporal powers while bishops’ spiritual powers were henceforth invested by the pontiff or his representative. Seen in this context, Urban II’s wording, “each side,” can only refer to the Church and the Empire and their complicated and intertwined relationship. Although Urban II claims to fully believe and confirm Gregory VII’s position towards this relationship, a look at each pope’s policies and agendas will show that this was not entirely the truth.

As we have noted, the Gregorian Reform movement as a whole was a complex mixture of Church reform measures. It is noteworthy to mention that the movement ultimately revolved around reforms related to lay investiture, simony, clerical celibacy, and nepotism. Out of these topics, both Gregory and Urban were most concerned with the issue of lay investiture. Overall, this dealt closely with the issue between church and state relations, to which Gregory’s policies paid particularly close attention. Regarding the reformers as a whole, Norwich points out that, “The key word in the reformers’ vocabulary was *restituere*, to restore the freedom enjoyed in the early Church.”⁵ Both Gregory and Urban repeatedly called for a return to the old ways of the Church, referring to stricter moral standards as well as increased freedom from secular authorities. For example, Gregory routinely claimed, “I have been concerned above all that holy Church, the Bride of God . . . should return to her proper dignity and remain free, chaste, and catholic.”⁶ This quotation exemplifies Gregory’s concerns regarding reform for the Church’s dignity, but more importantly, for the Church’s freedom from secular control. Under Gregory, it was this aspect that dominated his policies. Additionally, the movement under Gregory produced drastic changes in both the Church and the secular world through the papal election decree (1059, when Gregory was still Cardinal Hildebrand), which established the College of Cardinals

⁴ Robert Somerville and Stephan Kuttner, *Pope Urban II, the Collectio Britannica, and the Council of Melfi (1089)* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 45.

⁵ Norwich, *Absolute Monarchs: A History of the Papacy*, 265.

⁶ I. S. Robinson, “Church and Papacy,” in *The Cambridge History of Medieval Political Thought C. 350-C. 1450*. ed. J.H. Burns (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 252-305 at 258.

The Influence of Pope Gregory VII and the Gregorian Reform on Pope Urban II

and called for them to elect popes and the proscription of clerical concubinage, as well as the free elections and investiture of bishops. These changes ultimately led to major schisms with the secular sphere, which tasked Urban with fixing the issue.

Like Gregory, “Urban II hoped to disseminate his version of the program for ecclesiastical reform inherited from his predecessors.”⁷ For the most part, Urban carried out the same aspects of the reform as did Gregory. However, there were differences in the way Urban carried out these reform policies. Outside of providing slightly different views surrounding the lay investiture controversy, Urban also “almost certainly spoke at length about peace.”⁸ This is an important point regarding the policy undertaken by Urban, because it differs with regard to Gregory’s policy movement. When Gregory began his reform legislation, his focus seems to have been primarily focused on increasing the Church’s, and especially the papacy’s, power by any means necessary. “Gregory’s actions were a logical reflection of his absolute conviction that papal primacy was not only valid within the Church, but even more so in the secular sphere.”⁹ However, this caused great unease and controversy to occur between the Church and the Holy Roman Empire. This struggle, initially between Gregory VII and Emperor Henry IV, was soon accompanied by other feuds, which actually “made matters worse” for the reform movement.¹⁰ As can be seen, Gregory was not afraid to upset the emperor in his quest for reform. On the other hand, when producing new reform legislation, Urban sought a path that was more peaceful and considerate of all Christians. Although Urban was also interested in increasing the power of the papacy, a closer examination of the goals and agendas of Gregory VII and Urban II will show just how different their reform movements really were from one another.

Many historians have accused Gregory of harboring some unethical motivations for his reform agenda. In *Popes and Antipopes: The Politics of Eleventh Century Church Reform*, for example, Mary Stroll concedes that, “while Hildebrand/Gregory VII was influential, he also provoked a lot of hostile opposition.”¹¹ This hostile opposition came from many sources, including even some of his own clergy, in part because of Gregory’s attempts to expand and centralize the power of the papacy. Andrew Lantham notes that, when Gregory became pope in 1073, “the process of renewal and revitalization took a different tack: it evolved from being an essentially legal and hortatory effort—involving both the promulgation of canons proscribing these practices and a variety of efforts designed to delegitimize them—to one focused on

⁷ Robert Somerville, *Pope Urban II, A Pseudo-Council of Chartres and Congregato (C. 16, Q.7, C2 “Palea”)* in *Reform and Renewal in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance*, vol. 96, ed. Christopher M. Bellitto and Thomas M. Izbicki (Netherlands: Brill, 1999), 18-34 at 18.

⁸ Herbert Edward John Cowdrey, “The Peace and the Truce of God in the Eleventh Century,” *Past and Present*, no. 46 (February 1970): 42-67 at 57.

⁹ Frank J. Coppa, *The Great Popes Through History: An Encyclopedia* (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Publishing Group, 2002), 101.

¹⁰ Cowdrey, “The Peace and the Truce of God in the Eleventh Century,” 64.

¹¹ Mary Stroll, *Popes and Antipopes: The Politics of Eleventh Century Church Reform* (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 243.

transforming the papacy into a powerful institution capable of more effectively pursuing the socially constructed values and interests of the reform Clergy.”¹² Stemming from this motivation to increase the papacy’s, and thus his own, power to such a high degree, it hardly seems surprising that many have viewed Gregory in a negative light.

The *Dictatus Papae*, unsigned but found in Pope Gregory VII’s register from A.D. 1075, include twenty-seven unique points that collectively provide insight into Gregory’s motivations and agenda.¹³ Taken as a whole, these points place a heavy emphasis on diminishing the power of secular rulers and increasing papal authority. Within the *Dictatus Papae*, there are a few of the dictates that merit specific mention. Point two states: “That the Roman pontiff alone can with right be called universal.” Point twelve states: “That it may be permitted to him to depose emperors.” Point nineteen states: “That he himself may be judged by no one.”¹⁴ Although these claims can be justified by virtue of the pope’s position as God’s vicar here on earth, these statements also show Gregory’s ambitions of promoting universal power within the papacy. The lines between increasing the power of the Church and its papacy, on the one hand, and that of Gregory himself, on the other, thus became increasingly blurred. Not only did Gregory assert that he was at the top of the hierarchy; he also gave himself the right to depose emperors and have complete control over the temporal sphere. In a sense, these points showcase the fact that, “under Gregory, obedience to God thus became obedience to the papacy.”¹⁵ With the *Dictatus Papae* being the prime example of Gregory’s motivations to capture universal power, Gregory seems to have been more concerned with ruling as a world monarch than with actual Church reform. This document, coupled with his other extreme attempts at legislation, caused people of the time to see Gregory as overstepping his power and breaking peace within the Christian world. To summarize this point, I. S. Robinson says, “It was this harmony that Pope Gregory VII was alleged to have destroyed by unlawfully seizing the secular sword.”¹⁶

When looking at Urban II’s motivations and agenda, in contrast, we see a pope who seems more concerned about the unity of Christendom as a whole. Above all, Urban II was a man who wanted to promote peace, especially in Europe. Thus H. E. J. Cowdrey noted, “The theme of peace was prominent in early twelfth-century versions of Urban’s preaching.”¹⁷

¹² Andrew A. Lantham, “Theorizing the Crusades: Identity, Institutions, and Religious War in Medieval Latin Christendom,” *International Studies Quarterly*, vol. 55, no. 1 (March 2011): 223-243 at 231.

¹³ Gregory VII, *Dictatus Papae* 1090, *Internet Medieval Sourcebook*, <http://sourcebooks.fordham.edu/source/g7-dictpap.asp> (accessed March 18, 2017). The *Dictatus Papae* is not signed. Thus its authorship remains somewhat in doubt even though it is found in a papal register from A.D. 1075 sandwiched between other signed documents from Gregory VII’s papacy. Most historians recognize Gregory VII as its author, although some scholars continue to assert that the *Dictatus Papae* was inserted into the papal register at a later date. At the very least, however, the *Dictatus Papae* seem to reflect Gregory’s reform priorities.

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Coppa, *The Great Popes Through History: An Encyclopedia*, 99.

¹⁶ Robinson, *Chapter Eleven: Church and Papacy*, 303.

¹⁷ Cowdrey, *The Crusades and Latin Monasticism, 11th-12th Centuries*, 75.

The Influence of Pope Gregory VII and the Gregorian Reform on Pope Urban II

Although Gregory VII was certainly not opposed to the notion of peace, his methods of announcing legislation led to greater hostility from the secular sphere. In Urban's eyes, restoring the original mission of the Church and reuniting the Eastern and Western Churches were the primary goals. Of course, "ever since his accession, he had worked hard to improve relations with Byzantium, Church union being, of course, the ultimate objective."¹⁸ Ecclesiastical unity was important to Urban, in no small measure because dependent upon it was the success of the First Crusade, which Urban II initiated through his famous sermon at the Council of Clermont in 1095. In sum, Urban certainly wished to continue and follow through with the reforms begun under Gregory. However, he took great care to do so in a more harmonious way. This diplomatic skill that Urban possessed yielded greater success in dealing with secular rulers in the long run. "Urban's legacy is multifaceted. Urban is, of course, the pope of the First Crusade, but he is also more, including his work to end the papal schism and to advance the process of ecclesiastical reform. This all marked Urban's pontificate as a turning point in the history of the Gregorian Reform."¹⁹

Although we can see a great deal of difference among Urban's and Gregory's motivations behind their reform movements, it is impossible to get a complete snapshot of this without discussing the Crusade movement. We have thus far examined the motives of Urban and how they are more relatable to Church unification and peace. However, when looking at the accounts of Urban's sermon at Clermont, his motives appear equally as complex as those of Gregory. We first begin by looking at the Crusade movement under Gregory. Although no Crusade actually occurred under Gregory, there is evidence of his intentions to mobilize a Crusade, for in 1074, Gregory issued a letter calling for a Crusade. It was in this letter that Gregory said, "simply to grieve is not our whole duty. . . . Know, therefore, that we are trusting in the mercy of God and in the power of his might that we are striving in all possible ways and making preparations to render aid to the Christian empire as quickly as possible."²⁰ Although Gregory's primary goals revolved around increasing papal power, this letter shows that he was also interested in preaching a Crusade. The reason that he never actually called for a Crusade was in large part due to the escalation in tensions between Gregory and Henry IV that produced the Investiture Controversy. Nonetheless, Gregory's goal of preaching a Crusade not only went far towards influencing Urban, but it also helped change the way in which Christians viewed warfare. Although fighting had occurred between Christians and Muslims since the seventh century, Cowdrey noted, "It can be concluded that Gregory was responsible for profound changes in the Christian attitude to the bearing of arms."²¹ This concept of the bearing of arms began to change under Gregory and expanded further under Urban as they extended their reform

¹⁸ Norwich, *Absolute Monarchs: A History of the Papacy*, 119.

¹⁹ Coppa, *The Great Popes Through History: An Encyclopedia*, 111.

²⁰ Gregory VII, *Call for a "Crusade", 1074*, *Internet Medieval Sourcebook*, <http://sourcebooks.fordham.edu/source/g7-cde1078.asp> (accessed March 18, 2017).

²¹ Cowdrey, *The Crusades and Latin Monasticism, 11th-12th Centuries*, 34.

agenda to crusading by merging Christian pilgrimage with a Christian knighthood fighting to recover the Holy Land from Muslim control. Adam Nemeroff has observed,

Through the Gregorian Reform movement put forth by Pope Gregory VII, the Church successfully consolidated moral and political authority over European Christendom. The confluence of moral and political supremacy (over feudal lords and monarchs), located centrally in the office of the Pope, uniquely positioned Pope Urban II to call the First Crusade and for thousands and thousands of Europeans to heed his call. By reclaiming the Church's moral and political supremacy through the specific reforms of Church celibacy, simony, and lay investiture, Pope Gregory successfully paved the way for the Church's calls for Crusade.²²

Gregory's influence inspired Urban to call for the First Crusade, and this, in turn, sheds further light on his reform legacy. Before closely looking at the accounts of Urban's sermon at Clermont in 1095, however, we should first acknowledge some additional background that points to Gregory's continued influence on Urban's calling of the First Crusade. As John Gilchrist has observed, both "Gregory and Urban were leaders in directing the soldier's profession to ecclesiastical ends: the Christian knighthood, obedient to the papacy, could now earn salvation by means of weapons."²³ In addition to enacting ecclesiastical reform through legislation, Urban was following very closely in the footsteps of Gregory in preaching the First Crusade. "A similar concept of 'righteous warfare' is found in the legislation of Gregory VII," further evidence of this influential relationship, yet Urban also preached Church unity along with the idea of righteous warfare.²⁴ In the context of the Gregorian Reform and the concept of a crusading, Gregory had set the framework for a successful calling. Urban harnessed parts of Gregory's Crusade motivations, yet tailored them in such a way that promoted Christian unity, hereby ensuring the recruitment of a sufficiently large army. In sum, the type of reform and Crusade that Urban was promoting made "the time ripe for such a combination of ideas."²⁵

This not only demonstrates how Urban borrowed the idea of the Crusade for the purpose of armed pilgrimage, but also leads us to a discussion on Urban's sermon at Clermont. It is important to understand that Urban placed heavier emphasis on mobilizing a Crusade because he saw this as an important part of the reunification process of Christendom, his primary goal. Nonetheless, Paul E. Chevedden has pointed out, "many scholars have confused Urban's strategy

²² Adam Nemeroff, *The Gregorian Reform Movement*, <https://sites.dartmouth.edu/crusadememory/2016/04/27/the-gregorian-reform-movement/> (accessed March 4, 2017).

²³ John Gilchrist, "The Papacy and War against the 'Saracens', 795-1216," *The International History Review*, vol. 10, no. 2 (May 1988): 174-197 at 176.

²⁴ Robinson, *The Papacy, 1073-1198: Continuity and Innovation*, 327.

²⁵ Cowdrey, *The Crusades and Latin Monasticism, 11th-12th Centuries*, 83.

with a war of aggression.”²⁶ This confusion is misleading and stems from multiple points. Not only had the idea of warfare against Muslims had been around for hundreds of years, but Urban was also borrowing ideas from Gregory and earlier reform popes when he preached his famous sermon at Clermont.²⁷ Beyond this, the different surviving accounts of his sermon paint a complicated picture of the motivations behind the pope’s actions.

The problem here, of course, is that no verbatim transcript of Urban’s sermon exists, only multiple accounts that were written down later from memory, with each showcasing some of Urban’s aims and ambitions. In the account written by Fulcher of Chartres, for example, the themes of the truce and the peace of God (pleas for limiting warfare among the feudal nobility and calling for the protection of clergy and peasantry from attacks) dominate. Urban is shown in a favorable light here, using his sermon to encourage Christians to stand up and fight for the faith. Urban proclaims, “Although, O sons of God, you have promised more firmly than ever to keep the peace among yourselves and to preserve the rights of the Church, there remains still an important work for you to do.”²⁸ Here Urban is calling for Christian knights to redirect their fighting skills and use them to defend Christianity. Other surviving accounts, meanwhile, record Urban’s other themes and/or motivations in calling for the First Crusade.

In Robert of Monk’s account, we are presented with themes of conquering land. There has been much debate regarding the Crusades and their connection to colonialism. Although this does not seem to have been the case, this account shows why some historians have jumped to this conclusion, and it also sheds light on Urban’s complicated and potentially contradictory motivations. Within this account, crusaders are urged to “take the land from that wicked people and make it your own. That land which, as the scripture says, is flowing with milk and honey, God gave to the children of Israel.”²⁹ This passage portrays Urban’s motivations to conquer land and expand the power and reach of his papacy, with this being portrayed as the “will of God.” Although taking back these lands is a main theme of the crusading movement, this puts into place additional incentives for Urban and his actions. We see similar ideas in Baldric of Dol’s account, where Urban says, “The possessions of the enemy, too, will be yours, since you will make spoil of their treasures and return victorious to your own.”³⁰ Although he mentions the crusaders returning home here, the promise of treasure/booty raises further questions regarding the incentives of Urban and the crusaders as a whole.

Lastly, we look at Guibert of Nogent’s account of Urban’s sermon. In this account, emphasis is placed on the type of war that Urban wants to be waged. Here Urban is recorded as

²⁶ Paul E. Chevedden, “The View of the Crusades from Rome and Damascus. The Geo-Strategic and Historical Perspectives of Pope Urban II and ‘Ali ibn Tahir al-Sulami’,” in *Cultural Encounter During the Crusades*, ed. Salonen Jenson and Helle Vogt (Denmark: University Press of Southern Denmark, 2013), 27-53 at 45.

²⁷ Cowdrey, *The Crusades and Latin Monasticism, 11th-12th Centuries*, 83.

²⁸ Sarah Jane Allen and Emilie Amt, eds., *The Crusades: A Reader*, 2nd ed. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014), 34.

²⁹ Allen and Amt, *The Crusades: A Reader*, 36.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 39.

saying, “We now hold out to you wars which contain the glorious reward of martyrdom, which will retain that title and praise now and forever.”³¹ This account shows that Urban has ultimately produced a new kind of warfare. This warfare is one in which Christians are able to take up arms for a just cause and bring peace to the world and also be assured of eternal salvation. As can be seen, the different accounts of Urban’s speech show just how complicated Urban’s agenda and motivations were. Not only did he have multiple views behind his intended efforts; many of them seem to come into conflict with one another. Outside of these conflicting motivations, it is important to note that some of the common emphases in each of the accounts were the themes of salvation, the forgiveness of sins, fighting a just war, and images of suffering Christians. In sum, Urban was able to successfully preach and encourage the First Crusade, with the idea being heavily influenced by Gregory. However, this only makes it more difficult and nearly impossible to present a completely accurate and clear picture of what Urban’s motivations and agenda were for calling a Crusade, as well as for his reform movement in general.

In consideration of alternative arguments, it is imperative to address a few important points. First, it is hard to go against the fact that Urban was heavily influenced by Gregory. We have seen examples of this not only through Urban’s own statements, but also when looking at his reform legislation and the calling of the First Crusade. However, Gregory and Urban differed in their motives and points of emphasis within their individual agendas. While Gregory may have been striving to a papal monarch, or at least to defend papal primacy against incursions by secular authorities, Urban placed greater emphasis on promoting peaceful relationships with secular rulers and successfully preaching the First Crusade. Nonetheless, Gregory and Urban’s motivations and individual agendas are still being debated to this day. Likewise, the relative success of each pope’s impact on ecclesiastical reform remains an open question.

Gregory VII and Urban II clearly were far from carbon copies of one another. Urban followed Gregory’s path of Church reform, but carried out his actions in a more careful consideration for secular authorities. This is not to say that Urban was not concerned with expanding his papal power, especially if he could reunite the Western Church with the Orthodox Church of the East under the leadership of the Roman papacy. At the same time, Urban saw as central to his larger concerns the need to promote peace throughout western Europe, which required him to repair the schisms that had occurred under Gregory’s rule. In the end, Gregory and Urban each had quite a complex set of motives attached to their respective reform agendas. This influential relationship between Gregory and Urban sheds light on how different popes were operating within the Gregorian Reform, but also poses new questions regarding the complicated aspects and true success of the reform movement under the various reform popes of their day. The complexities of Gregory and Urban’s agendas, motivations, and degree of success leave the debate open to further consideration in the future, even though one may never know any definitive answers to these questions.

³¹ Ibid., 41.

**The Struggle for the Conquest of Antioch (1097-1098):
Muslim and Christian Perspectives of a Critical
Battle during the First Crusade**

Mersadi's Dā Curtsinger

Pope Urban II's sermon at the Council of Clermont in 1095 calling for Christians of Europe to recapture Jerusalem in the name of God brought forth a widespread response from people of all social ranks.¹ These included *princeps* (princes or leaders), *minors* (petty knights, castellans, and lords), the *populous* (the poor and laborers), and, lastly, the clergy.² The following excerpt from Urban's letter provides instructions on how the Christian community could join this cause:

Your brotherhood, we believe, has long since learned from many accounts that a barbaric fury has deplorably afflicted and laid waste the churches of God in the regions of the Orient. More than this, blasphemous to say, it has even grasped in intolerable servitude its churches and the Holy City of Christ, glorified by his passion and resurrection. Grieving with pious concern at this calamity, we visited the regions of Gaul and devoted ourselves largely to urging the princes of the land and their subjects to free the churches of the East. We solemnly enjoined upon them at the council of Auvergne (the accomplishment of) such an undertaking, as a preparation for the remission of all their sins. And we have constituted our most beloved son, Adhemar [*sic*], Bishop of Puy, leader of this expedition and undertaking in our stead, so that those who, perchance, may wish to undertake this journey should comply [w]ith his commands, as if they were their own, and submit fully to his loosings or bindings, as far as shall seem to belong to such an office. If, moreover, there are any of your people whom God has inspired to this vow, let them know that he [Adhemar] will set out with the aid of God on the day of the Assumption of the Blessed Mary, and that they can then attach themselves to his following.³

In his letter of instruction for those who would go on crusade, Pope Urban II is calling for the relief of the Christians in Jerusalem. In his sermon at the Council of Clermont earlier that same year, the Pope had claimed that the Muslims were spreading their faith rapidly into their territory and turning Christian churches into mosques or destroying them, and presumably pressuring Christians in those regions to convert to Islam. By sending Adhémar, Bishop of Puy, as his papal legate and leader of this holy journey to Jerusalem, he hoped that those who had been forcibly converted would come back to the Christian faith and that the spread of Islam

¹ Thomas F. Madden, *The Concise History of the Crusades* (Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield, 2013), 1.

² Riley-Smith, Jonathan, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading* (Great Britain: Anthlone Press, 1986), 74-75.

³ Urban II, "Letter of Instruction to the Crusaders," in *The First Crusade: The Accounts of Eyewitnesses and Participants*, edited and translated by August C. Krey (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1921), 42-43.

would be stopped. Of course, a successful crusade would also greatly enhance the status of the papacy. As Thomas Asbridge observed, “Launched as it was just as Urban began to stabilise [*sic*] his power-base in central Italy, the campaign must be seen as an attempt to consolidate papal empowerment and expand Rome’s sphere of influence.”⁴ Urban had other motives as well, for by choosing to go this route, the pontiff sought not only to unite and purify Western Christendom and, in the process, redirect the violence so common among the nobility of Europe towards the Muslims, but he also hoped to enhance the prestige of the Roman papacy with the Greek Church at Constantinople and the Levantine Church in Asia Minor, Syria, and Palestine.

The crusade itself pitted the Christians against the Muslims for the control of Jerusalem. Many of those who heeded this call for a crusade were nobility. They were, after all, the ones most able to afford the supplies (food, water, armor, weapons, mounts, etc.) in order to make the tedious journey to Jerusalem. On the other hand, those of the labor classes who were strong in their faith also traveled to the Holy Land. The journey was dangerous and arduous, however. By the time that the groups of crusaders arrived at Constantinople, only those with hope and faith in their God and with a determination to fulfill their oaths were left for the journey on to Jerusalem. As the leaders embarked upon their route to reach their final destination, they captured critical objectives along the way. These included Nicaea, Edessa, and, especially, Antioch.

Their plan was to besiege and capture Antioch before taking the cities down the coastline in route to Jerusalem. However, even as the besiegers of Antioch successfully gained possession of the city (by bribing a guard, scaling the city walls, and besieging the Muslims inside of Antioch’s citadel), they soon found themselves the besieged as the Muslim leader Kerbogha and his large relief army encircled Antioch, trapping the crusaders inside. At this critical moment, the true power struggle for control of Antioch began. Not surprisingly, Christian and Arab historians have perceived this battle from greatly different perspectives. Whereas Muslim historians such as Ibn al-Athīr, Ibn al-Qalānisi, and Ibn Taghribirdi tended to place the blame on the Muslim leaders for the loss of Antioch, Christian historians, in stark contrast, gave thanks to divine intervention for the miraculous victory eventually bestowed upon them. Clearly something unusual had transpired, which both sets of chroniclers struggled to explain. How had it been possible for the crusaders to achieve victory in a battle that they should have clearly lost?

Modern day historians may never know what events unfolded during the Battle of Antioch; nonetheless, the reports of the first and second sieges (mostly the latter) of Antioch by the Muslims and Christians provide modern historians with critical evidence and eyewitness accounts that describe the battle, if also from quite different perspectives. Crucial to the crusaders’ victory was the timely “discovery” of the Holy Lance, which appeared to Peter Bartholomew (a poor French religious mystic traveling with the crusaders) and the crusaders after a series of visions and miraculously was uncovered in the floor of the Basilica of St. Peter in Antioch. Peter Bartholomew and many of the crusaders claimed that the Holy Lance—the lance thought to have belonged to Longinus, a Roman Centurion—had been used to pierce the side of Christ during his crucifixion. This raises questions concerning the role that the Holy

⁴ Thomas S. Asbridge, *The First Crusade: A New History* (London: Free Press, 2004), 19-21.

Lance may have played in the crusader victory at Antioch. Though the episode was denied, downplayed, or even ignored by Muslim historians, Christian chroniclers present at the time later claimed that, with the Holy Lance leading them into battle, Christ had directly intervened to give the crusaders their otherwise undeserved victory. What are we to make of this today?

This much is clear: when Kerbogha trapped the crusader forces inside the city of Antioch, he cut off their access to the outside world. No longer able to replenish their food and water supplies, the surviving accounts record, they were forced to eat twigs, leaves, and even to consume the flesh and blood of their horses. The crusaders, desperate for survival, offered to abandon the city in return for the sparing of their lives, but Kerbogha refused to agree to their terms. Meanwhile, those who tried to flee the city by scaling down its walls were met with ambush and either were killed or narrowly escaped death. Once again, this begs the question: if the Muslims had the city surrounded and enjoyed such numerical superiority along with ample supplies, how does one explain their loss of Antioch? Can the crusaders' victory at Antioch be attributed to the First Crusade's being a "Holy War"?⁵

In fact, the surviving evidence suggests that the Christians' victory stemmed in large measure from the actions of Peter Bartholomew, who reportedly inspired the crusaders to search for the Holy Lance on the basis of visions that he allegedly had received from St. Andrew. Having begun to lose their faith in the Christian God because they were outnumbered and out of supplies, the hopeful, faith-inspired testimony and actions of Peter Bartholomew in the discovery of the Holy Lance in the church that St. Peter reportedly had founded in the first century renewed their faith in Christ. Following three days of prayer, the crusaders abandoned their semi-shelter of the city in a combination of desperation, spiritual aspiration, and a burst of adrenaline to face their foes, many of them no doubt expecting to die as martyrs. Meanwhile, the Muslim sources tell us, outside of the city gate the divided Muslim army under the command of Kerbogha, the atabeg of Mosul, failed to achieve victory because a critical rift had developed between the atabeg and the other Muslim emirs. The crusaders won a great victory as a result, but the story warrants a closer look, for upon this famous battle, one might argue, the fate of the entire First Crusade rested.

The Sources

As noted above, several contemporary accounts of the Battle of Antioch survive. The following section explains what we know of each of these chroniclers and their accounts of the battle.

⁵ The term "holy war" from the Christian perspective refers to reclaiming kingdoms, territories, and cities that once had been claimed for Christ but subsequently had been conquered by Muslims, as well as fighting those of other faiths in the name of Christ. The crusade went further by fusing holy war with Christian pilgrimage. For more on the concept of "holy war," see Madden, *The Concise History of the Crusades*, 1-4; and Jean Flori, "Pour une redéfinition de la croisade," *Cahiers de civilisation médiéval* 47 (2004): 329-50, at 349.

Muslim Sources for the Battle of Antioch

Unlike the later crusades, only a handful of Muslim chroniclers or sources cover the First Crusade. As Carole Hillenbrand has observed, “The First Crusade [generally speaking] is poorly documented on the Muslim side in comparison with the relative wealth of documentation in the Crusader sources.”⁶ Nonetheless, a handful of Muslim chroniclers did record in considerable detail the struggle for control of Antioch, especially during the second siege of the city by the forces of Kerbogha. What little was recorded by Muslim historians about the first siege mostly concerns the emir of Antioch, Yaghi Siyān, and his failure to protect Antioch from the crusader army; his ensuing death is also laid out with some detail. The Muslim sources for the Battle of Antioch that have come down to us include:

1. Ibn al-Athīr: “Ibn al-Athīr [1160-1233], . . . born to a Mesopotamian family, . . . did not write during the time of the First Crusade.”⁷ However, his most important and influential work, the *al-Kāmil fī'l-ta'rikh* (*The Perfect History*, or *The Collection of Histories*), provides a history of Islam to the year 628/1231.⁸ This work is influential for many different reasons. Francesco Gabrieli observes: “For his history of the [later] Crusades Ibn al-Athīr was an eyewitness The clarity and simplicity of his style, which avoids archaisms and embellishments and aims at presenting the essential facts, has contributed to his reputation as the chief [Muslim] historian of the later Crusades.”⁹ Nonetheless, his account of the First Crusade constitutes an important Muslim source that includes descriptions of the Muslim loss of Antioch and Jerusalem to the Christian crusaders.
2. Ibn al-Qalānisi: Ibn al-Qalānisi lived from 1073 to 1160, and was born in Damascus. As an eyewitnesses to the First Crusade, Francesco Gabrieli observes, “He is the earliest Arab historian to write about the Crusades, in his chronicle known as *Dhail ta'rikh Dimashq* (*Appendix to the History of Damascus* [an earlier chronicle by Hilāl as-Sabī]).”¹⁰ Since Ibn al-Qalānisi is credited with being the earliest Arab chronicler of the crusades and an eyewitness to both the First and Second Crusades, Gabrieli describes his chronicle as perhaps the most “circumstantial and accurate,” as well as “dry and objective” account.¹¹

⁶ Hillenbrand, *The Crusades: Islamic Perspectives*, 54.

⁷ Ibn al-Athīr, *The Chronicle of Ibn al-Athīr for the Crusading Period from al-Kāmil fī'l-ta'rikh*, part 1: *The Years 491–541/1097–1146: The Coming of the Franks and the Muslim Response*, translated and edited by D. S. Richards (Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate, 2006), 1-2.

⁸ Francesco Gabrieli, *Arab Historians of the Crusades*, translated from the Italian by E. J. Costello (California: University of California Press, 1969), xxvii.

⁹ Ibid., xxvii-xxviii.

¹⁰ Ibid., xxv.

¹¹ Ibid.

3. Ibn Taghribirdi: Ibn Taghribirdi was an Egyptian Mamluk historian.¹² Mamluks comprised an “elite Turkish slave army.”¹³ According to the sources, Ibn Taghribirdi died around 1469-1470.¹⁴ This dating shows that he was not writing during the time of the First Crusade; like Ibn al-Athīr, he wrote later. Ibn Taghribirdi’s discussion of the First Crusade, but more specifically of the Holy Lance and sieges of Antioch, is found in Book V of his *al-Nujum al-zahira fi muluk Misr wa’l-Qahira*.¹⁵

Crusader Sources for the Battle of Antioch

1. Anonymous: The anonymous southern Italian Norman author of the *Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum*, “or “The Deeds of the Franks and other Jerusalemites,” is the “primal source for the First Crusade.”¹⁶ The author first attached himself to Bohemond, and later to Raymond of St. Gilles (Count of Toulouse). The first nine books of the *Gesta* may have been composed prior to November 1098 while still at Antioch. Though this chronology has recently been challenged, the tenth and final book of the *Gesta* certainly was finished prior to 1104 and perhaps as early as 1101.¹⁷ Nirmal Dass, the translator of one of the editions of the *Gesta*, states, “. . . [T]he questions—who wrote the *Gesta*, and is it an eyewitness account—are ultimately unimportant, because the *Gesta* is trying to relate not the experiences dependent upon personal experiences, but upon the tradition of history in the medieval world”¹⁸ As one reads this work, which covers the Council of Clermont in 1095 through the capture of Jerusalem and the Battle of Ascalon in 1099 from the perspective of a knight, it is evident the *Gesta Francorum* incorporates the eyewitness of others in addition to the observations of the author.
2. Raymond d’Aguilers: In his *Historia Francorum qui ceperunt Jerusalem*, completed before 1105, Raymond d’Aguilers provides a second eyewitness account of the First Crusade and the Battle of Antioch, especially the visions of Peter Bartholomew and the discovery of the Holy Lance.¹⁹ Raymond, ordained a priest on the crusade, served as the

¹² Carole Hillenbrand, *The Crusades: Islamic Perspectives* (Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers, 1999), 33.

¹³ Madden, *The Concise History of the Crusades*, 161.

¹⁴ Hillenbrand, *The Crusades: Islamic Perspectives*, 59.

¹⁵ Ibid., 314 and 326, n. 156.

¹⁶ Anonymous, *The Deeds of the Franks and the Other Jerusalem-bound Pilgrims*, edited and translated by Nirmal Dass (New York: Rowman and Littlefield, 2011), 1.

¹⁷ Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading*, 60-61. Also see Marius Kjørmø, “The Holy Lance of Antioch: A Study on the Impact of a Perceived Relic during the First Crusade” (M.A. thesis, Institute of Archaeology, History, Culture Studies and Religion, University of Bergen, 2009), 16-18.

¹⁸ Anonymous, *The Deeds of the Franks and the Other Jerusalem-bound Pilgrims*, edited and translated by Nirmal Dass, 2.

¹⁹ Raymond d’Aguilers, *Historia Francorum Qui Ceperunt Iherusalem*, edited and translated by John and Laurita Hill (Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1968).

chaplain to Raymond of St. Gilles, Count of Toulouse. His account provides a religious perspective to the crusader victory at Antioch as Christ's victory over the Muslims.

3. Fulcher of Chartres: Fulcher of Chartres' *Historia Hierosolymitana*, completed before 1105, consists of three books, the first of which covers from the Council of Clermont in 1095 through the death of Godfrey of Jerusalem in 1100.²⁰ Although it includes an account of the Battle of Antioch, Fulcher was not an eyewitness because, as his chaplain, he had accompanied Baldwin of Boulogne to Edessa in 1097. For his account of the two sieges of Antioch, Fulcher depends upon the *Historia* of Raymond d'Aguilers and the *Gesta Francorum*, or perhaps he simply used the same source materials used by them.²¹
4. Peter Tudebode: Peter Tudebode's *Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere*, written before 1111, appears at first glance to display a heavy reliance upon the *Gesta Francorum* and Raymond d'Aguilers' *Historia Francorum*. However, it also contains information not found in either work, and his translators have therefore argued that he had access to the same sources as Raymond d'Aguilers and the anonymous author of the *Gesta*.²²
5. Raoul of Caen: The *Gesta Tancredi*, written by Raoul of Caen sometime after Tancred's death in 1112, praises the deeds of Tancred, the nephew of Bohemond and later the regent of Antioch. The sources quoted in the *Gesta Tancredi* suggest that Raoul had received a classical education. Whether or not he was present during the Battle for Antioch remains uncertain, but he was clearly in the entourage of Bohemond when he returned to the East in 1107, and, after Bohemond's death, he served Tancred at Antioch. When Raoul discussed the story of the Holy Lance, he challenged Raymond d'Aguilers' account and called into question Peter Bartholomew's claim, asking why the Holy Lance should have been found at Antioch rather than at Jerusalem, where Jesus's disciples would have been more likely to have hidden it. Raoul also indirectly challenges the claim that Longinus, the Roman soldier of Pontius Pilate, brought the Holy Lance to Antioch by inquiring whether Pilate himself ever visited the city.²³
6. Robert the Monk: Until his deposition in 1097, Robert the Monk (d. 1122) was the abbot of the Benedictine abbey of St. Remy at Rheims.²⁴ We know that he was present at the

²⁰ Fulcher of Chartres and Others, *The First Crusade: The Chronicle of Fulcher of Chartres and Other Source Materials*, edited by Edward Peters, 2nd ed. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1998).

²¹ Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading*, 60-61; Kjørmo, "The Holy Lance of Antioch," 18-20.

²² Peter Tudebode, *Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere*, translated and edited by John and Laurita Hill (Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1974); Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading*, 60-61; Kjørmo, "The Holy Lance of Antioch," 18.

²³ Kjørmo, "The Holy Lance of Antioch," 20-22.

²⁴ Robert the Monk, *Robert the Monk's Historia Hierosolimitana*, translated by and Carole Sweetenham (Vermont: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2005), 1-11; Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading*, 135-138.

Council of Clermont, but whether or not he ever made the journey to the Holy Land remains a subject of debate. His popular account of the First Crusade, *Historia Iherosolimitana*, was probably completed by 1107. His *Historia* consists largely of a revised, polished version of the eyewitness account of the First Crusade by the anonymous south Italian Norman author of the *Gesta Francorum*, which had been completed early and was already circulating in France, to which Robert added additional material gathered from his own research. Robert wrote his *Historia* because a certain abbot, probably Bernard of Marmoutier, had expressed his dissatisfaction with the *Gesta Francorum*. As Robert reports, this abbot

showed me a history . . . but it displeased him very much, partly because it contained no description of the foundation of the crusade at the Council of Clermont, partly because it neglected to adorn the sequence of such beautiful events, and the literary composition staggered in rough manner.²⁵

Perhaps not surprisingly, as Carole Sweetenham has observed, “Robert the Monk was far and away the most popular” historians to give an account of the First Crusade.²⁶ More than one hundred medieval manuscripts of his chronicle survive, 10 times the number for any other account of the First Crusade.²⁷

7. Albert of Aachen: Little is known of Albert of Aachen, including even his name with any degree of certainty, though he appears to have lived in the region near Aachen. Rather than participating in the First Crusade, he collected stories and evidence from those crusaders who returned to the Rhineland. His *History of the Journey to Jerusalem* is valuable, first, because he appears not to have relied upon the various eyewitness accounts that circulated in the early twelfth century. Second, he provides more of a German perspective than a French one. And, finally, he adds information not found elsewhere.²⁸
8. Guibert de Nogent: In ca. 1106-1111, Guibert, abbot of Nogent-sous-Coucy and a former student of St. Anselm, compiled and edited his *Gesta Dei per Francos*, which enjoyed but a limited circulation during the Middle Ages, perhaps because of its high Latin.²⁹ The author’s main goal appears to have been to add a polished corrective to the crude Latin of the anonymous *Gesta Francorum*. As might be expected of a churchman, Guibert

²⁵ Trans. in Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading*, 137.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, vii.

²⁷ Kjørmo, “The Holy Lance of Antioch,” 23.

²⁸ Albert of Aachen, *History of the Journey to Jerusalem*, edited by Susan Edington (Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2013), 1, n. 2; Kjørmo, “The Holy Lance of Antioch,” 23-24.

²⁹ Guibert de Nogent, *Gesta Dei per Francos*, translated by Robert Levine (New York: The Boydell Press, 1997).

attributed the miraculous victory of the Franks at Antioch to the hand of God. His account contains material not found elsewhere, especially from Robert of Flanders.³⁰

The Byzantine Source for the Battle of Antioch

1. Anna Comnena: The sole surviving Byzantine source for the First Crusade, the *Alexiad*, was written by Anna Comnena (1083-1153), daughter of Alexios I Komnenos (r. 1081-1118) and his wife, Irene Doukaina. She finished her account, which completed an effort begun by her late husband, Nikephoros Bryennios the Younger (d. 1137), around 1148. Though the *Alexiad* contains obvious biases in favor of her father's government, it remains invaluable as a source because it is the sole eyewitness account of the First Crusade written from the Byzantine perspective.³¹

The First Siege of Antioch

The following sections will discuss the events leading up to the first siege of Antioch. Included here is a description of Antioch, the crusaders' journey to the city, the fear and death of Yaghi Siyān, how the siege began, and the initial outcome.

The City of Antioch

The layout of the city played a critical role in the battles for its capture by the crusaders and recapture by Kerbogha's Muslim forces. Constructed on the side of Mount Silpius, with its amazingly steep slopes, the city of Antioch has high and thick walls that surround it.³² Robert the Monk reported, "The city of Antioch is eminently defensible not only because of its natural site but also by virtue of very high walls, towers stretching up tall and numerous defensive devices built on top of the wall."³³ With strong city walls and only a couple of entrances into the city, the citizens and ruler of Antioch had very little to worry about, at least in terms of invasions, even though, during the first siege, the crusaders tested the viability of these walls, which enclosed an area much larger than the city itself. The walls were built into the mountain so that, during an extended siege, the ruler and citizens would be able to escape along a mountain pass; however, if the walls were ever completely surrounded, flight from inside the city would become virtually impossible.

Tradition holds that the city of Antioch was founded by Alexander the Great's general and successor in Syria, Seleucus, and named for his Macedonian father, Antiochus, in 300

³⁰ Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading*, 136; Kjermo, "The Holy Lance of Antioch," 24-25.

³¹ Anna Comnena, *The Alexiad*, edited and translated by Elizabeth A. Dawes (London: Routledge, Kegan, Paul, 1928).

³² Madden, *The Concise History of the Crusades*, xxvii-xxviii.

³³ Robert the Monk, *Historia Iherosolimitana*, 121 (Book IV, Chapter 1).

B.C.E.³⁴ There is no doubt that the city was built mainly for defensive purposes. Robert the Monk mentions other attributes that caused the city to be imposing. The walls are among the tallest structures featured in the city; therefore, they would have been visible from a great distance.

The conquest of Antioch was a goal that the crusaders had hoped to achieve from the very beginning. The crusaders did not want to take Antioch merely because it would provide a stronghold in which they could rest before traveling to Jerusalem. Antioch also held great significance for those of the Christian faith. The Book of Acts records that, “. . . it was at Antioch that the disciples were first called ‘Christians’.”³⁵ St. Peter’s Basilica at Antioch, founded by the apostle himself in the first century, long served as one of the five great Metropolitan churches of the Catholic Church (located, respectively, at Jerusalem, Antioch, Rome, Alexandria, and Constantinople).³⁶ Both Antioch and Jerusalem were Metropolitans of the Catholic Church, and, as such, each was overseen by a bishop. The Christian nickname for a follower of Christ, *Christianus*, was a Latin, rather than a Greek, name taken from the official language of the Roman Catholic Church. As Diarmaid MacCulloch has observed:

At this stage [when Antioch was a Metropolitan], the Church in Antioch had a single leader, overseer, or ‘bishop’ (*episkopos*), just like the (by then dispersed) community of Jerusalem: Ignatius—interestingly, a man with a Latin name, in the same way that the enduring Antiochene nickname for Christ-followers, *Christiani*, was a Latin rather than Greek idiom. . . .³⁷

This quote shows the contemporary comparisons of Antioch and Jerusalem along with their ties to Rome. To the Christians living at the time, having a Muslim in power over a city and church once regarded as Christian, especially a church founded by the first pope, would have been seen as blasphemous. By 1097, however, the sole ruler of Antioch was a Muslim emir named Yaghi Siyān (d.1098), who ruled over the mixed Christian, Muslim, and Jewish residents who inhabited the city. Thus, in conquering Antioch, the crusaders would not only gain access to a port city and establish a threshold in Syria, but they would also regain control of the apostolic city that marked the birthplace of Christianity.

³⁴ Ibid., 107, n. 53; Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 153.

³⁵ Book of Acts, 11:26b (NRSV).

³⁶ Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 154.

³⁷ Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Christianity: The First Three Thousand Years* (New York: Viking, 2009), 131.

The Journey to Antioch

Between 1098 and 1109 the crusaders would create four new districts on the Eastern side of the Mediterranean: Edessa, Antioch, Jerusalem, and Tripoli.³⁸ During the First Crusade, the most important of these settlements, other than Jerusalem itself, was the city of Antioch. Though their numbers are difficult to estimate with any precision, prior to their arrival at Antioch, the crusader forces had battled their way across Asia Minor with heavy losses and then fought for control of the city of Nicaea where, in June 1097, the crusaders probably had still numbered approximately a combined 43,000 cavalry and infantry. These numbers would later dwindle due to starvation, disease, desertion, and death in battle, yet from time to time reinforcements also were arriving from Europe. Some 15,000 crusaders were left to besiege Jerusalem in 1099; no doubt several thousand more were present during the first siege of Antioch, but many died or deserted in the months that followed. And whereas the crusaders still possessed some 700-1000 horses at the beginning of the siege, by the time of the final battle for Antioch in June 1098 only 100-200 remained alive, and these were in very poor condition.³⁹

There were distinct motives for the entire crusade, and the taking of Antioch in the minds of the crusaders. There were certainly religious motives that allowed soldiers to continue to fight, but at the same time atone for their sins by fighting for God.⁴⁰ On the other hand, Thomas Asbridge observed, "Of all the theories assigning acquisitive motives to the First Crusaders, the most enduring and influential has been the idea that the expedition was almost exclusively populated by land-hungry younger sons deprived of inheritable territory at home by the laws of primogeniture, and thus desperately eager to establish new lordships in the East. This image is, however, profoundly misleading."⁴¹ While the acquisition of hereditary lands was no doubt important in the Middle Ages and some of the younger sons of nobility were searching for land of their own, their motives for going on crusade, as Asbridge makes clear, were far more complex. Certainly in that day the acquisition of material wealth to help offset the tremendous cost of crusading and the degree of Christian devotion that would accomplish the will of God and regain the holy city of Jerusalem for Christ could go hand in hand.⁴²

On the way to Antioch, an ambitious Baldwin of Boulogne and Tancred abandoned their vows to retake Jerusalem and branched away from the main crusader army with around 100 knights. Their route is shown below in Figure 1. It was their hope to carve out territory with the support of Armenian Christians within the cities of Cilicia (including Tarsos, the birthplace of the Apostle Paul) and especially in Armenia (including Edessa). "They were warmly welcomed, and

³⁸ Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The Oxford Illustrated History of the Crusades* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 112.

³⁹ Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading*, 61-65.

⁴⁰ Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 66-75.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 67-68.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 66-75.

The Struggle for the Conquest of Antioch (1097-1098)

both men soon found themselves caught up in local politics.”⁴³ This warm welcome most likely stemmed from the shared religious beliefs between the Armenians and these crusader leaders, but Baldwin became even more involved with politics in Edessa. The ruler of Edessa, “Thoros, who was officially a vassal of the Turks but in reality acted independently, . . . offered to adopt Baldwin as his successor.”⁴⁴ Sensing a great opportunity, Baldwin accepted. Then, after Thoros was conveniently and violently killed in a coup, Baldwin gained full control of Edessa. In terms of the crusade and journey to Antioch, this was a great success. Armenian Christians would support the crusaders at Antioch, but Baldwin would play no role in the forthcoming sieges and battle for control of Antioch, even though Tancred did rejoin the forces at Antioch.⁴⁵



Figure 1: The First Crusade: The March from Constantinople to Antioch⁴⁶

The image above listed as Figure 1 shows the route that the crusaders took towards Antioch from Constantinople, which provided a passage through the Muslim lands. The Emperor of the

⁴³ Madden, *The Concise History of the Crusades*, 24.

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 149-152; Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading*, 58-59.

⁴⁶ Map of “The First Crusade: The March from Constantinople to Antioch,” in *The Crusades: An Encyclopedia*, ed. Alan V. Murray, 4 vols. (Santa Barbara, California: ABC-CLIO, 2006), 2:328.

Eastern lands [Byzantium], Alexios I Komnenos (r. 1081-1118)—father to Anna Comnena (1083-1153), the Byzantine chronicler who left to posterity the sole Byzantine account of the First Crusade (in the *Alexiad*)—played an important role in the crusaders' journey to Antioch.⁴⁷ The crusaders needed and desired to pass through his lands in order to continue on their way to Jerusalem. Ibn al-Athīr reports that the emperor said, “‘Unless you first promise me Antioch, I shall not allow you to cross into the Muslim empire.’ His real intention was to incite them to attack the Muslims.”⁴⁸ This story was retold by the Muslim historian Ibn al-Athīr even though he was not an eyewitness to the event. However, Anna Comnena and other Christian chroniclers, any of whom Ibn al-Athīr could have used as his source of information, give accounts of the oath that the crusaders swore to the emperor, namely, that “‘whatever towns, countries or forts . . . [the crusaders] managed to take which had formerly belonged to the Roman Empire, . . . [they] would deliver up to the Governor expressly sent by the Emperor for this purpose.’”⁴⁹ Though this passage does not specifically refer to Antioch, Anna Comnena, the author of the *Gesta Francorum*, and Albert of Aachen all record that Bohemond and the other noblemen later renounced their oaths and promises to turn over Antioch to the Byzantine emperor after the latter, en route to Antioch to relieve the crusaders, instead returned to Constantinople upon the advice of Stephen of Blois, who had just fled from the besieged city.⁵⁰

The Fear of Yaghi Siyān

In his *History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea*, William, Archbishop of Tyre (d. 1185), provides historians with a brief background on the Antioch governor, Yaghi Siyān, a Turk.⁵¹ He mentions that Yaghi Siyān was a Turkic slave in the great and powerful household of the Persian sultan, Malik Shah I (1055-1092), who had been appointed governor of Antioch in 1090.⁵² Ibn al-Athīr mentions that when Yaghi Siyān learned about the forthcoming arrival of the Christian crusaders at Antioch, “he was not sure how the Christian people of the city would react, so he made the Muslims go outside the city on their own to dig trenches, and the next day sent the Christians out alone to continue the task.”⁵³ The process of digging the trench appears to have been a defensive response, or rather a way to prevent the approaching crusaders from gaining easy access to the city.⁵⁴ Yaghi Siyān also must have been worried about whether the Christians whom he had ruled

⁴⁷ Asbridge, *The First Crusade: A New History*, 97.

⁴⁸ Ibn al-Athīr, *Kamil at-Tawarikh*, X, 185-188, translated by Francesco Gabrieli in *Arab Historians of the Crusades* (California: University of California Press, 1969), 3-4.

⁴⁹ Anna Comnena, *The Alexiad*, 261 (Book X, Chapter 9); Asbridge, *The First Crusade: A New History*, 110-111.

⁵⁰ Asbridge, *The First Crusade: A New History*, 227-228 and 369, n. 24; Madden, *The Concise History of the Crusades*, 27; Anna Comnena, *The Alexiad*, 283-284 (Book XI, Chapter 6).

⁵¹ William of Tyre, *A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea*, Vol. 1, translated by Emily Atwater Babcock and A. C. Krey (New York: Columbia University Press, 1943), 204.

⁵² Ibid.

⁵³ Gabrieli, *Arab Historians of the Crusades*, 5

⁵⁴ Hillenbrand, *The Crusades: Islamic Perspectives*, 68.

for so long might turn against him and try to sack the city along with the crusaders. The interesting thing here is that both the Muslims and the local Syrian Christians were to dig the trenches.⁵⁵ Rather than only having the Christians create the trenches as a punishment for their brethren coming to claim the city, he utilized manpower of both religions, albeit separately for security reasons.

This story is also important because it shows that Yaghi Siyān was more concerned with defending his city than with having the Christian and Muslim peoples working together, even though this no doubt would have been more efficient. But in continuing his account, Ibn al-Athīr also tell us that, when the Christians “were ready to return home at the end of the day he refused to allow them. ‘Antioch is yours,’ Yaghi Siyān told them, ‘but you will have to leave it to me until I see what happens between us and the Franks.’ ‘Who will protect our children and our wives?’ they said. ‘I shall look after them for you.’” And according to the Muslim chronicler, “He protected the families of the Christians in Antioch and would not allow a hair of their heads to be touched.”⁵⁶ Carole Hillenbrand notes this tension between Yaghi Siyān and the Syrian Orthodox Christian citizens of Antioch. “Obviously Yaghisiyan, as a Muslim Turkish overlord, was worried [about] how the local Christian population would respond to the Western Christian invaders—would they side with the Christian newcomers or remain loyal to the local Muslims with whom they lived?”⁵⁷ Erring on the side of caution, Yaghi Siyān made the Syrian Christian men leave the city and camp on the other side of the walls and trenches just in case they decided to rebel against him and side with the crusaders. The emir demanded that they stay out there until the crusaders arrived, so that he could see what it was that they desired from him. If the Christian men had joined the crusaders in taking Antioch, then Yaghi Siyān would have killed the women and children. At the same time, the Christian women and children served as a human shield against crusader aggression.

The first crusaders arrived at Antioch on October 20, 1097. Peter Tudebode, who was present, recorded that Yaghi Siyān desperately sent word to Kerbogha, requesting that a relief army be sent immediately to Antioch. “Overcome with fear of the ever-approaching crusaders, Yaghi Siyān “sent a messenger to Kerbogha, military chief of the Persian sultan, urging Kerbogha to come at the most opportune time because a very brave and formidable Frankish army had Antioch in a vise. Yaghi Siyān went on to promise his immediate surrender of Antioch to Kerbogha or great wealth if help was forthcoming.”⁵⁸ The fact that Yaghi Siyān was able to get word to Kerbogha was due to the crusaders’ inability to surround the entire city until the arrival of the main army one day later, on October 21st. Even then the reduced total number of the crusaders prevented them from besieging the back side of the city which was protected by the

⁵⁵ Ibid.

⁵⁶ Ibn al-Athīr, *The Chronicle of Ibn al-Athīr*, X, 185-188, trans. by Gabrieli in *Arab Historians of the Crusades*, 5.

⁵⁷ Hillenbrand, *The Crusades: Islamic Perspectives*, 68.

⁵⁸ Peter Tudebode, *Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere*, 65, n. 17.

mountain. During the siege, this would allow the Muslims not only to supply the city, but also to sally forth periodically to harass their besiegers.⁵⁹

Yaghi Siyān, of course, knew that, even though the city could hold out for quite some time, ultimately he and his men alone would be no match for the Frankish Army. Therefore, he enlisted the help of the Atabeg of Mosul. “Yaghi Siyān has sent his youngest son, Muhammad, east to negotiate support from Baghdad and the rulers of Mesopotamia.”⁶⁰ Kerbogha began gathering troops to journey to Antioch; however, he would not make the journey to Antioch for several months because he needed a strategic plan to triumph over the crusaders. He also needed to build a coalition of Muslims forces.⁶¹ As reports of the crusader victory at Nicaea and their subsequent advance upon Antioch began to filter in, while still not knowing precisely when the crusaders or even his reinforcements would arrive, Yaghi Siyān began having his people gather supplies within the city such as food, weapons, and materials for building machines and defensive units in preparation for the battle to come.⁶² “They too [the citizens of Antioch], fired by an equally keen desire for the safety of the city and the general welfare, strove diligently that nothing might be wanting which might be of assistance to the citizens in a state of siege.”⁶³ In addition, the Armenian and Syrian Christian residents of Antioch were digging trenches in front of the city, from which point they could also visit the crusader camps and report back to the emir.⁶⁴ No doubt these Christians were concerned about Antioch’s fate, and perhaps their Syrian roots trumped the Christian faith that they shared with the crusaders, but they also knew that their families were being held hostage within its walls by the emir. Perhaps the emir and his advisers, too, were trying to find a way to escape.

The Crusaders Arrive and the Battle Begins

The first siege began in October 1097 and ended when the city fell in early June 1098. The author of the *Gesta Francorum* reported, “In marvelous fashion we besieged three gates of the city, since on the other side there was no place from which to besiege (them), for a very steep mountain constrained us. However, our enemies, the Turks who were within the city, were so afraid of us on all sides that none of them dared to offend any of our men . . .”⁶⁵ Given the size of the crusader army, which even in its reduced state still numbered 10,000 or more men, the residents trapped inside the city no doubt were gravely concerned; at the same time, they also knew that taking the city would not be easy. Stephen of Blois, who was present for a time in

⁵⁹ Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 162-165.

⁶⁰ Ibid., 202.

⁶¹ Ibid., 204.

⁶² William of Tyre, *A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea*, 205.

⁶³ Ibid.

⁶⁴ Peter Tudebode, *Historia de Hieroslymitano Itinere*, 63-64.

⁶⁵ Anonymous, *Gesta Francorum*, in *The First Crusade: The Accounts of Eye-Witnesses and Participants* by August C. Krey (London: Princeton University Press, 1921), 125.

Antioch before becoming ill and departing for home, wrote to his wife, saying, “We found the city of Antioch very extensive, fortified with incredible strength and almost impregnable.”⁶⁶

The three gates around the front sides of the city walls are those that were besieged by the Christians. They were the Bridge Gate, Dog’s Gate, and Gate of Godfrey.⁶⁷ The other gates or entrances to the city, which the crusaders were unable to reach or block, were situated along the back wall in the mountains. Procuring supplies, for the crusaders, was necessary throughout the entirety of the six-month siege. An important location for gathering supplies for the crusaders was the port of St. Simeon, some sixteen miles distant to the west. To access the sea at St. Simeon, the crusaders needed to be able to cross the Orontes River, which bordered the city of Antioch to the west and then make the dangerous trek to the Mediterranean coast. To do so, they fashioned a make-shift bridge of boats tied together to cross the Orontes. “The Bridge of Boats may have been a rather ramshackle affair, but, as the siege continued, it gave the crusaders a crucial advantage: access to the sea.”⁶⁸ From this sea port, the crusaders could receive relief soldiers, food, weapons, and other necessities. The crusaders also took supplies as booty from Muslims that they fought on the way to Antioch; moreover, they attacked nearby towns, villages, and camps to procure supplies. Asbridge noted, “Each crusader contingent concentrated its foraging efforts on a different sector, channeling supplies back to troops at the siege front.”⁶⁹

The siege of Antioch by the crusader forces lasted six-months. While the Franks besieged Antioch, Yaghi Siyān kept the families of his Christian hostages safe just as he had promised the men whom he had exiled to the Frankish Camps. Any who tried to hurt these women and children were to face the wrath of their guardians. One purpose of keeping the women, children, and other family members of the Christians safe no doubt had been to show them that even as their brethren attacked the city, he kept his promise to them and that, if they died, it would be due to their fellow Christians and not to Muslims. Another likely rationale for keeping the women and children safe was so that Yaghi Siyān could escape from the city alive. The crusaders would not harm Christian women and children in the city; if protected them and the city fell, perhaps they would spare his life. However, things did not turn out as he anticipated. Thomas Asbridge reports, “At the same time [that the crusaders were entering Antioch], some of the native Christians still living within the city decided to turn on the Muslim garrison and began opening the city’s remaining gates.”⁷⁰ Finally, the emir’s worry had come true and his fate was sealed as he headed towards his death. The Christians who Yaghi Siyān had hoped would not betray him joined up with the crusaders; therefore, his only hope for survival was to flee the city.

How did the crusaders finally manage to break into the city? According to Ibn al-Athīr, an Armenian armorer named Rūzbah [or in other accounts, Zarrad or Firuz] was “offered . . .

⁶⁶ Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 158.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 126.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 165.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 170.

⁷⁰ Asbridge, *The First Crusade: A New History*, 209.

money and grants of land [by the crusaders for his help in entering the city]. They came to the window, which they opened and through which they entered.”⁷¹ The Franks then began to fight their way through the city. Unlike Yaghi Siyān, who promised to protect the families of the Christians who had dug the trenches around the city, the crusaders began slaughtering the Muslim residents. “With panic sweeping the rest of the city, Yaghi Siyan’s [*sic*] son rallied what few troops he could find and struggled up the slopes of Mount Silpius to find refuge in the fortress.”⁷² Aside from those who escaped into the citadel, no Muslim was spared, including women and children.⁷³ Thomas Asbridge reports, “Near dawn on 3 June 1098 crusaders mounted a ladder lowered by the renegade Firuz [Zarrad or Rūzbah] as Bohemond looked on. By this act of betrayal, Antioch fell to the Franks.”⁷⁴

Death of Yaghi Siyān

The ruler of Antioch panicked in fear once the Christians took over. Ibn al-Athīr tells us that the emir fled directly after the gates were opened. After traveling for some distance and then realizing what he had done, “he began to groan and weep for his desertion of his household and children. Overcome by the violence of his grief he fell fainting from his horse. His companions tried to lift him back into the saddle but they could not get him to sit up, and so they left him for dead while they escaped.”⁷⁵ Yaghi Siyān was weeping for his disgrace because he had left his family to suffer terrible fates at the hands of the crusaders. Adding to the grief that he no doubt felt throughout his body was the knowledge that he had no longer been able to keep Antioch safe and under his control. One possible explanation for the emir’s sudden fainting could be that he was older and may have suffered a heart attack. But this account also suggests that he was not as loved as he thought himself to be by those closest to him, for they left him for dead and ran for their lives in search of safety. What is perhaps most noteworthy here is that none of the members of his escape party stayed with him as he died. Of course, in their defense, his companions apparently believed him to be dying, and they themselves were already being hotly pursued; however, since they were the people whom the emir trusted the most with his life, they should have stayed with him as long as he lived and then completed their escape plan. Whatever the case here, we are told that “an Armenian shepherd came past, killed him, cut off his head and took it to the Franks at Antioch.”⁷⁶ This is the second time that an Armenian is seen siding with

⁷¹ Ibn al-Athīr, *The Chronicle of Ibn al-Athīr for the Crusading Period*, part 1: *The Years 491–541/1097–1146*, translated and edited by D. S. Richards, 14–15; cf. n. 79 below.

⁷² Ibid., 210.

⁷³ Ibid., 209

⁷⁴ Asbridge, *The First Crusade: A New History*, description of photo 20 which is a similar image depicted as an engraving by the 19th century French artist Gustav Doré. Also see France, *Victory in the East*, 257–258, and n. 74 above.

⁷⁵ Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kamil fi'l-Ta'rikh (The Collection of Histories)*, X, 185–188, trans. by Gabrieli in *Arab Historians of the Crusades*, 6.

⁷⁶ Ibid., 7.

the Franks, the first time being when the Armenian armorer helped the crusaders gain access to the city. The Armenians sided with the crusaders because they were also Christians and because the Armenians had been conquered and ruled by the Muslims until Baldwin retook Edessa. Meanwhile the Muslims who remained alive under the leadership of Yaghi Siyān's son had taken to the citadel on Mount Silpius to wait for the crusaders either to leave or be killed by Kerbogha's forces when the relief army arrived.

Robert the Monk also describes the death of Yaghi Siyān in his *Historia Iherosolimitana*. Like Ibn-al Athīr, he too, records that the emir fled the city; however, he claims that he did so "disguised in squalid rags"; therefore, this could have been a way for Robert to describe his contempt for the emir.⁷⁷ At the same time, this suggests that Yaghi Siyān may have been trying to hide amongst the masses so the crusaders would not recognize him. An elite like the emir, dressing down in rags, might have had high hopes that he would go unnoticed, even as he reached the outskirts of the city. This was not to be the case, however. "He was unlucky enough to be recognized by the Armenians, and they cut his head off on the spot; they took it to the princes [crusader leaders] along with his belt, which they valued at 60 bezants."⁷⁸

The Second Siege of Antioch

The second siege of Antioch is better documented than the first siege. Both the Muslims and the Christians provide their respective religious perspectives on the events that unfolded; however, differences are sometimes found within the same groups of chroniclers. As the crusaders celebrated their success in taking Antioch, Kerbogha and his army advanced to the city. According to the Christian chronicles, his forces began to arrive on June 4, 1098, just one day after the crusaders had taken Antioch, and soon they surrounded the city with the crusaders trapped inside. Running low on supplies, the crusaders sent messengers to ask for safe passage, but Kerbogha of course refused them. Meanwhile, Peter Bartholomew, a peasant traveling with the crusaders who assumed the role of a prophet, received a series of visions from St. Andrew telling him that the Holy Lance was buried in the church of St. Peter, and that with it the crusaders would win the battle. They found the Lance and after three days of processions left the city to face Kerbogha.

The Arrival of Kerbogha's Army at Antioch

Kerbogha, the Atabeg of Mosul, should be considered the great foe of the Christians throughout the entire second siege, not merely because he was the leader of the enemy army, but rather, because his exceptional background made him perfect for the role. Rosalind Hill, editor of the *Gesta Francorum*, observes that "Kerbogha tends, therefore, to be the subject of more

⁷⁷ Robert the Monk, *Historia Iherosolimitana*, 148.

⁷⁸ Ibid., n. 5.

speculative, even fantastical, characterization than any other Muslim leader.”⁷⁹ Kerbogha had gained his power in Mosul [located in Mesopotamia] by being an astute and merciless military commander.⁸⁰ He had many motives for fighting in the First Crusade. Above all, he wanted to take Northern Syria for himself to rule.⁸¹ Far from the sole ruler of a united Muslim force, however, Kerbogha needed time to consolidate his forces and to plan his attack on the crusaders at Antioch. Thus he planned for six months before making the journey to Antioch to face his opponents. As Thomas Asbridge has observed, “They [Kerbogha’s prospective subordinates] knew that he might one day lead the Seljuq world, and they chose now to be his ally rather than his enemy.”⁸² The reason that he was able to build such a massive army from so many different Muslim factions stemmed in large part, not only from his shrewdness, but also from his intimidating demeanor and the fear that he struck in them while they were in their presence.⁸³

As mentioned above, the purpose of Kerbogha’s coming to Antioch in the first place was from a letter sent by the late Yaghi Siyān via his son, Muhammad. As Muhammad delivered the letter, the envoys “took their hats off and threw them to the ground, they savagely plucked out their beards with their nails, they pulled at and tore their hair out by the roots with their fingers, and they heaved sighs in great lamentations.”⁸⁴ This act clearly had dramatized the severity of the situation at Antioch. The second siege began with Kerbogha’s entry into the spotlight. After months of planning and gathering troops, Kerbogha’s moment in history had finally come. “The crusaders had stolen and battled their way into Antioch, but their success came not a moment too soon. On the very next day, June 4th, Kerbogha’s army began to arrive.”⁸⁵

The Battle for Control of Antioch Begins

The arrival of Kerbogha’s forces quickly changed the crusaders’ status from besiegers to besieged. As the crusaders waited out the Muslim army inside the city, they took in their surroundings. The anonymous eyewitness Norman crusader recorded that “all the squares of the city were filled with the bodies of the dead and no one could stay there because of the terrible stench. One could not walk through the city streets without treading upon the bodies of the

⁷⁹ Anonymous, *The Deeds of the Franks and the Other Pilgrims to Jerusalem*, Edited by Rosalind Hill (New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1962), 68.

⁸⁰ Asbridge, *The First Crusade: A New History*, 203.

⁸¹ Ibid.

⁸² Ibid., 204.

⁸³ Ibid.

⁸⁴ Cited in *ibid.*, 202.

⁸⁵ Ibid., 211.

slain.”⁸⁶ Though the dead littered the earth beneath their feet, there was still a twofold threat with which the crusaders had to concern themselves.



Figure 2: Modern Day Citadel of Antioch⁸⁷

Figure 2 shows the mountaintop once commanded by the citadel of Antioch. Not much of Antioch remains today, but the photo above clearly shows its formidable location. Even after the crusaders had taken the city, the anonymous Norman tells us, “the citadel of Antioch, high up on the Mount Silpius, but still within the city, was in enemy hands.”⁸⁸ The enemy [Muslims] had fled there for protection after the emir’s death. From the crusaders’ perspective, there had never been such a worrisome moment in time. Now they had to direct their attention not only to the threatening army on the outside of the walls, but also to the enemy inside the citadel as well. Meanwhile, supplies in the city were running critically low.

Dilemmas Facing the Muslim and Crusader Armies

As the struggle between these two religious armies continued, many obstacles arose for both the Muslims and the Christians. Due to the large size of the city, Antioch “presented problems to the crusaders as defenders, just as it had when they were the besiegers.”⁸⁹ By the time that the crusaders had taken Antioch from the Muslims during the first siege, they were short on supplies, physically weak, lacking man-power, and running out of hope. Now that they occupied the city, not only did the defense pose problems, but, with the city surrounded by Kerbogha’s army, the crusaders’ remaining supplies dwindled quickly. One Frankish eyewitness reminisced:

⁸⁶Anonymous, *Gesta Francorum et Aliorum Hierosolymitanorum*, VIII, 20, Edited and Translated by James A. Brundage in *The Crusades: A Documentary Survey* (Wisconsin: The Marquette University Press, 1962), 56-57.

⁸⁷ Asbridge, *The First Crusade: A New History*, photo 19, available at: erenow.com/postclassical/thefirstcrusadeanewhistorythomasasbridge/37.html, photo 19 (accessed 12 December 2016).

⁸⁸Anonymous, *Gesta Francorum et Aliorum Hierosolymitanorum*, VIII, 20, Brundage in *The Crusades: A Documentary Survey*, 57.

⁸⁹ Asbridge, *The First Crusade: A New History*, 216.

The blasphemous enemies of God kept us so closely shut up in the city of Antioch that many of us died of hunger, for a small loaf cost a bezant [a Byzantine gold coin], and I cannot tell you the price of wine. Our men ate the flesh of horses and asses; a hen cost fifteen shillings, an egg two, and a walnut a penny. All things were very dear. So terrible was the famine that men boiled and ate the leaves of figs, vines, thistles and all kinds of trees. Others stewed the dried skins of horses, camels, asses, oxen or buffaloes, which they ate.⁹⁰

It can definitely be seen that nothing was going well for the crusaders. As the amount of food diminished, the worries of the Franks increased. “The majority of the knights, expecting God’s compassion, refused to slaughter their horses but did sustain themselves with their [horses’] blood.”⁹¹ This way the knights still had a steed on which to ride into battle as well as their own lives sustained, but their horses clearly must have been weakened from the loss of blood. They sent messengers to Kerbogha seeking for “safe-conduct through his territory but he refused, saying, ‘You will have to fight your way out.’”⁹² With both a superior force and position, Kerbogha chose to await the exit of the Christians from the city.

With his arrogance running high, Kerbogha’s followers were becoming agitated. Ibn al-Athīr records that Kerbogha “angered the emirs and lorded it over them, imagining that they would stay with him despite that. However, infuriated by this, they secretly planned to betray him, if there should be a battle, and they determined to give him up when the armies clashed.”⁹³ With their plan kept between them and out of the ears of their leader, the lack of loyalty evinced here by the emirs in the end would constitute a major blow to Kerbogha and threaten his chance for victory. Meanwhile the crusaders had been fighting together for months and shared a religious faith and a cause; therefore, even if they were not unified, they were able to work together in their fight for the Lord. Kerbogha’s gigantic army, in contrast, had been put together in a hurry and from differing regions across North Syria and Mesopotamia. The unity that they needed never came nor did the strong, firm, disciplined hand required to keep the emirs in line.⁹⁴ Carole Hillenbrand has observed:

Ibn al-Qalānisi’s account of the actual battle of Antioch (26 Rajab 491/approximately 29 June 1098), when the Muslims came to recapture the city, is vague and inadequate. The relieving army of Syria besieged the Franks until ‘they were reduced to eating carrion’. His narrative then continues: “Thereafter the Franks, though they were in the extremity of weakness, advanced in battle order against the armies of Islam, which were at the height

⁹⁰ Anonymous, *Gesta Francorum*, 62-63.

⁹¹ Raymond d’Aguilers, *Historia Francorum Qui Ceperunt Iherusalem*, 59.

⁹² Gabrieli, *Arab Historians of the Crusades*, 7-8.

⁹³ Ibn al-Athir, *The Chronicle of Ibn al-Athir: for the Crusading Period*, 16.

⁹⁴ Asbridge, *The First Crusade: A New History*, 234.

of strength and numbers, and they broke the ranks of the Muslims and scattered their multitudes.” . . . The chronicler is honest enough to admit that the Muslims were numerically superior and that the Franks were weak with hunger.⁹⁵

Ibn al-Qalānisi’s account shows that the Franks’ supplies were running low and that they were so desperate for food that they had resorted to eating their horses. Even though they were physically weak, however, they would still fight and defeat the Muslim army of Kerbogha. On June 10th, the crusaders decided to attack Kerbogha before he could mount a full-scale assault on the city.

Using a small postern gate further south along the ridge of Mount Silpius they deployed a force to harry Kerbogha’s camp. The crusaders managed to drive them into a retreat, but as they began to loot the camp Kerbogha issued a counterattack on the crusaders. Those who could made a chaotic flight back to the postern gate, but as a Frankish eyewitness recalled, this ‘was so terribly strait and narrow that many of the people were trampled to death in the crowd.’⁹⁶

The crusaders had not planned on the counter-attack that Kerbogha ordered. The southern gate that the crusaders had destroyed and left was very narrow, so there was little to no room for all of the retreating crusaders to gain the city and escape Kerbogha’s counter-attack. The crusaders themselves were shocked to see the strength and cunning of the Muslim leader and his men. The relentless attacks continued for two days. At the same time, Muslim warriors poured out of the citadel to attack the crusaders from the rear. One crusader eyewitness related that “many gave up hope and hurriedly lowered themselves with ropes from the wall tops [in an attempted suicide/martyrdom because of the lack of hope they had in beating Kerbogha’s army]; and in the city soldiers returning from the encounter circulated widely a rumour that mass decapitation of the defenders was in store.”⁹⁷

The death toll was high. Panic now spread throughout the city, but also throughout the crusader forces. Asbridge concludes, “The crusader leaders were able to calm their troops only by each swearing an oath not to abandon Antioch. . . . Those who stayed somehow managed to hold their ground on Mount Silpius for four long days. In part they survived through sheer, bloody-minded determination and martial skill.”⁹⁸ By having the crusaders take an oath, they were ensuring that the men would not try to kill themselves or desert in time of war. Before swearing this oath, despondent crusaders were committing suicide by throwing themselves off of Antioch’s walls or by lowering themselves by ropes to face certain death at the hands of the Muslims. The crusaders managed to fend off Kerbogha’s attacks for the first few days; as they

⁹⁵ Hillenbrand, *The Crusades: Islamic Perspectives*, 57.

⁹⁶ Asbridge, *The First Crusade: A New History*, 216.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 217.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 218.

did so, they decided to construct a wall of defense inside of the city. The purpose of the wall was to “cut off the citadel from the rest of the city, thus lessening the immediate danger from that quarter.”⁹⁹ Military crusade historian John France observes, “The Anonymous twice refers to the building of this wall; on the first occasion after he tells us how the deserters fled to St Symeon, which would imply a date of June 11-12, 1098; the second was the day on which a meteor fell into the enemy camp, the night of June 13-14. It seems likely, however, that the wall could be built because Kerbogha changed the emphasis of his attack.”¹⁰⁰ Rather than concentrating his forces to attack strategic points, Kerbogha now decided to spread his forces out and attack the walls of the city on all sides. While this no doubt also spread the crusader forces thinly, the absence of a concentrated Muslim attack on the city allowed a handful of men to build a wall that would block any further internal attacks from the citadel.

The Finding of the Holy Lance

With both their hope of winning the battle against Kerbogha and their faith in God fading, the crusaders needed encouragement. At this critical juncture, just when all despaired, a poor Provençal Christian by the name of Peter Bartholomew stepped forward and, on 10 June 1098, declared that he had been given visions from God. These visions had been delivered to him periodically by St. Andrew, an Apostle of Jesus Christ, for more than a year.¹⁰¹ St. Andrew explained that the only way to rejuvenate the lost faith of the crusaders would be to locate the Holy Lance, also known as the Lance of Longinus because it had been used by a Roman centurion, traditionally named in medieval sources as Longinus, to pierce the side of Christ during his crucifixion. This same Holy Lance, St. Andrew revealed to Peter Bartholomew, lay buried in the Basilica of St. Peter at Antioch.¹⁰² As a relic, Catholics believed, this Holy Lance possessed the miraculous power of Christ, thus the ability to aid his followers whenever they needed Him most. It was now to be used to prevent the enemy from reclaiming Antioch. As Thomas Asbridge observed, “Of all the relics in the Christian world, an item from Christ’s own life was considered to be the most precious and powerful, so the potential significance of the Holy Lance was immeasurable.”¹⁰³ It was the power of Christ embodied within the rusty weapon which, Catholics believed, had once pierced the side of Christ that would lead the crusaders to victory against the Muslim army.

During this crucial moment in the First Crusade the religious faith and emotional state of the crusaders were in such despair that the recovery of the Holy Lance would truly have seemed a miracle, perhaps too much of one to be credible. In fact, the eyewitness Raymond of Aguilers

⁹⁹Anonymous, *Gesta Francorum et Aliorum Hierosolymitanorum*, VIII, 20, Brundage in *The Crusades: A Documentary Survey*, 57.

¹⁰⁰ John France, *Victory in the East: A Military History* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 276.

¹⁰¹ Asbridge, *The First Crusade: A New History*, 221.

¹⁰² Ibid., 222.

¹⁰³ Ibid., 222-223.

recorded that some of the crusaders refused to believe in Peter's visions and the discovery of the Holy Lance. "The Bishop [Adhémar of Le Puy] took this tale to be nothing but a story," we are told; "the Count [that is, Raymond of St. Gilles], however, believed it and put the narrator in the custody of Raymond, his chaplain."¹⁰⁴ Another eyewitness, the anonymous Norman, left us the following account in his *Gesta Francorum*:

On [the 14th of June] twelve men and Peter Bartholomew collected the appropriate tools and began to dig in the church of the Blessed Peter, following the expulsion of all other Christians . . . But the youthful Peter Bartholomew, seeing the exhaustion of our workers, stripped his outer garments and, clad only in a shirt and barefooted, dropped into the hole. He then begged us to pray to God to return His Lance to the crusaders so as to bring strength and victory to His people. Finally, in His mercy, the Lord showed his Lance and I, Raymond, author of this book, kissed the point of the Lance as it barely protruded from the ground. . . When our men [the crusaders] heard that their enemies were destined to be altogether defeated their spirits revived at once, and they began to encourage one another. . . .¹⁰⁵

Despite Peter Bartholomew's visions, after a full day of digging the crusaders still had been unable to find the Holy Lance. In the end, it had been Peter Bartholomew himself who had done so. Perhaps he knew its location from his visions; perhaps he knew it because he had buried it there himself; perhaps he had it in his hand as he jumped into the hole to continue the work of the exhausted crusaders. The truth will never be known, but whatever transpired in St. Peter's Church that day, a lance had been found and the hopes of many were reborn as a result. Perhaps it was indeed the Holy Lance, but it is just as likely that Peter Bartholomew had simply picked up a lance from the masses of dead soldiers and buried it in the ground late at night while the others present were praying for its revelation. Since the bodies of dead citizens and soldiers littered the ground of Antioch, Peter Bartholomew easily could have taken a lance from a Christian or Muslim soldier's dead body. Lances, after all, were one of the main weapons used during the crusades. Marius Kjørmo provides an interesting notion in his thesis concerning the authority attributed to the Holy Lance following the crusader victory:

The discovery of a piece of metal in the ground by a disreputable character might not have convinced everyone, but if the crusaders believed that the only reason for their unlikely victory was by the grace of God, that would be a testament to the authenticity of the Holy Lance. This would also explain why Bohemond and his Norman and northern-

¹⁰⁴ Raymond of Aguilers, in *The Crusades: A Documentary Survey* by Brundage, 60.

¹⁰⁵ Anonymous, *The Deeds of the Franks*, trans. Hill, 59-60.

French compatriots would feel the need to confront the Provençals and demand proof that the Lance was in fact real.¹⁰⁶

What makes this so interesting is that Kjørmo states that Peter Bartholomew is a “disreputable” person. Since he was a barefooted poor man and was even accused by some of lying about the Holy Lance, it is possible that he said that he had reported these “visits” by St. Andrew in order to boost his own status and credibility among the crusader leaders.

In the *Gesta Tancredi*, Raoul of Caen claims that the entire discovery of the Holy Lance was staged and was fueled by a dispute between Bohemond and Raymond. “The visions were devised by a member of Raymond’s army, a ‘versatile fabricator of lies, Peter.’ The discovery of the lance was a fraud, for the same Peter had found an Arab spear point, which was unfamiliar to the Franks by its form, and claimed in the darkness to have discovered it during the excavation in the cathedral.”¹⁰⁷ This version of the story contains several new developments. First, the lance that is found is part of an Arab lance and not a Frankish lance. Since the lance tip was foreign to the crusaders, Peter Bartholomew could have easily claimed that this was the Lance of Longinus. Raoul, however, goes on to say that Peter Bartholomew was also a liar.¹⁰⁸

In regard to Peter Bartholomew’s finding the Holy Lance, the anonymous author of the *Gesta Francorum* recorded something oddly suspicious of Peter Bartholomew. Prior to telling the crusader leaders about the visions from St. Andrew, Peter Bartholomew was visited once more. The Anonymous recorded, “But Peter, afraid to reveal the advice of the apostle, was unwilling to make it known to the pilgrims. However, he thought that he had seen a vision, and said: ‘Lord, who would believe this?’ But at this hour St. Andrew took him and carried him to the place where the Lance was hidden in the ground.”¹⁰⁹ This depicts another suspicious act by Peter Bartholomew. Had he known the exact location of the Holy Lance, then there would have been no need for the excavation to occur. His entire story is full of oddities and actions that are questionable at best. Perhaps he had truly experienced visions by St. Andrew and the lance that he discovered was the Holy Lance which once had pierced the side of Christ. And yet, by claiming to know the location of the Lance and asking everyone present to pray for him while he uncovered it, Peter would have had no trouble staging its supposed “discovery.”

The Muslim Response to the Holy Lance

The story of the Holy Lance was documented by Muslim chroniclers as well as Christian historians. In contrast to crusader accounts, the Muslim chronicler, Ibn Taghribirdi, attributes the

¹⁰⁶ Kjørmo, “The Holy Lance of Antioch,” 71.

¹⁰⁷ Raoul of Caen, paraphrased by Colin Morris in “Policy and Visions: The Case of the Holy Lance at Antioch,” in *War and Government in the Middle Ages: Essays in the Honour of J. O. Prestwich*, ed. John Gillingham and J. C. Holt (Totowa, New Jersey: The Boydell Press, 1984), 33-45 at 38.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid.

¹⁰⁹ Anonymous, *Gesta Francorum*, in *The First Crusade: The Chronicle of Fulchre of Chartres and Other Source Materials* edited by Edward Peters (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press), 214.

find not to Peter Bartholomew's visions, but rather, to Raymond of St. Gilles, Count of Toulouse. According to Ibn Taghribirdi, Raymond, the cunning and sly (but also, as known from the crusader sources, deeply pious) leader of the Franks, arranged a ruse with a monk [Peter Bartholomew] by commanding him, "Go and bury this lance in such-and-such a place. Then tell the Franks afterward, 'I saw the Messiah in a dream saying, "In such-and-such a place there is a lance buried, so go and look for it, for if you find it the victory is yours. It is my lance.'" So they fasted for three days [beginning on June 25, 1098] and prayed and gave alms and went out to the Muslims, and they fought them until they drove them out of the town."¹¹⁰ Clearly Ibn Taghribirdi was trying to attribute the find and subsequent Muslim defeat to crusader falsehood. Both the Christians and the Muslims, in fact, record that the crusaders processed barefoot publicly and fasted for three days after finding the Holy Lance in order to regain their spiritual faith.

The Muslim chronicler Ibn al-Athīr explains that the "Muslims said to Kerbuqa [*sic*]: 'You should go up to the city and kill them one by one as they come out; it is easy to pick them off now that they have split up. He replied: 'No, wait until they have all come out and then we will kill them.'"¹¹¹ His ill-advised response did not sit well with those who followed him, for they knew that this would allow the crusaders to assemble in full battle formation before beginning their attack. "When all the Franks had come out and not one was left in Antioch," Ibn al-Athīr reported, "they began to attack strongly, and the Muslims turned and fled. This was Kerbuqa's fault, first because he had treated the Muslims with such contempt and scorn, and second because he had prevented their killing the Franks."¹¹² Thus the chronicler's explanation for the Muslim defeat differs considerably from that of the *Gesta Francorum*, even though many of the details of the story are found in the sources of both sides.

Embassy of Peter the Hermit to Kerbogha

Oddly, following the discovery of the Holy Lance on June 14th, the crusaders undertook no assault for two weeks. Not until June 28th did the now-famous encounter between the two sides take place. Thomas Asbridge wrote, "No evidence survives to indicate that the crusaders were actively prevented from initiating military action against their Muslim besiegers between 14 and 28 June."¹¹³ Unclear even today is exactly why the crusaders waited two weeks before attacking the Muslims. Perhaps they simply needed time to recover from the days of ambush and attack that had preceded the discovery of the Lance. No doubt, too, their forces had been reduced by several hundred crusaders during the assault on the city. If they accepted the authority of the Holy Lance and Peter Bartholomew's account of his visions by St. Andrew, however, it did not

¹¹⁰ Ibid., 314.

¹¹¹ Gabrieli, *The Arab Historians of the Crusades*, 8.

¹¹² Ibid., 8.

¹¹³ Thomas Asbridge, *The Holy Lance: Power, Devotion and Memory on the First Crusade*, [https://www.reading.ac.uk/web/files/GCMS/RMS-2007-01 T. Asbridge, The Holy Lance of Antioch.pdf](https://www.reading.ac.uk/web/files/GCMS/RMS-2007-01_T._Asbridge_The_Holy_Lance_of_Antioch.pdf) (accessed 10 December 2016), 11.

make sense for the crusaders to have waited to fight Kerbogha. After all, they had run out of supplies and famine and disease were already killing many of the crusaders and their horses. They were nearing the end, and only by one last valiant effort could they still be saved.¹¹⁴

At least some skepticism about the Holy Lance remained, however. Even though *a* lance had been found, the all-important question of whether or not this lance was *the* Lance that had pierced the side of Jesus during his Crucifixion remained. One reason that some of the crusaders [including Bishop Adhémar] had refused to believe Peter's story when they had first heard it was because in 1097 the bishop had personally seen what was ostensibly the Holy Lance on display in Constantinople. Clearly only one of these lances (if even that) could be authentic.¹¹⁵ Still, most of the crusaders accepted its authenticity, perhaps because of their faith in visions and the power of relics, perhaps because they had little else in which to hope. The discovery of the Lance restored their faith, which ultimately translated into a miraculous victory over the Muslim army. As historian Hans Eberhard Mayer noted, "The immediate effects of the discovery were enormous. The army's morale was raised and all were united in urgent determination to break the blockade and destroy Kerbogha."¹¹⁶ But if that was the case, why did the crusaders not surge out of Antioch to attack Kerbogha's army on June 15th?

In Albert of Aachen's account, there is a new event that is brought center stage. During the two-week interim, even though they were short on supplies, the crusaders sent an embassy led by Peter the Hermit to Kerbogha in the hope of reaching some sort of agreement. Peter the Hermit reportedly opened with the following message:

Karbugha [sic], most renowned and glorious prince in your kingdom, I am the messenger of Duke Godfrey, Bohemond, and the princes of the entire Christian multitude: do not scorn to listen to their decisions and advice which I am carrying. The leaders of the Christian army have decided that if you will consent to believe in Lord Christ who is the true God and son of God, and will renounce gentile superstitions, they will become your soldiers and, restoring the estate of Antioch into your hands, they are prepared to serve you as lord and prince.¹¹⁷

By this message the crusaders were saying that if Kerbogha and his men would convert to Christianity then the crusaders would become their allies. They would be willing to fight with the Muslims against whatever enemies that they encountered (which presumably might have included Byzantium). By saying that they would serve him as their superior meant that they were willing to serve him as if he were one of their own. "Karbugha [sic] scorned to listen to this,

¹¹⁴ Ibid., 12.

¹¹⁵ Ibid., 5.

¹¹⁶ Hans Eberhard Mayer, *The Crusades*, trans. John Bennett Gillingham (London: Oxford University Press, 1972), p. 52. Cf. Rosalind Hill's comments in the Introduction to *The Deeds of the Franks and the other Pilgrims to Jerusalem*, xxxiv.

¹¹⁷ Albert of Aachen, *History of the Journey to Jerusalem*, 166.

much less to do it. Indeed he instructed Peter the Hermit in his sacrilegious rites and the doctrines of the gentiles, declaring that he would never give them up.”¹¹⁸ Thus Kerbogha countered by trying to convert Peter the Hermit to Islam. Finally, Peter revealed an alternative proposal from the crusaders:

“It still seems,” he said, “to the Christian princes, that since you are reluctant to have such eminent men put under you, and you refuse to become a Christian, you should choose twenty young knights from your multitude, and the Christians will do the same, and, with hostages given on both sides, and an oath sworn on both sides—you in your God, they in theirs—they should join you in single combat in the middle. And if the Christians do not obtain victory they will return to their own lands peacefully and without injury, restoring Antioch to you. If, though, your men are unable to triumph, you and yours will withdraw peacefully from the siege, leaving the city and land to us, and you will not allow so great an army to perish in fighting one another.”¹¹⁹

Kerbogha then instructed Peter the Hermit to relay the following message to his leaders:

“Know one thing, Peter, that the Christians should choose, namely to send all their unbearded youth to us, as slaves to me and my lord the king of Khurasan, and we shall bestow on them great favours and gifts. Similarly girls who are still virgins shall have access to us, and permission to live. But men with beards or any grey hair are for beheading, with the married women. Otherwise I shall spare no one on grounds of age, but shall destroy them all by the sword, whom moreover I shall wrap in chains and iron fetters.”¹²⁰

There was no way that Kerbogha planned on giving up Antioch to the crusaders without a fight. The young men that the crusaders were to hand over would be personal slaves to his leaders and him; however, the virgins would most likely be raped and used as sex slaves or child brides for the men. The enslaved boys might receive the gift of life rather than any actual favors or material gifts but there is no way that a slave would be given riches. Those who were older than the preferred slaves would be slain. The married women would be murdered to prevent any children who could grow up to destroy the Muslim army. If they refused to agree to his terms, the crusaders would die fighting against Kerbogha’s army. Needless to say, Kerbogha’s message gave the crusaders ample reason to fear and worry. Their leaders decided that the knights and local residents should not learn what had transpired between the two sides. They thus had no knowledge of the conversation that had taken place between Peter the Hermit and Kerbogha.

¹¹⁸ Ibid.

¹¹⁹ Ibid., 167.

¹²⁰ Ibid.

A Crusader Victory: End of the Second Siege of Antioch

On June 25, 1098, the crusaders began their three days of processions from church to church, fasting and confessing their sins to the members of the clergy, and celebrating the Eucharist.¹²¹ Meanwhile, Kerbogha resided at his camp and began to create another plan of attack on the crusaders even as a member of Kerbogha's army brought him several weapons of deceased Franks.

As he sat on his throne, they brought him a Frankish sword which was in abysmal condition, blunt and covered in filthy rust. They also brought a lance in equally bad state—indeed it made the sword look good in comparison. When Kerbogha saw these, he said: 'Who can tell us where these arms were found? And why have they been brought into our presence?' . . . Kerbogha smiled and said: 'It is quite obvious that these people are completely mad. If they think they can conquer the Kingdom of Persia for themselves with this kind of weapons they are not in their right minds.'¹²²

The lance that was brought to Kerbogha suggests the possibility that the Holy Lance, later found by the Christians, was just a normal lance after all. Lances were common weapons used in the Middle Ages, and they were not difficult to make. The weapons from the dead Franks were either from the counter-attack that Kerbogha had led after the crusaders had ransacked his camp, or perhaps they were left from the first siege. There is no response to any of the rhetorical questions that the Muslim Army leader has asked. Upon seeing these Frankish weapons, Kerbogha became filled with even greater arrogance and contempt for the crusaders than that which he already possessed. This hubris led him to conclude that his enemies stood no chance against him whatsoever, a false sense of security clearly reinforced by the finding of the rusty weapons.

Meanwhile, the crusaders prepared for three days with prayers and processions to ensure God's favor in the forthcoming battle. Just to be sure, however, as they were preparing to leave the city for battle, the Catholic clergy came out carrying crosses and praying for the victory of the crusaders, as well as blessing the men with the Sign of the Cross. "So we closed our ranks, and, protected by the Sign of the Cross, we went out by the gate which is over against the mosque."¹²³ Raymond of Toulouse carried the Holy Lance into battle at the front of the crusaders' ranks.

As the crusaders began exiting the city to face Kerbogha and his troops, a few Muslims attacked and killed some of them. This went against Kerbogha's orders, and so he personally stopped them from doing any more damage to their enemy. As noted above, he felt that their

¹²¹ Asbridge, *The First Crusade: A New History*, 232.

¹²² Robert the Monk, *Robert the Monk's Historia Iherosolimitana*, 153.

¹²³ Anonymous, *The Deeds of the Franks and the other Pilgrims to Jerusalem*, 68.

efforts would be more successful if they waited for the crusaders to exit the city and then attacked the crusaders all at one time. The emirs under his leadership, however, felt otherwise.

The crusaders rallied their troops and formed their battle lines. Kerbogha finally went out to meet his enemies, but he was compelled to do so, for the most part, alone, for only a handful of his Muslim warriors stood with him. Those who did were mercenaries or members of his previous armies. Some of Kerbogha's army fled in terror as the crusaders attacked while those who had planned to betray him carried out their plan. When the crusaders attacked, they seized the opportunity to abandon Kerbogha and his abusive ways. Astounded, the crusaders watched the enemy flee in a confused state, but they rejected the temptation to follow their fleeing enemies out of fear of a possible Muslim trap. "The only Muslims to stand firm were a detachment of warriors from the Holy Land, who fought to acquire merit in God's eyes and to seek martyrdom."¹²⁴ As the final Muslims were either being killed or fleeing the Christians, "Karbogha [Kerbogha] fled with them."¹²⁵ Amazingly, the crusaders, who believed they were going towards their deaths, in fact had won the battle. Kerbogha had fled the battlefield, losing his possessions but retaining his life.

As they left, the Crusaders prepared themselves for an attack from the citadel; however, just as before (during the beginning of the sieges) there was no attack. "Within hours the Muslim garrison of Antioch's citadel surrendered and the whole city was at last truly and safely in Latin Hands. The significance of the Great Battle of Antioch cannot be over-stressed. It was, without doubt, the single most important military engagement of the entire expedition."¹²⁶

A True Victory for the Crusaders?

According to both sides of the spectrum, the crusaders should have lost this battle. The only way that the Christians could have won the battle was purely by a miracle. Al-'Azimi, a contemporary of the Arab historian, Ibn al-Qalānisi, places the blame on the Muslims for their loss of the city of Antioch. "They [the Franks] were extremely weak and the Muslims were strong. The Muslims were defeated, because of the evil of their intentions."¹²⁷ Once the crusaders marched from the city, Kerbogha had no desire to meet them head on. If he had been paying any sort of attention to his enemies, rather than staying "in his tent playing chess," and if he had been more receptive to the strategies and advice of his subordinates, then the battle might have resulted in a far different outcome.¹²⁸ So although they might not have known it as they left the city and formed their ranks, the odds were actually in the crusaders' favor. The addition of the clergy carrying crosses and praying for victory while blessing the men with the Sign of the Cross only added to the crusaders' confidence and prospects for victory.

¹²⁴ Gabrieli, *Arab Historians of the Crusades*, 9.

¹²⁵ Ibid., 17.

¹²⁶ Ibid., 239; France, *Victory in the East*, 297.

¹²⁷ Hillenbrand, *The Crusades: Islamic Perspectives*, 57.

¹²⁸ Asbridge, *The First Crusade: A New History*, 236.

Clearly the crusaders' faith had been "replenished" after Peter Bartholomew found the Holy Lance. Had Christ helped the crusaders find it in order that they might win the battle? Or did Peter Bartholomew place the Lance where the crusaders were digging on purpose? The truth can never be known to modern historians because the only people that would know are part of history itself. From the lack of evidence, however, one can speculate, much like the Muslim chroniclers had done, that the lance discovered was not that of Longinus, but simply a regular lance that had been found by Peter Bartholomew. Later that same summer (in early August 1098), Raymond d'Aguilers reports, the now-deceased Bishop Adhémar, who had recanted of his former doubts and accepted the Lance's authenticity, was buried in the floor of the Basilica of St. Peter at the very spot where the lance had been found. Two days after his death, the bishop appeared to Peter Bartholomew. Thomas Asbridge pointed out the brilliance of the reconstructed history here. "The physical fusion of the two cults—a masterstroke of manipulation—was reinforced once Peter began relaying the bishop's 'words' from beyond the grave, revealing that Adhémar now recognized the authenticity of the Lance and that his soul had been severely punished for the sin of having doubted the relic"¹²⁹ Later Christian sources even depicted Adhémar as having carried the Lance into battle.¹³⁰ A few months after Adhémar's death, however, Peter Bartholomew felt compelled once again to defend the authenticity of the Holy Lance by undergoing an ordeal of trial by fire, as a result of which he died twelve days later.¹³¹ So the controversy over the authenticity of the Holy Lance remains, though the resulting crusader victory at Antioch is beyond dispute.

Conclusion

The purpose and progress of the first and second sieges of Antioch have been analyzed by modern historians through the perspectives of various chroniclers, but there has never been a full explanation for the outcome. The first siege of Antioch, however, holds clues that can help clarify the siege that followed. As the crusaders traveled to the city of Antioch from Constantinople, they had to fight several battles before facing Yaghi Siyān and his men. By taking Antioch the crusaders would be one step closer to regaining Jerusalem. By conquering Antioch, the crusaders also would reinstate their right to control the birthplace of Christianity; controlling Antioch once again would restore its place as a Christian city, as it had been centuries earlier when it had been a Metropolitan. With Antioch's walls and defenses in their sights, however, the crusaders needed to find a way inside. They did this by bribing an Armenian armorer named Ruzbah with money and land. He provided them with access to ladders and allowed the Christian crusaders to enter the city and take Yaghi Siyān by surprise. Knowing that he held little chance of defeating the army with greater numbers and amidst the panic that seized

¹²⁹ Asbridge, "The Holy Lance of Antioch," 22-23.

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*, 24-25.

¹³¹ *Ibid.*, 23.

the residents of the city, the emir of Antioch then fled, which inevitably led to his death. This allowed the crusaders to take the city rather easily; however, once news of Kerbogha's approaching relief army filled their ears, they realized the folly of their actions and the desperateness of their situation. Meanwhile, inside the walls of Antioch the crusaders wasted no time in slaughtering its Muslim residents. Men, women, children, scholars, the elderly—it mattered not to the crusaders whom they killed, so long as they could obtain their goal. Thus Muslims who might have been able to provide historical documentation of the conquest were presumably slain during the first siege.

With regard to the second siege, it seems clear that the Christian army, starving and growing weaker by the day in body and faith, should never have won the battle against Kerbogha's army. To the Muslim chroniclers, the crusaders' reliance upon the Holy Lance reflected proof that Christianity was a blind and shallow faith. The Christian historians, on the other hand, saw things differently, yet even they did not agree on the Lance's authenticity. What was clear, however, was the impact of its discovery upon the morale of the crusaders. However they might have appeared to the Muslims and even to us today, relics constituted an important component of the medieval Christian faith. Beyond the faith factor, whenever one is in great danger or filled with excitement, adrenaline pulsates through the body and allows the person (or people) to perform actions that he might not otherwise be able to accomplish. Additionally, in this case, the religious motivational speeches, prayers, and processions of the Christian leaders, coupled with the belief of many in the power of the Holy Lance, reinvigorated the crusaders and gave them the courage to face Kerbogha with little to no fear. The consequences were enormous, as Carole Hillenbrand has observed. Indeed, without a victory at Antioch it would be hard to imagine the retaking of Jerusalem or any subsequent crusades.

The real reason for the Crusader victory at Antioch is much more prosaic. Behind the bland statements that, even though the Crusaders were hungry and weak and the Muslims were numerically strong, the Crusaders somehow managed to win the day, is the unpalatable truth that this was probably *the* turning point for the First Crusade. The Muslim commanders of Syria came together to relieve Antioch but in the decentralised political climate of the day they were unable even to stay together long enough to achieve victory.¹³²

Ibn Taghribirdi, on the other hand, attributed the Muslim defeat to the Egyptian Fatimids. He specifically blamed “al-Afdal, the vizier of Egypt, for not sending out the Fatimid armies to join the Syrian commanders: I do not know the reason for his not sending them out, [what] with his strength in money . . .”¹³³ If Kerbogha had been a better leader in kindness and mind, however, the Muslims still might have been the victors. Clearly “disunity and infighting underlay

¹³² Hillenbrand, *The Crusades: Islamic Perspectives*, 59.

¹³³ Ibid.

this Muslim defeat, against all expectations and against distinctly underwhelming odds, outside Antioch.”¹³⁴

From the First Crusade, and especially from the two Sieges of Antioch, there are lessons to be learned for us living today. As in the eleventh century, we still have Muslim and Christian persecution. If both religions could set aside their hatred, both past and present, they would see that they share many similarities and goals. Another lesson to be learned for Christians and Muslims today would be that it is important to study both sides of the story because each side will leave out important details; on the other hand, it is impossible for one side to know the entire chain of events from the other’s perspective.

¹³⁴ Ibid., 58.

The South Bend Fugitive Slave Case: How Varying Attitudes Towards Slavery Affected the Outcome

Claire Harvey

Despite being fairly sparsely populated, the Ohio River and the river towns along its shores were booming centers of social and economic activity in the mid-nineteenth century. Beyond the surface, however, the Ohio River was an integral point of location for the Underground Railroad.¹ John Norris, a Kentucky slave owner residing on the banks of the Ohio River across from Lawrenceburg, Indiana, probably knew this all too well, for his slaves were prone to cross the river from time to time. In 1847, some of Norris's slaves were successful in reaching the Indiana, possibly by crossing the Ohio state line at Cincinnati, Ohio, and from there they eventually journeyed on to Michigan. It was not until two years later that Norris caught up with them and attempted to take his fugitive slaves back to Kentucky. In what became known as the "South Bend Fugitive Cases," John Norris petitioned to reclaim the escaped slaves. This case was not just a controversial litigation; it also exposed the impact of local cultural attitudes towards slavery at the time upon the outcomes of legal proceedings. The South Bend Fugitive Slave Case involved two individual judges, each of whom examined the evidence and rendered quite a different judgment. One case took place in South Bend in front of the Probate Judge of St. Joseph County, Hon. Elisha Egbert.² The second case, which was a lawsuit filed by John Norris, took place in Indianapolis, Indiana, in front of the Circuit Court of the United States with U.S. Supreme Court Justice John McLean presiding over it.³ By examining the proceedings of each judge, one can identify how perspectives of justice and judicial objectivity differed as a result of local community influence. Strong abolitionist views present in South Bend affected the outcome of the case there, and ultimately affected the destiny of the defendants.

Abolitionist vs. Proslavery

The mid-nineteenth century attitudes toward slavery were complex. No matter the location, one would have found a variety of opinion over slavery. This often led to heated discussions between individuals in the form of books, speeches, essays, sermons, lectures, and editorials. According to Gilbert Osofsky, the literature on these debates is far from lacking. After analyzing the various forms of these debates, Osofsky found that three main themes were most prevalent in the literature related to the slavery issue. These themes typically divided abolitionists from the proponents of slavery. Such themes looked at the condition of slavery in the eyes of God, the

¹ J. Blaine Hudson, *Fugitive Slaves and the Underground Railroad in the Kentucky Borderland* (Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland & Company Inc., 2002), 103.

² *The South Bend Fugitive Slave Case, Involving the Right to a Writ of Habeas Corpus* (New York: Anti-Slavery Office, 1851), retrieved from the Library of Congress, <https://www.loc.gov/item/10034367/> (accessed July 27, 2016), 2.

³ "Important Decision," *Richmond Weekly Palladium*, 19 June 1850, p. 2, col. 1.

condition of slavery in the institution of American democracy, and the condition of slavery based upon a genetic or biological superiority of whites over blacks.⁴

The evangelical abolitionist Theodore Dwight Weld, a strong believer that slavery was an offense against God and the Bible, often testified that slavery was the worst form of sin. Weld and his followers spent their lives trying to spread their doctrine and convince their listeners of the evils of slavery. Weld preached the message that non-slaveholding Christians were just as guilty as slaveholders if they remained silent on the issue.⁵ On the other side of this debate was Reverend B. M. Palmer. Although Palmer and Weld were both reading from the Bible, they held radically different interpretations of the biblical teaching on slavery. Palmer interpreted the Bible to say that blacks were destined to be servants for all time because they were the “cursed descendants of Ham.” He also claimed that whites had been created separately from blacks and, further, that the serpent who had tricked Eve in the Garden of Eden had been one of these black men. Palmer insisted that “God entrusted the care of ‘the black race’ to Southern slaveholders.”⁶ These two “educated” men provide examples of how attitudes toward slavery could be swayed by particular interpretations of Christian theology, which served as a guiding force in this time and influenced opinions of both abolitionists and slaveholders. Indeed, during the 1830s-1840s the Presbyterian, Methodist, and Baptist churches each split into northern and southern regional churches as a result of their radically different views on this very issue.

The second debate focused on the legitimacy of slavery as an institution of the American Democracy. How could leaders of the United States proclaim that it was a country of freedom if it permitted slavery? Our Founding Fathers, of course, had written and signed the Constitution in order to give liberties to themselves. They were not particularly bothered with the question about whether slaves should have freedoms because this was not an issue that mattered to them at the time. A number of them, including Thomas Jefferson, opposed slavery on moral grounds and later emancipated at least some of their slaves, yet their attitudes remained ambivalent.⁷ The assertion that all men had been created equal, however, was an important topic of discussion for abolitionists. How could the United States say one thing and do another? Proslavery advocates also had a problem with the Constitution, for they did not believe that all men had been created equal. Instead, they argued that slavery had existed throughout history and that slaves comprised an essential part of the workforce in any thriving society. The only reason there were no white slaves was because there were already sufficient numbers of black slaves. In the Bible, Abraham had a slave woman and St. Paul ordered the runaway slave Philemon to return to his master. Proslavery advocates also argued that slaves were property, rather than human beings, and that

⁴ Gilbert Osofsky, *The Burden of Race: A Documentary History of Negro-White Relations in America* (New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1967), 86.

⁵ Ibid., 87.

⁶ Ibid., 90.

⁷ Ibid., 95.

their owners' rights were protected by the U.S. Constitution.⁸ Such radically different interpretations of the U.S. Constitution in the mid-nineteenth century led people to question the state of American democracy.

The final theme that Osofsky found to be debated between abolitionists and proslavery was whether blacks were racially inferior to whites. Many abolitionists regarded blacks as an infant race that needed more time to grow before they could be judged in relation to whites. They were not being given a fair enough chance to prove that they were not inferior. In order for blacks to show that they were as worthy a race as whites, their chains would have to be broken and they would have to be granted the same liberties as whites.⁹ Proslavery advocates, of course, saw this quite differently. They believed scientific proof established that blacks were biologically inferior. They regarded the human race not as a single race, but rather, as one separated into different species. Just as an owl differs from an eagle, so too a black person differs from a white. The proslavery scientists were brought in to prove which human "species" is inferior to the other based upon the size of a brain. These scientists concluded that the brains of blacks were significantly smaller on average than those of whites. Thus blacks must be the inferior species.¹⁰

The most important aspect to take away from these three debates between slavery supporters and abolitionists is that an individual's biases often exert a strong impact upon his or her fundamental assumptions. This helps explain why abolitionists could come at the issue of slavery from a very different perspective than proslavery advocates, and reach completely opposite conclusions. Of course, such debates raged at the time not only between individuals, but also within local communities. The fact that the initial hearing of the South Bend Fugitive Slave Case took place in a small courtroom in front of Judge Egbert from the probate court likely had a significant impact on the case's outcome. Elisha Egbert was a part of the Portage Township of St. Joseph County community.¹¹ Although there is no way of knowing for sure, his decision in the case may have been swayed by the strong abolitionist opinions of his fellow community members. Perhaps he held strong abolitionist views himself, but whatever the case there, he was certainly acquainted with many of these community leaders, and we know for certain is that the South Bend community had many abolitionist residents who became embroiled in the South Bend Fugitive Slave Case.

The Fugitive Slave Law of 1793 vs. The Fugitive Slave Law of 1850

The Fugitive Slave Laws of 1793 and 1850 are important to these cases because they would have been the laws that the judges of the cases looked at when deciding a verdict. The very first case that was brought in front of Judge Egbert in 1849 and also the first suit brought in the Seventh

⁸ Ibid., 99.

⁹ Ibid., 101-103.

¹⁰ Osofsky, *The Burden of Race*, 105-106.

¹¹ 1850 United States Census, Portage, St. Joseph County, Indiana, digital image s.v. "Elisha Egbert," *Ancestry.com*.

Harvey

Circuit Court in 1849 would have used the law of 1793, while the final lawsuits that were brought in the Circuit Court of Judge McLean in the fall of 1850 would have subject to the law of 1850. Not only would these two laws be important factors, but the judges also would have had the recent U.S. Supreme Court Case of *Prigg v. Pennsylvania* to consider.

In 1793, the first fugitive slave law was put into effect. The portion that is important to the South Bend Fugitive Slave Case is the section that tackles how a fugitive slave should be brought back to the place from which he or she supposedly escaped. The law stated that the individual claiming a fugitive slave who was residing outside of his owner's state to be his could capture him or her and take him or her back to the owner's home state as long as he had a certificate that allowed the removal of that slave. A judge or magistrate would issue the certificate if he found that there was sufficient proof that they were, in fact, fugitive slaves. This became extremely important to the South Bend Fugitive case; indeed, it supplied the basis for how the outcome of the case was decided and whether or not the claimed fugitive slaves were to be set free. Another part of the law of 1793 that would prove to be important to the South Bend lawsuit was the portion that stated that any person who was proven to have aided the fugitives in their escape could be sued for a penalty of \$500, payable to the owner of the slave(s). In the fall of 1850, John Norris would sue various members of the South Bend community who had aided his slaves in the Seventh Circuit Court in an attempt to collect this additional penalty in addition to recovering damages for the loss of his slaves.¹² In the end, however, he would fail to recover the penalty from the defendants because, under the 1850 Fugitive Slave Law which had recently been enacted, the \$500 reward was no longer to be offered. Instead, those who aided escaping slaves were now subject to a fine or imprisonment.

The Fugitive Slave Law of 1793 was put to the test in 1842 with the case of *Prigg v. Pennsylvania*. Slave owner, Edward Prigg, tried to take a black woman named Morgan, whom he claimed to be a fugitive slave, out of the state of Pennsylvania and back to his home without a proper certificate issued by a judge or magistrate. Lacking the proper documentation, Prigg was first taken to court and convicted of kidnapping, a conviction that Prigg appealed all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court. The Supreme Court reversed Prigg's conviction and, furthermore, in the majority opinion stated that "masters had a common law right of reception, and they could thus seize their slaves without any legal proceedings, as long as they did it without any breach of the peace."¹³ Now Southerners could claim any black as a fugitive slave and remove them without going to a judge as long as they did so in a manner that complied with court limitations on public behavior. The outcome of this Supreme Court case would have been in the back of the minds of both Judge Egbert and Judge McLean (who issued the dissenting opinion in *Prigg v. Pennsylvania*), and no doubt exerted an impact upon the two different outcomes of the South Bend cases.

¹² *Encyclopedia of African American History 1619-1895: From the Colonial Period to the Age of Frederick Douglass*, vo. 2, Oxford University Press, s.v. "Fugitive Slave Law of 1793," 72.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 73.

In 1850, the Fugitive Slave Law of 1793 was amended and the Fugitive Slave Law of 1850 was passed on September 18, 1850. The 1850 Fugitive Slave Law made it easier for Southerners to claim and transport a slave back to his home, so that henceforth it did not really matter whether he was a freed black or a fugitive slave. Every county in the United States now had an appointed commissioner whose job it was to enforce this new fugitive law. The commissioners had the power to hold hearings and give out certificates of removal of blacks out of state. The commissioners could also call for U.S. marshals and the U.S. military as a means of enforcement of the law. This new law also stated that any person who interfered with the law could be fined or jailed, thus making the aiding of fugitive slaves a criminal offense. The law was also specific about how fugitive slaves should behave in court. Slaves were prohibited from testifying before the commissioner, and the only ways in which they could have an attorney represent them was if they could pay for one themselves, or, alternatively, if one volunteered to represent them. Even the way that the commissioner was paid worked against the fugitive's favor.¹⁴ "The commissioners were to be paid by the claimants, receiving five dollars if they held against a claimant but ten dollars if they found in the claimant's favor and ordered the black returned to slavery."¹⁵ All of these prejudiced aspects of the Fugitive Slave Law of 1850 made life harder for freed blacks as well as for fugitive slaves. They lived in constant fear of being seized by Southerners and forced back into slavery. Such biased laws were predisposed to favor slave owners, but in John Norris's case, both the first trial in South Bend and the second trial in the Seventh Circuit Court were concluded prior to the enactment of this law. Only the final lawsuits to collect a \$500 penalty under the 1793 law from each of those accused of having aided in the escape of the Powells were filed after the new law had been enacted.

The South Bend Fugitive Slave Case

The story of the South Bend Fugitive Slave Case begins with slave owner, John Norris, and his slaves, the Powell Family, who lived on the banks of the Ohio River in Boone County, Kentucky, on the south side of the Ohio River across from Lawrenceburg, Indiana. Norris had a total of six slaves—Lucy and David Powell together with their four sons, Lewis, George, James, and Samuel. Norris had allowed some of his land to be cultivated and harvested by the Powell family to keep for themselves, and would on occasion allow them to cross the river to Lawrenceburg, Indiana, to sell their crops for money of their own. However, despite this leniency, and possibly because of it, late on the night on October 9, 1847, David and his family set off for the North, using the Underground Railroad, escaping first to Indiana and eventually settling in Michigan. It took until the next morning for the escape to be discovered and an alarm to be given. Norris and a party of about forty men set out to find the family. After two months their party was still far behind, and had only found a few articles of clothing that had belonged to

¹⁴ Ibid., 74.

¹⁵ Ibid., 74-75.

Harvey

the Powells. Discouraged, Norris and his men eventually gave up the pursuit.¹⁶ About two years later, however, Norris received information that the family was in Cass County, Michigan. With this new information, Norris and a group of eight men set out once again in search of the fugitive slaves.¹⁷ Eventually, on September 27, 1849 Norris and his group of men found and forcibly entered the new home of the Powell family. The extent of the violence that went on during the capture depended upon who told the story. According to Lucy Powell, Norris and his armed men violently broke into her house and threatened the entire household.¹⁸ According to Norris, however, he and his men had peacefully arrived at the house, informed the Powells that they had come to take them back to Kentucky, upon which the younger boys and Lucy had all expressed a willingness to return to Kentucky with little objection.¹⁹ At the time, David and his son Samuel were away from the household, but Lucy and their other three sons were still there. The Powells' oldest son, Lewis, had just recently married and now was forcibly separated from his new wife. Norris and his men immediately took custody of Lucy and her three sons, bound and placed them in a covered wagon, and set off for Kentucky, traveling through the state of Indiana.²⁰

Local residents of the Michigan community in which the Powells had been residing, having learned of their abduction, quickly took up pursuit of Norris and the Powells. One of these pursuers was a neighbor of the family, Mr. Wright Mauldin, an active member of the Underground Railroad in Michigan who had aided in other daring escapes away from slavery. Mauldin, along with the Powells' family lawyer, Edwin B. Crocker, and other local members of the South Bend community, were successful in overtaking Norris's wagon just outside of the city of South Bend, Indiana, and stopped them from moving on any farther. Mauldin drafted, signed, and swore to a petition for a writ of *habeas corpus*, asserting that Lucy and her children were free blacks who had been kidnapped in Michigan and were now being deprived of their liberty illegally "under the pretense that they were fugitive slaves."²¹ Hon. Elisha Egbert, Probate Judge of St. Joseph County, Indiana, with special authorization to issue and try writs of *habeas corpus*, issued the writ demanding that Norris deliver the abducted Powell family members to the court and show valid reason for their detention. Deputy Sheriff Russell Day, accompanied by several armed local citizens, went in search of Norris and his men and the captives to serve the writ. Norris and his group, it seems, were sufficiently intimidated by Deputy Sheriff Day and his men that they agreed to halt their trek back to Kentucky long enough for a trial to be convened to

¹⁶ *History of St. Joseph County, Indiana* (Chicago: Chas. C. Chapman & Co., 1880), 618.

¹⁷ John McLean, Circuit Court of the United States, *Reports of Cases Argued and Decided in the Circuit Court of the United States, For the Seventh Circuit*, vol. 5 (Cincinnati: H.W. Derby & Co., 1855), 92-106 at 93.

¹⁸ Paul Finkelman, "'The Law, and Not Conscience, Constitutes the Rule of Action': The South Bend Fugitive Slave Case and the Value of 'Justice Delayed,'" *The Constitution, Law, and American Life: Critical Aspects of the Nineteenth-Century Experience*, ed. Donald G. Nieman (Athens & London: University of Georgia Press, 1992), 25.

¹⁹ McLean, *Reports of Cases*, 93-94.

²⁰ *The South Bend Fugitive Slave Case*, 1-2.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 2; Carol E. Mull, *The Underground Railroad in Michigan* (Jefferson, North Carolina, and London: McFarland & Company, Inc., Publishers, 2010), 62.

investigate Norris's claim that the Powells were his slaves. Meanwhile, a cautious Norris insisted that his captives be held securely in jail until he could obtain counsel.²²

As word spread around town that there were kidnappers of free blacks within the town's vicinity, anxiety and fear spread throughout the community. Hundreds of Cass County neighbors arrived in South Bend for the hearing in support of the Powell family. Norris hired two prominent lawyers from northern Indiana, Messrs. Liston and Stanfield, to present his defense, while Messrs. Deavitt and Crocker volunteered to represent the Powells.²³ Working with his lawyers, Norris returned the following writ to the court:

I John Norris the person to whom the within writ is directed, do hereby return the same, as commanded with the within-named persons in my custody, that I am a resident of Boone County, Kentucky, that the within-named persons are my slaves according to the laws of Kentucky, and are my property according to the laws of said State, that I have a just claim to the services of the within-named persons, agreeably to the laws of said State, and that said persons named in the within writ, sometime in the month of October, 1847, absconded and fled from my service in said State, and fled and took refuge in the State of Michigan, where I found them on the 27th instant, and then and there arrested them as fugitives from labor, and took them into my custody, and I am now on my journey proceeding to Boone County, in the State of Kentucky, with the within-named persons as my own slaves and property, as such fugitives from labor.²⁴

Arguments by both sides continued until nightfall as to whether or not Norris should be allowed to take his slaves back to Kentucky, or whether instead, as the captives' attorneys argued, he had failed to meet the provisions of the Federal law of 1793. The entire courthouse was filled with spectators who were anxious to learn the decision of Judge Egbert. When the decision was read that the Powell family be ordered to be released, the courthouse buzzed with excitement. The judge ruled that, under the Federal law of 1793, Norris did not have a certificate that was required by the act of Congress for him legally to hold his captives and transport them through a state other than the state in which he had found them. Since Norris had found the Powells in Michigan but was now transporting them through Indiana, the law required him to go before a judge of the circuit court or of the state or county, in this case within Indiana if not previously in Michigan, and provide proof of his ownership of the slaves in order to obtain such a certificate. Because Norris had not done this, Judge Egbert decided to let the Powells go.²⁵

Not surprisingly, Norris was outraged at the court's decision. What happened next depends upon whose rendition one believes. According to the version of the story published by

²² *The South Bend Fugitive Slave Case*, 2-3.

²³ *Ibid.*, 3.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 4.

²⁵ *Ibid.*

Harvey

the Anti-Slavery Office in New York, Norris and his men attempted to seize the captives. One of Norris's counsels, Liston, announced that Norris and his men would shoot anyone who attempted to interfere with the seizure and that they would be justified in doing so. Unarmed, the citizens in the courthouse wisely decided not try to intervene in any way, but afterwards, rather than trying to take the Powells out of town by force, Norris and his men, vastly outnumbered, quietly allowed the sheriff to lock the Powells up in jail for safe keeping. According to the Circuit Court report from the trial that took place later, Norris and his group of men had drawn their weapons, warned the crowd not to approach, and then asked the sheriff to keep the Powells in his jail rather than let them escape. The sheriff had allegedly seen Norris do "all he could to pacify the crowd," and agreed to do so.²⁶ Despite the differences in the stories of the intensity of the threats in the courthouse, the Powells were in jail once again, this time with the sheriff holding them as an agent of Norris because, it now came to light, during the period of the lawsuit Norris had obtained a writ under a law of the State of Indiana (even though the U.S. Supreme Court had ruled such state laws on fugitive slaves unconstitutional) by which he claimed legally to own the slaves.²⁷ Meanwhile, some 150-400 armed blacks from the Michigan community from which the Powells had been abducted arrived in South Bend, only adding to the racial tensions there.²⁸

Days later, another legal proceeding convened as Norris still hoped to take the Powells out of the county in route to the Ohio River. Norris, meanwhile, had been expending energy trying to persuade the local residents that he was a kind master. He was now telling them how he had given the Powells "ground to cultivate for themselves, and many other privileges, that he permitted them to go to Lawrenceburgh, in Indiana, whenever they pleased, to sell their garden stuff, and that they had taken advantage of this liberty to run away."²⁹ Supporters of the Powells later argued that this constituted his granting permission for the Powells to move to a free state. Other witnesses later recalled that Norris had insisted that they had only been given permission to "attend the market at a village on the Kentucky side" of the Ohio River, and that the Powells had crossed the river to the Indiana side without his permission.³⁰ With good reason, therefore, Norris was anxious about the upcoming trial and what might be his final opportunity to prove that the Powells were in fact his property.³¹ In the end, he was unable to convince the court and, after a lengthy hearing, the court decided once again that the Powells should be released. This time, after the decision of the court had been read aloud, the Powell family was immediately swarmed by friends and neighbors and taken away to their homes with cheers of freedom and

²⁶ McLean, *Reports of Cases Argued and Decided in the Circuit Court of the United States, For the Seventh Circuit*, vol. 5, 96.

²⁷ *The South Bend Fugitive Slave Case*, 5.

²⁸ McLean, *Reports of Cases Argued and Decided in the Circuit Court of the United States, For the Seventh Circuit*, vol. 5, 97.

²⁹ *The South Bend Fugitive Slave Case*, 8.

³⁰ McLean, *Reports of Cases Argued and Decided in the Circuit Court of the United States, For the Seventh Circuit*, vol. 5, 102-103.

³¹ *The South Bend Fugitive Slave Case*, 7.

rejoicing.³² David Powell later told an interviewer of his anxiety throughout all of this: “I once had a wife, she was taken from me and sold South. I have never seen her since, I know not whether she is dead or alive, and when the news came, that this, my second wife, was in the hands of the Kentuckians, I felt that I had nothing more to live for.”³³ Unfortunately, this would not be the last that the community of South Bend would hear of John Norris.

On December 21, 1849, John Norris filed a law suit in the United States Circuit Court, for the District of Indiana, against Leander B. Newton, George W. Horton, Edwin B. Crocker, Solomon W. Palmer, David Jodon, William Willmington, Lot Day, Jr., Amable M. LaPierre, and Wright Mauldin for their participation in the Powells’ “escape” from South Bend as a last-ditch effort to recover the value of the Powell family to him as well as other damages.³⁴ Since Mauldin was a resident of Michigan rather than of the state of Indiana, the suit against him was dismissed. The other defendants were charged with having knowingly harbored, concealed, and enabled the four members of the Powell family to escape from the plaintiff, Norris, who put them up as being worth \$2,500. The court commenced its session on May 20, 1850, with Norris represented by O. H. Smith and J. A. Liston, and the four defendants by Joseph G. Marshall and J. L. Jarnegin.³⁵ It was heard before Judge John McLean and a jury. McLean was Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court from 1829 to 1861.³⁶ In this capacity he had issued a dissenting opinion in *Prigg v Pennsylvania*, arguing that Prigg should first have been obligated to prove that Morgan was his slave before removing her from the state of Pennsylvania. In 1837, McLean was assigned as Justice for the Seventh Circuit (covering Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, and Michigan), in which capacity he was still serving at the time of the South Bend case.³⁷ During the trial, Kentucky Governor Crittenden visited Indianapolis at the invitation of the governor of Indiana to address a Union mass meeting. Judge McLean dismissed the trial hear Governor Crittenden’s address before the convention, which the jurors also attended.

The Court was adjourned over to attend this great convention, over which Judge Huntington presided. Crittenden, of course, was called upon to address the meeting. This afforded him a favorable opportunity, which was not neglected, of lecturing the citizens of Indiana upon their constitutional duties to the South, one of the most important of which, he seemed to think, was this in relation to restoring fugitive slaves, which he was very sorry to say had been so often violated to the great annoyance of Kentucky slaveholders. He remarked, however, that he would give Indiana credit for one thing,

³² *Ibid.*, 8.

³³ *Ibid.*, 10-11.

³⁴ *Norris v Newton et al.*, in McLean, *Reports of Cases Argued and Decided in the Circuit Court of the United States, For the Seventh Circuit*, vol. 5, 92-106.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 9.

³⁶ Robert M. Cover, *Justice Accused: Antislavery and the Judicial Press* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1975), 243.

³⁷ Cover, *Justice Accused*, 260.

Harvey

which was that whenever a Kentuckian had applied to her courts to enforce the law of 1793, he had always secured his claim, and he hoped Kentucky would never have any reason to complain in this respect, otherwise it might weaken her attachment to the Union.³⁸

Other prominent speakers addressed the convention, reminding those in attendance (again including the jurors) that “it was all-important to sacrifice a few of these ‘fanatical abolitionists,’ for the good of this ‘glorious Union.’”³⁹ Judge McLean also delivered a lengthy charge to the jury reminding them that “the act of Congress of 1793 gives an action to the plaintiff for the damages received.”⁴⁰ Not surprisingly, the jurors ruled in favor of Norris this time and the worth of each person was decided upon. Lucy at age 40 was valued at \$500, Lewis at age 20 was worth \$800, George at age 16 was worth \$750, James at age 14 was worth \$700 and the plaintiff’s expenses at South Bend was worth \$165.80 with the jury assessing the damages at \$2,856.⁴¹ John Norris successfully received compensation from the court for lost property when just a few months earlier it had been decided in another court that they were not his property to begin with. By this time, however, the Powells were back in Michigan. Meanwhile, arguing that the newly-enacted Fugitive Slave Law of September 1850 applied only to cases arising after its passage, between the spring and fall of 1850 Norris’s attorneys filed twelve suits against 15 defendants, seeking to collect a \$500 penalty from each of the defendants in accordance with the law of 1793. In May 1851, however, the court decided in favor of the defendants on this issue.⁴²

The South Bend Abolitionist Community

The county of Saint Joseph in Indiana was known for being a home to a population of African Americans. Not only was it a place that African Americans could call home, but it was also a place that was home to many prominent abolitionists. John Norris targeted many of these abolitionists as being aids to the escape of the Powells. It seemed that Norris had no proof besides the simple fact that they were known abolitionists in the area. John Norris sued Leander B. Newton, George W. Horton, Edwin B. Crocker, Solomon W. Palmer, David Jodon, William Willmington, Lot Day, Jr., Amable M. LaPierre, and Wright Mauldin. Four of those men were known abolitionists in St. Joseph County, one of those men was a known abolitionist from Michigan, and one of those men, Lot Day, Jr., was the sheriff of St. Joseph County.

³⁸ *The South Bend Fugitive Slave Case*, 12-13.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 13.

⁴⁰ McLean, *Reports of Cases Argued and Decided in the Circuit Court of the United States, For the Seventh Circuit*, vol. 5, 104.

⁴¹ *The South Bend Fugitive Slave Case*, 13-14. Despite his dissenting view in *Prigg v Pennsylvania*, the New York Anti-Slavery Society was quite critical of Judge McLean in this instance, and especially of his charge to the jury. See *ibid.*, 22-29.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 29-31.

The first noteworthy abolitionist from South Bend was Solomon Palmer. Palmer was first an active abolitionist in New York but moved to South Bend in the early 1840s. He owned a mill that was located south of the city. This mill was the site of Underground Railroad activity. Esse Bissell Dakin wrote about this in the *South Bend Daily Tribune* on April 25, 1899. He stated that:

Mr. Palmer owned and operated a mill ten miles south of South Bend in the midst of dense woods and frequently fugitives were seen by him dodging about in the underbrush. Upon one occasion, when driving home with his son, they saw three negroes by the roadside. Mr. Palmer called to them and they were quick to recognize a friend. Leaving his son to walk back to the mill, he drove the fugitives to his home where, behind locked doors and closely drawn shades, Mr. Palmer gave them supper and they rested several hours. Later in the night he drove them to Niles, where Mr. LaPierre took them in charge, procuring tickets and putting them on the train for Detroit from which point they reached Canada.⁴³

This is also where we see that Amable LaPierre took some part in the Underground Railroad. It seems that he was willing to risk going to a train station and buying tickets for African Americans. This could have been an extremely risky thing to do simply for the fact that it was done completely in the public eye. If the wrong person saw or caught wind of this action then LaPierre could have found himself in trouble. John Norris must have known about some of these abolitionist actions that Palmer and LaPierre had undertaken and decided on that basis that they had something to do with the Powells' escaping.

The other two abolitionist supporters from South Bend are Leander B. Newton and Edwin B. Crocker. In the same *South Bend Daily Tribune* article, Dakin mentions Newton, as well as other members of the community, as being active supporters of the Underground Railroad in South Bend. He however does not state whether they were actual conductors or not. What he does say is that "not all of the gentlemen mentioned harbored fugitives or conducted them to places of safety, but they contributed money and then, as now, the success of any undertaking depended largely upon the amount of money at hand."⁴⁴ We, however, do know more about Edwin B. Crocker. Edwin was the attorney who defended the Powells. Dakin described him as "one of the most prominent abolitionists in South Bend and his name was known to workers on the routes both east and west."⁴⁵ The fact that Crocker had this abolitionist reputation and, even more importantly, the fact that he represented the Powells probably had a lot to do with why Norris seemed to dislike him so much. These men were prominent members of the South Bend community. They were just a few of probably many people who held abolitionist views in the area.

⁴³ Esse Bissell Dakin, "The Underground Railroad," *South Bend Daily Tribune*, 25 April 1899, p. 6-7.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 6.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*

Conclusion

The various attitudes towards slavery obviously affected nineteenth-century Americans in very different ways. Clearly the abolitionists looked at the slavery issue very differently from proslavery advocates. Where the latter would have seen a black slave who was inferior to them racially and belonged in chains, the former would have recognized a human being who was being deprived of his or her liberties given from birth. These attitudes affected many people's day-to-day lives, and it also impacted legal outcomes in court. This helps explain how the South Bend Fugitive Slave Case could be looked so at differently by two different judges. One judge was looking at the case in his hometown community and was surrounded by strong emotions and passion siding towards the Powells. The other judge looked at the case in a community that was distanced from the emotions. Both judges had different opinions on how the case should have gone. They both looked at the same law and to some extent agreed. They both agreed that John Norris should have had the legal certificate that claimed the Powells were his property and that he could take them out of state. The difference was that Judge Egbert was not convinced that the Powells were legally Norris's slaves while Judge McLean believed that they were. The South Bend community no doubt had something to do with that. Had they not been so pro-abolitionist and also passionately certain that the Powells either had never been Norris's slaves or else were free blacks because they had been given permission by Norris to leave the state in order to sell produce at Lawrenceburg, Indiana, the end of this story might have been very different.

Kappa Alpha Theta at Hanover College, 1882-1889

Jenna Auber

Founded by Bettie Locke, Alice Allen, Hannah Fitch, and Bettie Tipton at Indiana Asbury College in 1870, Kappa Alpha Theta was built upon the principles of attaining the highest scholarship and influencing the campus, community, and world for good.¹ The founders hoped that the support within the organization would encourage women to continue pursuing higher education despite the adversity brought upon them by those against coeducational schooling. Gradually, the founders granted charters to interested groups of women at other colleges, including Hanover College.

Shortly after Hanover College began admitting women, the national members of Kappa Alpha Theta, along with women at Hanover, determined that their campus merited a charter. Hanover College gained this charter on January 2, 1882. The arrival of Nu Chapter on Hanover's campus allowed women students to foster relationships with other women who could support them in their academic endeavors. This focus on academic achievement in the early years of Nu Chapter placed these women in the nineteenth-century college "outsider culture." This outsider culture was characterized by students who cared deeply about their schoolwork, but not about the college experience in general. Especially in the early years of coeducation, women tended to participate in the outsider culture due to the apprehension with which male students and faculty members regarded them. However, after 1882, a gradual shift took place in the way in which Nu Chapter interacted with the rest of the College. As its members became more secure in their place as women students, members of Nu Chapter increasingly contributed to the "participant culture" of Hanover College until Nu Chapter's disestablishment in 1899. Participant culture of the nineteenth century was defined less by academic proficiency than by peer interaction and relationship building. More social than that of the outsiders, participant culture was often associated with fraternities. Nu Chapter's letters published in the early volumes of the *Kappa Alpha Theta Journal* show a gradual shift from the outsider culture to the participant culture between 1882 and 1899. This change from one culture to another on Hanover's campus represents the shifting attitude toward women on college campuses in the late nineteenth century.

In general, Kappa Alpha Theta saw their members as the most suitable among their colleagues to assure women's place on campus, as opposed to women on campus who did not belong to the fraternity.² They "strove to prove themselves the intellectual equals of men while at the same time continuing to fulfill the tenets of 'true' and 'noble womanhood'" and remaining within the Victorian notions of the 'feminine ideal.'³ A noble woman was an "ideal woman," or

¹ Kappa Alpha Theta Grand Council, "For Parents," *Kappa Alpha Theta*, http://www.kappaalphatheta.org/learnabouttheta/whatistheta/for_parents.cfm?from=HomeHeaderLink (accessed 18 Nov 2016).

² The term "sorority" was not employed until Gamma Phi Beta adopted it in 1874.

³ Diana B. Turk, *Bound by a Mighty Vow: Sisterhood and Women's Fraternities, 1870-1920* (New York: New York University Press, 2004), 13.

one who embodied the idea of what a woman should be at the time: a sophisticated woman of society who was educated in the art of entertaining, rather than academically. Along with continuing to fulfill this idea of “noble womanhood,” the women of Kappa Alpha Theta strove to prove themselves as intellectuals capable of academic achievement. They did this by redefining for themselves “the feminine ideal, broadening it to include intellectual capacity along with more socially accepted traits of morality and social grace.”⁴ The idea of scholarship was implemented into the constitution by Kappa Alpha Theta’s founders: “the object of this society shall be to advance the interests of its members, to afford an opportunity for improvement in composition and debate and elocution, to cultivate those social qualities which become a woman, and to provide for its members associated bound by a common interest.”⁵ These objectives allowed for independence in academia, since the college woman could pursue the subjects of interest to her rather than focusing solely on the subjects that would allow her to be the “ideal woman.” In studying debate, elocution, and the subjects of interest to her, the early Kappa Alpha Theta members thus redefined their feminine ideal to include intellectual curiosity.

Due to this priority upon intellectual curiosity, the early Theta sisters looked for scholarship above all else when selecting a new woman to pledge. Unlike today, the recruitment process consisted solely of looking at a potential sister’s academic performance, be it her grades or faculty recommendations.⁶ When active members decided to extend a bid to another woman, they saw no need to meet her beforehand if the potential member had achieved success in her academics. Other factors contributed to this decision, of course, but academics remained the most important factor. Chapter meetings, in turn, became the ideal place for Theta’s focus on academic achievement. Members presented their speeches and performances for critique by their sisters in these meetings, using the time to perfect their schoolwork.⁷ The importance stressed upon this academic performance in both potential members and full members is emblematic of the outsider culture. Not as concerned with the social aspect of attending Hanover College, the women strove for academic excellence in an attempt to prove themselves as worthy students.

Faced with opposition to their presence on campus as women and as fraternity members, the five charter members of Nu Chapter fought for acceptance. During the 1881-1882 school year, Hanover College had just sixty-four students. Of these, twelve were women.⁸ Seven of these women would join Kappa Alpha Theta, making up fifty-eight percent of the women on campus.⁹ The author of an article in the 1899 volume of *The Crowe* (the Hanover College

⁴ Turk, *Bound by a Mighty Vow*, 35.

⁵ Ibid., 23.

⁶ Ibid., 25.

⁷ Ibid., 22.

⁸ “Annual Catalog of Hanover College, 1870-1895,” Archives of Hanover College, Duggan Library, Hanover College (Hanover, Ind.).

⁹ “Nu: Hanover College, Chapter History,” in *The Kappa Alpha Theta*, vol. 13, no. 4 (May 1899), 285. As described below, the journal’s title was shortened in 1892.

yearbook) conceded that “the welcome to the young ladies as students was not very cordial, and their attempt at organizing a fraternity was not heartily encouraged by those in authority.”¹⁰ Despite the opposition, however, the early Thetas fought back through their commitment to scholarship—further embracing the outsider culture and distancing themselves from the common community. Today, scholarship remains the highest aim of Theta on all college campuses.

No chapter minutes have come to light from the initial years of Kappa Alpha Theta’s presence on Hanover’s campus; whatever minutes might have once existed disappeared during the fraternity’s sixty-year absence from 1899 to 1959. However, the *Kappa Alpha Theta Journal*, published in Kansas by the Kappa Chapter and distributed to all of the chapters, made its first appearance in 1885. The editors of the *Kappa Alpha Theta Journal* expected member chapters to send letters to inform the other the chapters of the events and activities that they had sponsored, so thereafter, as noted above, Nu Chapter contributed to the *Journal* on a regular basis. Some of Nu Chapter’s letters provide details of their achievements and events, while others show little of their activity since the previous issue. Between 1885 and 1892, these letters focus very much on scholarship and academic achievements of the Nu Thetas. After 1892, the letters show a shift from a focus on academics to the participant culture ideal, displaying more interest in the other fraternities and parties on campus than on their academics per se. Academics are still mentioned after 1892, of course, but not to the same degree as they once had been. This year thus appears to mark a shift from the outsider culture to the participant culture, suggesting a greater acceptance of women as students on Hanover’s campus.

In their letters from 1885 to 1892, Nu Chapter regularly comments on the current members’ academic achievements, as well their alumnae achievements upon graduation. The author of the letters often includes information about Hanover College during that time, such as the arrival of new professors, the construction of new buildings, and the creation of new academic departments. Commencement is often discussed, especially if a Theta had a role in the ceremony. In both the June 1885 and October 1885 letters, Nu wrote of the commencement ceremony of the Class of 1885. In June, the author stated that “the Class of ‘85 is comprised of eighteen members, seventeen of whom are gentlemen—and the “daughter of the regiment” is a Theta. Her diploma, from the ladies’ Literary society, will be delivered by Mrs. Josephine Nichols of Beta chapter.”¹¹ In October, the reader learns that the “daughter of the regiment” was Cressie Gilchrist, the author of the previous letter. Nu also boasted in October that,

On Wednesday eve before Commencement, the three literary societies of the College delivered diplomas to their graduates and held their annual reunions. The young ladies’ society was fortunate in obtaining the services of the prominent lecturess, Mrs. Josephine R. Nichols, of Indianapolis. The lady holds, among other honors, the presidency of the State W.C.T.U., and is an honorary member of our K.A.Θ. We were delighted to adorn

¹⁰ Hanover College, “Kappa Alpha Theta. Nu Chapter,” in *The Crowe* [yearbook] (1899): 126.

¹¹ Cressie Gilchrist, “Nu: Hanover College, Hanover, Indiana,” in *The Kappa Alpha Theta Journal*, vol. 1, no. 1 (June 1885), 27.

her with our prettiest pin, and when she was heartily encored and responded in the neatest fashion, (the first time, Dr. Fisher told us, in the history of the College that a speaker, on that occasion, had ever been encored,) we were more than pleased.¹²

From this part of the letter, the reader can infer that the ladies of Nu Chapter were proud that their honorary sister had brought respect for the women on campus by speaking so well that those in attendance had demanded an encore. They were also proud because Dr. Fisher had told them that this had been the first time this had happened in the history of the College, indicating that a big step for women had just been achieved on the campus. They felt that their hard work in prioritizing academic excellence was successful at the time, insinuating that women did previously have a place at Hanover College as intellectuals.

As for graduated members, by 1898 three members had become missionaries, four had become College professors, ten were teachers, and one became involved in politics.¹³ The *Kappa Alpha Theta Journal* lists the names of some of these sisters in its chapter correspondence throughout the years. In 1886, Cressie Gilchrist was appointed to be a teacher in the Presbyterian Mission School at La Costilla, New Mexico.¹⁴ Katie Piatt, the last of the charter members, graduated in 1886 and subsequently received a job as the chair of Natural Sciences at Kalamazoo Female College in Kalamazoo, Michigan.¹⁵ Established in 1887, the new Department of Music chose a Theta, Laura Palmer, as an “instructress.”¹⁶ Finally, Nu’s only “Notable Theta,” Anna Adams Baird, is mentioned in the 1891 *Kappa Alpha Theta Journal*. Notable Thetas were members who were “recognized for their contributions to their profession or to the larger community.”¹⁷ Anna Adams Baird and her new husband, William, visited Hanover one last time before leaving for Korea in 1891, where they worked as missionaries. Nu’s letter said that “Baird is well fitted for her work for she is a bright and earnest woman, having held the position of State Secretary of the Y.W.C.A., in Kansas, for several years preceding her marriage.”¹⁸ Baird lived in Korea until her death in 1916 and is known for having translated children’s songs and nursery rhymes into Korean.¹⁹ Even though these members had graduated and left Hanover College, the Thetas at Nu still supported them in their endeavors and were sufficiently proud of their achievements to share them with other Thetas throughout the country. The current members

¹² Annie L. Adams, “News from Hanover,” in *The Kappa Alpha Theta Journal*, vol. 1, no. 2 (Oct. 1885), 53.

¹³ Hanover College, “Nu Chapter, Kappa Alpha Theta History,” in *The Quid* [yearbook] (1898): 87.

¹⁴ “Nu: Hanover College, Hanover, Indiana,” in *The Kappa Alpha Theta Journal*, vol. 1, no. 3 (Jan 1886), 98.

¹⁵ “Nu: Hanover College, Hanover, Indiana,” in *The Kappa Alpha Theta Journal*, vol. 2, no. 1 (Oct 1886), 36.

¹⁶ “Nu: Hanover College, Hanover, Indiana,” in *The Kappa Alpha Theta Journal*, vol. 2, no. 3 (June 1887), 118.

¹⁷ Kappa Alpha Theta, “Notable Thetas,” *Kappa Alpha Theta and Kappa Alpha Theta Foundation*, <http://heritage.kappaalphatheta.org/page/notablethetas> (accessed 19 Nov 2016).

¹⁸ “Nu: Hanover College, Hanover, Indiana,” in *The Kappa Alpha Theta Journal*, vol. 5, no. 1 (Jan 1891): 14.

¹⁹ Kappa Alpha Theta, “Notable Thetas,” *Kappa Alpha Theta and Kappa Alpha Theta Foundation*, <http://heritage.kappaalphatheta.org/page/notablethetas> (accessed 19 Nov 2016).

wanted to convey the importance of the fact that their members were showing both their fraternity and their sex in the best possible light, thus proving that women belonged on the campus.²⁰

This focus on academics in Nu Chapter is apparent in the chapter's letters to the *Kappa Alpha Theta Journal*, which repeatedly display their determined nature through the vows that they were taking during initiation to support each other in their academic endeavors and their pledge always to achieve the highest scholarship. The Nu Thetas were very active in the Zetaethlean Society, and practiced their speeches for these literary society meetings beforehand in chapter. They also discussed various books and readings upon which they agreed at the beginning of the term.²¹ As noted above, however, the focus solely on academics shifted in 1892; thereafter, the Nu Chapter letters published in *The Kappa Alpha Theta*—the title had been shortened from *The Kappa Alpha Theta Journal* that same year—show more of an emphasis on the participant culture and a focus on other fraternities on campus. Interestingly, the male author of the section entitled “The Greek Press” in *The Kappa Alpha Journal* (a publication of the social fraternity known as the Kappa Alpha Order) in April 1892 praised the latest issue of *The Kappa Alpha Theta*, noting that it was “full of a variety of contributions, from the highest sentimental verse to discussions weighty enough to suit the most severe advocate of seriousness and knock-down solemnity. . . . The chapter letters are . . . well written,” he added, “and brimming full of natural womanliness.” Taken as a whole, he concluded, the issue “breathes a gentleness, a tenderness that proves that the writers are women, real women, not according to the human patents of modern times, but according to the original design of the universal God, who after all is a greater inventor than man.” Indeed, he observed, the Nu Chapter was now signing its letters, “Lovingly, Nu.”²²

The Nu Chapter letter from April 1892, perhaps from the very same issue of *The Kappa Alpha Theta* examined by the author of the *Kappa Alpha Journal* article, confirms this shift. The author of the Nu letter states that the six new freshmen Thetas “persist in having impromptu candy pullings, spreads, and the like while the upper classmen stay at home and ‘dig.’”²³ In the nineteenth century, the word “dig” meant “to study hard and closely at a subject.”²⁴ The considerable difference in interests here no doubt reflects the generational gap between the

²⁰ Turk, *Mighty Vow*, 24.

²¹ “Nu: Hanover College, Hanover, Indiana,” in *The Kappa Alpha Theta Journal*, vol. 3, no. 4 (Oct 1889): 131-132.

²² Reported by the author of “The Greek Press,” in *The Kappa Alpha Journal* (a publication of the Kappa Alpha Order), vol. 9, no. 4 (April 1892): 365, available as a Google book at: https://books.google.com/books?id=IOESAAAIAAJ&pg=PA365&lpg=PA365&dq=Kappa+Alpha+Theta+Journal&source=bl&ots=_JCztsnKB&sig=zX6rEUyWTcRzv2jE3ia8VbR6a9o&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKewjbtZbL7tbUAhVCMYyKHR71AgUQ6AEISzAH#v=onepage&q=Kappa%20Alpha%20Theta%20Journal&f=false.

²³ “Nu: Hanover College,” in *The Kappa Alpha Theta*, vol. 6, no. 3 (Apr 1892): 164-165.

²⁴ *Oxford English Dictionary Online*, <http://www.oed.com.haproxy.palni.edu/view/Entry/52553?rskey=i5lo6Y&result=4&isAdvanced=false#eid> (accessed March 10, 2017), s.v. “dig, v.,” definition I.1.c.

newer members and the upperclassmen Nu Thetas at Hanover. The upperclassmen, in keeping with the way that they had been taught when they became Thetas, preferred to remain in their rooms studying, focused on academics, rather than participating in the social events attended by the underclassmen. The underclassmen, in contrast, attended events characteristic of the participants at the time, such as candy pullings. The younger members felt more comfortable with their role on campus as woman and as students, encouraging them to participate in social events rather than solely focus on academics. The older Nu Chapter sisters, meanwhile, remained conservative and somewhat insecure in their positions at Hanover. In an attempt to cultivate justification and purpose to their college experience, they remained committed to academic excellence.

A new emphasis on the participant culture emerged within the context of initiations and pledges mentioned in the letters, juxtaposed alongside the continued interest and enthusiasm about academics. Celebrations following initiations are rarely mentioned in the chapter letters. Prior to 1892, the chapter mentioned only that new young women had pledged, or that they initiated one new member who was “a girl of rare accomplishments and . . . a valuable addition to our number.”²⁵ When writing of the initiation of Jessie Young, daughter of Hanover professor Andrew Harvey Young, in 1895, however, the author of the letter appears significantly more enthusiastic: “The latest event of interest and importance was the initiation of Jessie Young of ‘98. The affair was one of the most enjoyable we have ever had; the zeal and spirit with which the mysteries were unveiled, the dignity and appreciation of the new sister, and last, but not least, the ‘spread.’”²⁶ The emphasis on the “spread” and the change in the amount written about initiation suggests that, while initiation and ritual had been important in the past, it had never been celebrated to this extent. Once again Nu Chapter appears to have embraced the participant culture, leaving behind the emphasis strictly on academics found among the earlier sisters who had been seeking to prove their intellectual capacity.

Beginning in 1896, the letters mention the social events hosted by Nu Chapter. Professor Young’s home became the location for many of these events since Nu Chapter did not have its own chapter house, only a hall reserved to host their Monday evening chapter meetings. A popular professor on campus and the father of a Theta at this time, Professor Young’s home was the logical location for the chapter to host its events. The members planned the events down to the last detail, and invited their friends and other fraternity members on the campus. In their March 1898 letter to *The Kappa Alpha Theta*, the writer told of the Valentine’s Day party that the chapter had hosted. Before writing of the party, she discussed academics and how the chapter’s minds wished to think of something more “agreeable” than scholarship.

But lately our thoughts have wandered from the daily intercourse with musty classics, from the intricacies of Pythagoras’ doctrines, from the mysteries of science, and the

²⁵ “Nu: Hanover College, Hanover, Indiana” in *The Kappa Alpha Theta Journal*, vol. 2, no. 3 (June 1887): 118.

²⁶ “Nu: Hanover College,” in *The Kappa Alpha Theta*, vol. 10, no. 1 (Nov 1895): 39.

learned depths of Psychology and Logic to something more agreeable. On February 14 we gave a "Valentine Party" at the home of Prof. Young. Everything was in keeping with the night and hearts were displayed everywhere.²⁷

This statement demonstrates that the participant culture had become more influential in the life of Nu Chapter by 1898, and that the chapter members now held the status of academics in less esteem than their social lives, quite a different scenario from when the chapter had received its charter in 1882. This change in importance is telling of the feeling that women were more accepted as students on Hanover's campus, as the women of Nu became more involved in social events rather than academics.

The last activity of Nu Chapter before its disestablishment due to declining enrollment at Hanover College occurred in October 1899 at the home of one of its patronesses. Described as "one of the pleasantest social events of the first term," the reception included a game where the gentlemen chose the name of a young lady and then wrote descriptions of that young lady from memory. The members spent the remainder of the evening singing and talking with the other attendees of the reception.²⁸ Enrollment at the college had been steadily declining, however, along with the number of women in the chapter. By 1892, only twenty-five percent of women on campus were in Nu Chapter, as opposed to the fifty-eight percent in 1882.²⁹ Part of this decreased participation, of course, stemmed from increased competition with other sororities who were present on campus by this time, but clearly Nu Chapter was in a state of decline. Perhaps the members of Nu Chapter were unaware of the fact that they were to return their charter at this reception on account of the declining enrollment of women at the college and membership in the chapter, but whatever the case may have been, this final activity of Nu Chapter certainly exemplified participant behavior in middle-class college culture: to host a party to celebrate the seventeen-year presence of Kappa Alpha Theta on Hanover College's campus. This reception celebrated the fact that the charter members had successfully established a chapter on campus only two years after women were first admitted to the college, and also that they had been able to prove to those who disapproved of their presence that women could be academics just as well, if not better, than men. Once this had been achieved, members of Nu Chapter could partake in the participant culture on campus and engage in more social events, confident of their acceptance as women academics and of their place on the campus of Hanover College.

²⁷ "Nu: Hanover College," in *The Kappa Alpha Theta*, vol. 12, no. 3 (Mar 1898): 162-163.

²⁸ "The Kappa Alpha Theta Reception," in *The Journal of Hanover College* (Jan. 1900): 166.

²⁹ *Annual Catalog of Hanover College, 1870-1895*, Archives of Hanover College, Duggan Library, Hanover College (Hanover, Ind.).

The Soviet Sports Machine

Hannah Markisohn

For much of the twentieth century, international sports provided a way for countries to compete internationally without going to war. Instead, they sought to exert their superiority over others in very-conspicuous sports fora. Athletes became superstars, and their dominance and successes were attributed to their country. In many nations, these wins were interpreted as products of their ideology, and for the Soviet Union, these sports victories represented triumphs of socialism over capitalism, as a way for the U.S.S.R. to validate its socialist way of life. The Soviet Union placed a large emphasis on sport as a way not only to keep its citizens healthy and prepared for military ventures, but as a way to show the ultimate success of its socialist regime. Sports became a vehicle through which members of society were enriched and the individual, in turn, was able to enrich society.¹

Soviet Sports Schools

Sports schools began to emerge almost immediately after the fall of the tsarist system. They were created by the new socialist regime with the dual intent to keep the Soviet population healthy, especially with regard to the lower classes, and as a way to produce successful athletes. At first, Soviet leaders associated international competition with capitalism and thus refused to participate in international sports. The government needed a cheap and effective way to improve the basic health of its impoverished citizens, however, and Soviet leaders eventually found that sports competitions offered a solution to this social problem. Thus the Soviet interest in sport reflected the high importance that the government placed on “the health of the people and for the physical education of its young citizens.”² As time went on, many of the people who had lived in abject poverty under the tsarist system benefitted from the health and hygiene rewards that the new Soviet sports movement offered.

The first of the sports schools opened in the 1930s in major cities such as Moscow and Leningrad. The construction of these sports schools helped to re-establish a close link between sports, the military, and the government.³ This was done through the set-up of a government committee called the U.S.S.R. Sports Committee which helped to organize elements within the sports movement such as: “the individual sports federations, the various sports societies, sports schools, coaching, research, competition, medicine, etc.”⁴ These various elements were seen in sport before the Soviet Union took power; however the emphasis on these elements from the

¹ James Riordan, *Soviet Sport Background to the Olympics* (New York: Washington Mews Books, a Division of New York University Press, 1980), 41.

² Valerie Shteinbakh, *The Soviet Contribution to the Olympics* (Novosti Press Agency Publishing House, 1980), 7.

³ Ibid., 34.

⁴ Ibid., 42.

government was a new concept. This Committee held much of the power in regard to sport; in particular, the Sports Committee is given credit for the Soviet reentrance into the Olympics.

In 1930, “Stalin signed the decree organizing physical education throughout all Soviet Russia. Private sporting clubs and organizations were abolished and athletes of every kind were placed in the hands of the state.”⁵ With this enactment, the first sports schools for children, controlled by the state, appeared in the Soviet Union in 1936.⁶ This decree from Stalin was designed to indoctrinate young people within the Soviet Union in order to further socialist ideology and stamp out the old tsarist way of thinking in the younger generations.⁷ Because of this, sports education formally began in the U.S.S.R. in the first grade (in the ten-year school system), with boys and girls each receiving a minimum of two hours of physical education per week in addition to other organized sports in which the children might have participated.⁸ In this way, sports become integrated into people’s lives from a very young age, which made the mentality that sports talent must be grown from an early age all the more prominent in later generations.⁹ Thus, committees such as the U.S.S.R. Sports Committee were set up with their sole focus on sport. This committee made it “no secret that their ultimate aim is to produce Olympic Winners. It is also openly acknowledged that the Soviet leadership regard success in the Olympics as an indicator of a nation’s health and power.”¹⁰ With this thinking in place, Soviet leaders began to utilize the military in Red Army schools as a pool for developing talent for the national teams, in the process allowing athletes to serve their country in a multitude of ways.¹¹

By the 1940s sports schools were popping up all over the country. The importance of these sports schools cannot be overstated in the eyes of the Soviet leaders. The U.S.S.R. especially valued talent in music, the arts, and sports at an early age. “Talent is nurtured within the state system, not in private clubs. It is therefore free and open to all.”¹² Those who demonstrated potential would receive free developmental support. By making sport free and open to all, the Soviet leadership believed that the best athletes would emerge, and that with these best athletes the Soviet Union would soon dominate the sports world.

The Red Army schools emphasized the idea that it was due to the state that athletes, who were also soldiers, were able to reach their full potential. It was with the help of these schools, run by the Red Army, that athletes were able to achieve a high level of dominance. These schools were another way for the Soviet leadership to show their people that it was through the socialist regime that they were able to “achieve maximum efficiency in its sports challenge,”

⁵ John R. Tunis, “The Dictators Discover Sport,” *Foreign Affairs* 14, no. 4 (1936): 608.

⁶ Shteinbakh, *The Soviet Contribution to the Olympics*, 12.

⁷ Tunis, “The Dictators Discover Sport,” 606.

⁸ Joseph A. Marchiony, “The Rise of the Soviet Athletes,” *Comparative Education Review* 7, no. 1 (1963): 20.

⁹ Riordan, *Soviet Sport Background to the Olympics*, 68.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 69.

¹¹ *Red Army*, DVD directed by Gabe Polsky, 2015.

¹² *Ibid.*, 17.

which in turn allowed Soviet athletes to triumph over Western ones.¹³ The Red Army Hockey Club, as it was known in the U.S. and Canada, was a key creation of the development of the sports movement, and, with its creation, “Stalin would create athletes to dominate the west.”¹⁴ The Soviet dominance would last from the 1950s through 1991, when the Soviet Union collapsed, but was already beginning to wane by the mid-1980s.

Russia competed in the 1912 Stockholm Olympics, but due to ideological differences claimed by Russia after the Revolution of 1917, the 1912 Olympics were the last games in which Russia competed until the 1952 Helsinki Games. Thus for the better part of fifty years ideological differences kept the Soviet Union out of Olympic competition. Intentional decisions made in the 1940s and 1950s regarding sport were what eventually allowed the Soviets to become successful in many different Olympic sports. Once the Soviet government realized that it could use international competition to show and promote the validity of the Soviet system, its leaders initiated the process of once again becoming involved in international sports.

By 1945, “it was clear that the Soviet Union had decided to reverse its policy on competing in Western sports organizations” where they not only intended to compete, but to dominate.¹⁵ Soviet leaders began to watch how international competition affected international relations. They came to the conclusion that it was another way to fight political and ideological battles, and that sports had a way to reach people in a way that politics would be unable to. Consequently, in the early 1950s this led to petitioning the International Olympic Committee to recognize the Soviet sports systems as part of the Olympic movement.

Starting in April of 1951, “Soviet leaders, recognizing the prestige value of sports success as a prop for their ailing regime, set up a Russian Olympic Committee.”¹⁶ This meant that the goal of training athletes expanded from winning international competitions, to competing for, and winning, gold medals during both the summer and winter Olympic Games. Henceforth, it was expected that these athletes would acknowledge that it was through the Soviet system that they were able to win on an international and Olympic level. Athletes would need not only to excel in the competitions, but increasingly would also have to be politically reliable.

The Emergence of Soviet Dominance in International Competition: International Hockey

The Soviet dominance in sports throughout a wide variety of competitions, including the Olympics, over the latter half of the twentieth century is crucial to understanding the Soviet

¹³ Riordan, *Soviet Sport Background to the Olympics*, 160.

¹⁴ The term “Red Army Hockey Club” was mainly used by Western countries such as the U.S. and Canada. However, in many other places, including the Soviet Union itself, it was called the Central Sport Club of the Army or CSKA.

¹⁵ Toby C. Rider, *Cold War Games: Propaganda, the Olympics, and U.S. Foreign Policy* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2016), 43.

¹⁶ Riordan, *Soviet Sport Background to the Olympics*, 146.

Union. Although Soviet athletes excelled in a number of sports, their dominance in hockey during the second half of the twentieth century makes hockey an ideal case study of the Soviet sports machine and the elite athletes that it produced. The emergence of sports as a vehicle for social change did not go unnoticed by the Soviet leadership who specifically began to use it for their own political agendas.¹⁷ Increasingly, pressure was put on athletes to win each and every event in which they competed.

Victory, specifically in terms of international competition, was the ultimate goal of the Soviet leadership. “Every new sports victory is a victory for the Soviet form of society and the socialist sports system,” and through these victories Soviet leaders had proof that their socialist way of life was triumphing over “the decaying culture of capitalist states.”¹⁸ Publicly at least, Soviet athletes viewed competition for their country as an honor rather than an obligation. When Soviet athletes were asked why they took up sport, in regard to competing for their country, these were the most typical replies: “to defend the colours of the USSR, to bring fame to the USSR and Soviet sports, the desire to win, a sense of one’s own importance, the fact that your team, your people, and your country needs you.”¹⁹ Of course, such answers may have been the result of indoctrination and political pressure. Nevertheless, these answers show how important it was not only to the government, but also to the Soviet people, that they emerge victorious. Sport was an effective mechanism for the U.S.S.R. to promote the benefits of communism within their own country and also abroad.

This idea of victory at all costs can be clearly seen in the Soviet hockey team. Time and time again, at least until the 1980 Olympic Games, the Red Army hockey team was a well-oiled machine that seemed unbeatable. However, the Canadian form of the sport was not the first form of hockey introduced to the Russian people. Before the Revolution of 1917, the Russians had played a sort of Russian hockey that allowed them to adapt more easily to the Canadian style. This Russian style was adapted from the Nordic countries and it closely “resembled field hockey on ice.”²⁰ Initially there were no facilities for it; thus the players had to wait for those long winter months when the conditions outside allowed them to play. It was often referred to as “winter football” and many of soccer’s greatest stars played hockey in the off-season.²¹ This meant that when Canadian hockey was first adopted, many of the first generations of players already knew not only how to skate, but also had a basic understanding of speed and passing—two crucial elements for Canadian hockey. This was the major factor that allowed for what many thought was a fast rise to dominance in the hockey arena in the 1950s. This rise was not expected by much of the international community because they believed that the U.S.S.R. would have a difficult time establishing a system, coaching staff, rules and regulations, and so forth. Due to

¹⁷ Ibid., 42.

¹⁸ Ibid., 15.

¹⁹ Shteinbakh, *The Soviet Contribution to the Olympics*, 31.

²⁰ Robert Edelman, *Serious Fun: A History of Spectator Sports in the USSR* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 32.

²¹ Ibid., 74.

this, their quick rise surprised many who were not knowledgeable about the sports schools that had been functioning in the Soviet Union since the 1930s.

The 1960 Olympics in Rome signaled an important turning point in Soviet Olympic history. Rome 1960 marked “the first time the USSR outpointed the USA in the team scoring in athletics.”²² This trend would continue at Tokyo 1964, Munich 1972, and Montreal 1976. The battle for the overall Olympic winner—in terms of a gold medal count—was an area in which the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. were determined to best each other. This became increasingly important during the Cold War when the Olympics were simply another battle to win during the war. Despite the final standings in international and Olympic competition, both the Soviet and U.S. governments saw sports as another battle of the Cold War that must be won. This shows that, when ideological differences were involved in sport, every competition was a battle that must be won.

Within the Socialist bloc, countries were free to copy the Soviet Union in their approach to sports. This became increasingly important because countries such as the U.S.S.R. began to see sport as “an efficacious means of advertising the advantages of socialism and demonstrating the advantages of socialism and demonstrating the superiority of the socialist way of life.”²³ Essentially, Soviet athletes were able to function as “cultural ambassadors wherever they visited, perpetuating a softer image of communism and contributing to a broader Soviet Policy of forming contacts and alliances.”²⁴ Many countries, especially the U.S., did not want the Soviets to be shown in any way other than in a harsh light. By making the Soviets seem villainous and powerful on the Olympic playing field, beating them would become a “David versus Goliath” moment that could work to the United States’ advantage.²⁵

When examining the Red Army hockey machine, it is impossible to talk about Soviet hockey without mentioning Anatoli Tarasov, the father of Soviet hockey. As the “head coach of the Red Army . . . he developed the (hockey) program” that would be considered the basis for much of the hockey that we watch today.²⁶ It is due to Tarasov’s direction and vision, that the Soviet team was able to dominate the sport of hockey. He implemented the famous style of hockey that has been associated with the Soviets since the twentieth century and started the successful hockey team almost entirely from scratch. For Tarasov, hockey was another form of art, and the creativity and originality found in art were also required in hockey. Tarasov is also credited with finding such talents as Vladislav Tretiak, Boris Mikhailov, and Vladimir Petrov.

²² Shteinbakh, *The Soviet Contribution to the Olympics*, 58.

²³ *Ibid.*, 153.

²⁴ Rider, *Cold War Games: Propaganda, the Olympics, and U.S. Foreign Policy*, 83.

²⁵ This idea of sport being used a part of the socialist agenda was nothing new; however, the success of the sports machine was the vehicle for socialist ideology to spread itself throughout Western culture. With the overall success of Soviet countries, as a whole, in the Olympics, countries such as the U.S. began to worry about the widespread implications this success would have in their own nations. Many of the top teams in the 1980s were from socialist countries which only served to help the Soviets and their socialist agenda. To the Soviets and other socialist countries, this only served to prove the superiority of socialism.

²⁶ *Red Army*, DVD directed by Gabe Polsky.

For many people, the coach of the Red Army who is most remembered is Viktor Tikhonov, who took over when Tarasov was ousted from his role as head coach in 1972.²⁷ Tikhonov ruled the Red Army team like tyrant, pushing his players to the extreme in all facets of training and for many ruling their personal lives as an added bonus. This style of coaching, incompatible with the personalities of many athletes, seemed to create a constant state of tension between Tikhonov and his players, an “us versus you” mentality.²⁸ Initially, many thought that Tikhonov would be a natural fit, seeing as he had played hockey for the Soviet Union. Yet instead of connecting with his players, like many had thought would happen, he exercised complete control over his players and was a demanding coach on his best days. Viacheslav Fetisov, former defenseman for the U.S.S.R. and the Detroit Red Wings, asserted that it was only due to Tikhonov’s connections rather than talent and qualification that he had been able to get the job as head coach of the Soviet hockey team.²⁹ Fetisov also claimed that the team did not respect Tikhonov; they followed his direction and decisions, but on a personal level the respect was not there because it was never earned. Despite this, athletes in the U.S.S.R., could never have achieved the level of success that they did without their highly-trained coaching staff.³⁰

The hockey team quickly became a powerhouse in the 1950s, but it was not until the 1960s that the rest of the world began to take notice of what would come to be called the Soviet Sports Machine. In the 1972 Summit Series, the Soviets came extremely close to beating the Canadian team that was composed of NHL stars. Despite the fact that the Soviet Union had won every hockey Olympic and World Championship from 1963 to 1971, many observers still had doubts about the abilities of the Soviet hockey team.³¹ Though the Soviets did not beat the Canadian team, this closely-contested series showed the world that they were a force to be reckoned with and not a team that should be counted out. For many countries, this served as a wake-up call for two things: first, although the Canadians played the game well, they were no longer necessarily the best; and second, the Soviet style of hockey must be studied and copied in order to compete on the same level. The Soviets by this time had become the epitome of a successful hockey team, well-conditioned and working together seamlessly to produce win after win.

The majority of Soviet hockey team members were officers in the Red Army, yet instead of doing traditional army duties, the chief “military” duty of these athletes was to play hockey for their country.³² They were paid what was typical for most officers in the army, yet where they differed was bonuses. If the team won a gold medal or came in first in an international

²⁷ *Of Miracles and Men*, directed by Jonathan Hock, 2015, ESPN 30 for 30 TV Documentary.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ *Red Army*, DVD directed by Gabe Polsky.

³⁰ Riordan, *Soviet Sport Background to the Olympics*, 91.

³¹ Jeff Merton, “The Rise, Fall and Resurrection of Russian Hockey,” February 14, 2002, <http://www.espn.com/olympics/winter02/hockey/story?id=1326249>.

³² Ibid.

competition, such as a world championship, the players would receive a bonus usually equaling out to about \$2500.³³ For many, these bonuses provided a big incentive because they were only living on an army salary and playing hockey eleven months out of the year, leaving little or no time to earn additional money by any other means. There were also perks associated with this type of service such as international travel and a high level of prominence. Fame came for many athletes, but those who were officers in the army received a government backing that brought on an entirely new form of recognition at home in the Soviet Union. Hockey players became superstars for the people of the Soviet Union, and when, in 1980, they fell from the pedestal upon which they had been placed, the hockey team no longer had the same allure it once held for many in the U.S.S.R.

Between 1964 and 1976 the Soviet hockey team earned the Olympic gold medal in every Olympics. They also dominated international competition. In the World Championships between 1963 and 1979 the Soviets only missed the gold in three years, and even then still managed to earn silver in two cases and bronze in the other. In the 1974 Summit Series, which many expected the Canadians to easily win, the Soviets emerged victorious. Going into the 1980s there was the expectation that the Soviet hockey team would continue its streak of dominating the competition.

1980 Lake Placid Winter Olympics: The Implications of a Silver Medal

During the winter Olympics that took place at Lake Placid in 1980, the U.S.S.R. hockey team unexpectedly lost to the U.S. team. As tensions were reaching their peak, the 1980 Olympics “had this Cold War flavor to it,” claimed journalist Lawrence Martin.³⁴ This was true in more ways than one. The Soviets had long been recognized as the most dominant team in the hockey world, but going into the 1980 Olympics, the Soviet athletes had an extra layer of international hostility due to the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan that had begun in December of 1979.³⁵ The U.S. even led a boycott of the 1980 Summer Olympics that were to take place in Moscow that ended with the U.S. and many other countries not participating, making it one of the smallest turnouts (in terms of countries competing) since the 1956 Olympics. Thus the Winter Games were deemed even more crucial for the Soviets to win because the Soviets wanted to be in a winning position going into the Moscow games later in 1980.³⁶

Going into the matchup against the U.S. team, the Soviets were extremely confident—just weeks before they had easily beaten the U.S. in Madison Square Garden.³⁷ The mentality of

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ *Red Army*, DVD directed by Gabe Polsky.

³⁵ *Of Miracles and Men*, directed by Jonathan Hock.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Ibid.

the Soviet people and the government going into the 1980 Winter Olympic Games was, according to journalist Lawrence Martin, “we’re the best and we’re the best because of the Soviet system, because of socialism that’s why we’re the best.”³⁸ This made the loss for both the Soviet government and the people all the more painful to experience. The Soviet players had proven themselves time and time again over the last decade, continuously coming out victorious in both the Olympics and in other international competitions. They had been playing together for a long time; being in the Red Army program together seemed to bring a sort of closeness and understanding between the players.³⁹ Along those lines, with an average age of twenty-one the American team was less experienced; by comparison the Soviet players were on average, at least five years older.⁴⁰ Thus when the Soviets lost, much of the world was shocked.

The match started off fairly predictably, as the Soviets quickly took the lead in the first period. But the U.S. seemed able to keep up like no other team before them had done. When the Americans were able to gain the lead and win the game, the Soviet players looked on in awe of the Americans. To see the reaction that winning elicited from the opposing team was not something that had been experienced by Soviet players for a long time.⁴¹ What many forget about this Olympics is that the Soviets still won the silver medal, but this was little consolation for the Soviet leaders, who viewed this as a loss in terms of the Cold War, as well as for the players, who were not accustomed to losing on a world stage. This was hardly the strong front the Soviets wished to put on for the world, that the U.S. could beat them in a sporting match.

The silver medal was seen as a humbling experience by many, and it was something with which the Soviet leadership struggled to cope. To put it succinctly, the U.S. team outplayed the Soviet team, and the loss was not something that Tikhonov or his players had ever anticipated. Their defeat showed that the Soviets could be beaten, which was not what the Soviet government wanted the world either to know or to see. The Soviet response led to a reform of some parts of the sports schools and system in order to avoid another loss like Lake Placid. The hockey program was overhauled and coaching staff changed, while the players remained employed, at least initially. This may have been an overreaction on the part of the Soviet leadership, but to the Soviets, winning at hockey was the ultimate political goal, which in turn meant that the prospect of not winning was totally unacceptable.

Despite what many in the Soviet Union would call a great and terrible loss, the hockey team quickly bounced back to victory. The Soviet hockey team continued to dominate until the late 1980s when the Soviet Union began to crumble from within. This showed that the ‘problem’ may not have been the system. Some of the veteran players and coaching staff were let go and younger players were brought in by Tarasov, whom he thought he could more easily control.⁴²

³⁸ *Red Army*, DVD directed by Gabe Polsky.

³⁹ *Of Miracles and Men*, directed by Jonathan Hock.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

⁴¹ *Ibid.*

⁴² *Red Army*, DVD directed by Gabe Polsky.

Despite this Olympic loss, the Soviet team had won the hockey gold medal six times between the 1964 and 1988 games. Yes, the loss at the height of the Cold War was not desirable, but as a whole the Soviet hockey team remained a dominant force that few were ever able to defeat, at least until the fall of the Soviet Union in 1991. This was simply a rare instance where the Big Red Sports machine hit a glitch, because when the Soviet sports machine got going, it was mighty hard to stop.⁴³

The Decline of the Soviet Union

After the loss at the 1980 Winter Olympics, the many problems within the Soviet system gradually came into full view. By 1991, the Soviet Union had collapsed and was supplanted by Russia and a dozen or so other independent countries. Each of these countries, including Russia, had its own sports machine with varying degrees of success.

Now that the Soviet Union no longer existed, changes in sport were beginning to take place in Russia. The decline of the Soviet Union was something that loomed in the back of the minds of many. The relationship between the Soviet government and its athletes had not been as strong as many people had once believed. In particular, the government's treatment of its hockey players who wanted to gain permission to play in the National Hockey League (NHL) was strikingly bad. The Soviet leadership feared that their players might defect, showing the world that their athletes were leaving due to a failing system. Despite the truth in that fear, the government was reluctant to admit this to the world, and thus tension between Soviet leadership and athletes only continued to worsen as the Soviet Union declined in the last decades of the twentieth century. The government repeatedly took credit for their athletes' successes to show the validity of the Soviet system rather than give the credit due to the individuals who were competing, proving that the authorities continued to believe that the system was more important than the individual. Over time, this began to anger Soviet athletes who had consistently put in time and effort to be as successful as possible in their sport for their country.

Soviet hockey players now seemed to be pawns in a game of chess that was being played against the whole world. Consequently, when the Soviet players wanted to play for the NHL in the U.S. and Canada, the Soviet government opposed them at every juncture. Some hockey players did in fact hope to defect in order to escape a system to which they felt that they had been subjected for far too long. To many of the Soviet players, too, the appeal of far greater income was enticing. The Soviet players, we have noted, were paid an army salary, and since the Soviet Union economy was failing, their income was small at best. Another reason that players such as Fetisov found the NHL so appealing was the new coaching staff that they would have in the U.S. Fetisov had a profound dislike of head coach Tikhonov and little respect for the man.

Vladislav Tretiak retired at age thirty-two because he simply could not stand to play hockey any longer; he was burned out. Considering that these players were training eleven months out of the year, with the majority of that time being away from their family, it seems

⁴³ Ibid.

surprising that more players did not burn out.⁴⁴ Tretiak's retirement seems to have been the product of years of grueling practices and ill treatment of the players by Tikhonov. Many of the Soviet players could only subject themselves to this type of treatment for so long before a change became necessary. Players such as Tretiak seized the initiative and took what actions they deemed necessary for themselves. To his credit, although Tretiak did ultimately quit the Soviet hockey team, he never tried to capitalize on his hockey success by trying his luck in the U.S. Nonetheless, his retirement angered many Soviets, especially those with leadership roles within the government, who believed that these players had a responsibility to their country, which after all had made them into what they were. In gratitude, they should do whatever was required of them to promote the Soviet Union and its communist political ideology, rather than being disloyal.

By 1985, the Soviet Union was stagnating economically, no longer able to compete with the economies of Western countries; the reality that was the Iron Curtain which had existed for so long no longer existed, according to journalist Vladimir Pozner.⁴⁵ Sports, for all its importance to Soviet leadership, had never generated much revenue for the government, and "the pressing needs of perestroika further decreased what had already been limited support."⁴⁶ This led to the Soviet government's loaning players to professional teams in North America on the condition that the Soviet government receive as payment a large part of their salary. Thus the Soviet players' success was still being tied to the Soviet government, but now with the players supporting the government financially rather than the reverse.⁴⁷ Despite angering players such as Fetisov, the Soviet practice did not deter their desire to leave and play in the NHL.⁴⁸

Nonetheless, the results were confusing at best. North American teams drafted Soviet players, and despite the Soviet government's still claiming the players who left to play in the NHL and also despite receiving a portion of their salaries, the Soviet leaders remained hesitant to allow 'their' players to leave. This paranoia was largely unjustified. Viacheslav Fetisov, for example, wanted to play for the New Jersey Devils, yet although "he wished to play in the NHL, he did not wish to defect."⁴⁹ This was the perspective of many of the players wishing to play in the NHL. While they wanted a different life for themselves, defecting was not an option.

During this time the Soviet Union had very strict rules about the individual's role in sport and society. According to Soviet leaders it was the individual's job to obey and not question the system.⁵⁰ If the individual were to disobey Soviet leadership or "if he tried to have a say, that

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶ Robert Edelman, *Serious Fun: A History of Spectator Sports in the USSR* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 216.

⁴⁷ *Red Army*, DVD directed by Gabe Polsky.

⁴⁸ Edelman, *Serious Fun: A History of Spectator Sports in the USSR*, 221.

⁴⁹ Ibid., 224.

⁵⁰ *Red Army*, DVD directed by Gabe Polsky.

could end his career,” according to journalist Lawrence Martin.⁵¹ It was due to this that we can see the government becoming increasingly frustrated with athletes’ requests to play for Western countries. However, the Soviet leadership did understand that many things within their system were failing, and by allowing concessions to be made in certain matters, the focus could be placed on the areas where it was desperately needed—like fixing the failing economy.

Much of this desperation to keep athletes in the Soviet Union came from the situation with Alexander Mogilny, a hockey player for the Red Army team who “defected to the U.S. while playing in a tournament for the Soviet Union.”⁵² This created a panic within the Soviet leadership, who feared that if one person deflected that this might start a wave of other athletes wanting to follow suit. This possibility—Soviet star athletes defecting after they had brought prestige to the Soviet Union—was something that the Soviet government could ill afford. Soviet leaders needed their athletes to continue to dominate in international and Olympic competitions and show the world, especially the Western world, that they were winning due to their superior socialist political system.

Consequently, when Fetisov had officially resigned his officer’s commission and had secured Tikhonov’s signature on the necessary documents, there was resistance from the government when it came to actually allowing Fetisov to leave the U.S.S.R. and play in the U.S. for the NHL. Fetisov claimed that Tikhonov and the Soviet officials were dragging their feet in accepting his resignation because they did not wish to lose such a valuable player, and they especially did not wish to lose the said player to the U.S.⁵³ As time went on, and especially after the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, however, the Russian government eventually allowed players to leave on the condition that they would return to Russia to play for the Russian team in international and Olympic competitions when it was required of them.

After initially dragging its feet, the Soviet government eventually granted Fetisov and eight other Soviet players permission to leave the Soviet Union and play for the National Hockey League. Fetisov had been drafted in the NHL back in 1978, but had been unable to leave the Soviet Union at that time. Fetisov reentered the NHL Entry Draft in 1989, however, and was drafted by the New Jersey Devils.⁵⁴ He remained in New Jersey until 1995, when he was traded to the Detroit Red Wings. Despite his Fetisov’s obvious talent, however, he did not prosper – at least not initially – in the way that many had hoped he would do. In New Jersey, Fetisov struggled to adapt to this new, more simplistic style of playing, and it was not until he was traded to Detroit that he was able to shine. This struggle to adapt to a new mode of playing the game of hockey also proved problematic for other Soviet players when coming to the NHL. These players were trying to cope with a new language, new surroundings, and people who held different values than the ones they had lived by in the U.S.S.R.⁵⁵ By the time the Red Wings acquired

⁵¹ Ibid.

⁵² Ibid.

⁵³ Edelman, *Serious Fun: A History of Spectator Sports in the USSR*, 224.

⁵⁴ *Red Army*, DVD directed by Gabe Polsky.

⁵⁵ Edelman, *Serious Fun: A History of Spectator Sports in the USSR*, 226.

Fetisov, and eventually, the top four other Russian hockey stars—the so-called “Russian Five”—they had decided to capitalize on the Soviet style of play rather than trying to force the Russians to adopt the simplistic style of the NHL.⁵⁶

The Russian Five changed the way Soviet players were viewed in the NHL and increased their potential value to other teams. The Russian Five consisted of three forwards: Sergei Fedorov, Igor Larionov, and Vyacheslav Kozlov; and two defensemen: Vladimir Konstantinov and Viacheslav Fetisov.⁵⁷ The five had played together in the Soviet Union, had each been coached by Tikhonov, and were all superb players. They had each contributed, at some point or another, to the success of the Red Army Hockey Club. For the first time in the NHL the Soviet style of hockey was present and extremely successful. The Red Wings decision to reunite these players allowed them to once again bring back their Soviet-style hockey roots. With the Russian Five, the Detroit Red Wings won the Stanley Cup in 1997 and remained a dominant team for close to a decade.⁵⁸ This decision also helped to foster a change of the style of hockey played within the NHL, one that would continue to evolve and dominate the NHL for years to come.

The Soviet Union officially collapsed in 1991. Gorbachev’s policies were not taking the country by storm like many had hoped they would. Instead they created an environment that allowed for many more domestic issues to emerge, and Gorbachev was not able to fix them. Thus when the country decided to join the Commonwealth of Independent States, Gorbachev stepped down because he believed he was no longer fit to lead the country in the new direction it wanted to go.⁵⁹ Gorbachev’s speech in December of 1991 marked the end of an ideology that had taken control of Russia for the better part of a century.

By the time that the Russian Five helped the Detroit Red Wings secure the 1997 Stanley Cup, the Soviet Union had fallen. However, the ideology that they were the best and would get that way through any means necessary did not disappear with the fall of the socialist system. The fall of the Soviet Union, of course, led to the disbanding of the Ministry of Sport. The succeeding Olympics were filled with disappointment for both the people and government as the idea of individual athletes competing to bring prestige and honor to the country seemed no longer to have a place in the Russian state. Journalist, Vladimir Pozner observed, “We kind of forgot about the patriotism.”⁶⁰ Despite these ongoing problems, however, Russian leaders after the fall of the Soviet Union continued to be shaped by the U.S.S.R. because that had been the regime under which they had grown up.⁶¹

⁵⁶ *Red Army*, DVD directed by Gabe Polsky.

⁵⁷ Ibid.

⁵⁸ Ibid.

⁵⁹ Mikhail Gorbachev, “The End of the Soviet Union: the text of Gorbachev’s Farewell Address (1991),” <http://www.nytimes.com/1991/12/26/world/end-of-the-soviet-union-text-of-gorbachev-s-farewell-address.html?pagewanted=all>.

⁶⁰ *Red Army*, DVD directed by Gabe Polsky.

⁶¹ Ibid.

After the success of the Russian Five in the NHL, the Soviet style of play became common in the NHL. The Russian Five had opened the door for a merging of styles of play. They also served to open the door for many other foreign athletes from both socialist and non-socialist countries, to play in the NHL. The Soviet hockey players set a precedent for international athletes to play in the U.S. and prosper.

What Happened to the Soviet Athletes?

For many Soviet athletes retiring from their sport meant turning to coaching. This allowed them to stay within a system in which they had grown up and to which they had dedicated their lives. Some former athletes even accepted positions within the new government. It seemed as though the Soviet athletes were coming full circle within the system that had created them.

Soon after the Detroit Red Wings won the Stanley Cup in 1997, one of the members of their unit was injured in a car accident that effectively ended his hockey career. Fetisov was injured in the accident as well, but was able to recover quickly from his injuries, and, by 2002, Fetisov was working as a coach of the Russian Olympic hockey team. The Russians won a gold medal, but Fetisov soon retired as a coach when, during the same Olympics, President Vladimir Putin offered him a position as Minister of Sport. Fetisov was henceforth in charge of the Federal Agency for Sport and Physical Education, but retired in 2008 to become a member of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation. He is still heavily involved in hockey and sports in general as a chairman on the World Anti-Doping Agency's Athlete's Committee, which is ironic considering the doping scandal that has plagued Russia since the 2016 Olympics in Rio.

Another prominent member of the Red Army hockey team was Vladislav Tretiak who, following his retirement in 1982, turned to coaching. He specializes in mentoring goalies, but is still involved in all aspects of coaching. In 2006, he was elected as the head of the Russian Ice Hockey Federation, which helped to cement his status as one of the Russia's hockey elite. Beginning in the 1990s he started Goalie Schools in Canada and the United States that still train players to this day. While these schools have produced many tremendous goaltenders, including Martin Brodeur, they are also said to be some of the most grueling hockey schools.

Less prominent players have been involved on a smaller scale. Most are still involved in hockey through coaching, though not on the large scale seen in Fetisov or Tretiak. Despite the grueling training regime to which they were subjected during their time in the Red Army Schools, it seems as though their love of the game is still there. Their willingness to stay involved in their sport speaks to their commitment to their sport and the game. Despite the negativity that surrounds Soviet hockey, it is hard for one to claim that they players had anything but love for the game.

Conclusion

Sports, throughout the twentieth century, were a non-violent means of war. The Soviet Union made use of it, and in sports such as hockey became a dominant force. The Red Army hockey

Markisohn

team's success was attributed to the Soviet Union and communism; hence when they won, it was a win for the entirety of the Soviet Union. Sports was a way of life for many in the Soviet Union; over time, many athletes became unhappy with their treatment within the system. The takeaway from this is that the intersection between sports and politics was not always good, especially inside the U.S.S.R., but the success of the Soviet Sports Machine cannot be understated.

OUTSTANDING FRESHMAN ESSAYS 2016-2017

World War I: The Lost Generation's Legacy in Literature

Sara Rutkowski

Dulce et decorum est / Pro patria mori—it is sweet and glorious to die for one's country.¹ This is the message with which European young men and women of the early twentieth century were indoctrinated before the start of World War I. By the end of the war, however, most realized that this had all been a great lie. This change in thought is reflected in literature and art produced during and after World War I illustrating that the people of the early twentieth century felt their governments had used them and wasted their youth on a war that left the world feeling dehumanized and lost.

World War I was the first war that greatly affected almost every country in our world. It was a war whose magnitude no one, including the soldiers themselves, truly understood until it was too late. When many of the young soldiers entered the war, they were doing so with dreams of glory, unaware that they would be entering a war that was unlike any history had ever seen before. By the war's end, these young men's optimistic war-glory dreams had been replaced by battered, war-fatigued realities. This transformation is reflected in the literature from both during and after the war by such authors and poets as Wilfred Owen, W. N. Hodgson, Ernest Hemingway, Ernst Junger, Herbert Read, Erich Maria Remarque, Helen Zenna Smith, Wilfred Gibson, and T.S. Elliot, along with many others.

Wilfred Owen's poems capture the anger that many felt toward their national powers. This anger was exemplified in two of his works, *Anthem for a Doomed Youth* and *Dulce et Decorum Est*. In *Anthem for A Doomed Youth*, Owen made his point known from the very beginning with a title that encapsulates the message of the entire poem: the soldiers, these young men, are doomed to die. He reiterated this point by asking rhetorically, "What passing-bells for these who die as cattle?" "Only the monstrous anger of the guns" is his answer.² The use of the word cattle symbolizes the fact that the leaders of the great European powers were sending their soldiers into battle as animals being led to the slaughter. Indeed, they cared little about the lives of those young men who were dying on their behalf: "Nor [was there] any voice of mourning" upon their deaths other than the "shrill, demented choirs of wailing shells."³

In *Dulce et Decorum Est*, Owen criticized the lie that war is glorious and something to be championed: "If you could hear, at every jolt, the blood / Come gargling from the froth-corrupted lungs, / Obscene as cancer, bitter as the cud / Of vile, incurable sores on innocent tongues, -- / My friend, you would not tell with such high zest / to children ardent for some

¹ Wilfred Owen, *Dulce et Decorum Est*, *Internet Modern History Sourcebook*, <http://sourcebooks.fordham.edu/Halsall/mod/1914warpoets.asp#owen21> (accessed November 9, 2016).

² Wilfred Owen, *Anthem for a Doomed Youth*, *Internet Modern History Sourcebook*, <http://sourcebooks.fordham.edu/Halsall/mod/1914warpoets.asp#owen21> (accessed November 9, 2016).

³ Ibid.

desperate glory, / the old lie: *Dulce et decorum est / Pro patria mori.*”⁴ This is the final stanza of the poem and appears after Owen has depicted a violent and graphic scene of a soldier dying from mustard gas. In these closing lines, the use of the word “children” is significant because it illustrates not only that these soldiers were young, but also that they were innocent. These young soldiers were putting complete trust in their governments, much as a child would do in a parent, and this innocent, unquestionable loyalty was being corrupted. With his words “high zest,” he portrayed a sarcastic and biting tone that hints at the inherent immorality of lying to young men about what they were going to experience when they went to fight. Owen’s criticism of the painted, glorified image of war contrasted sharply with the realities of the battlefields of that day. This angered revelation was reflected throughout Europe during and after the war.

The poet W. N. Hodgson presented a message similar to Owen’s when he criticized the war in *Before Action*. However, Hodgson used a wistful tone rather than Owen’s angry one. The intent of this seemingly joyful message was subtly to illustrate that these soldiers were naïvely full of dreams before they entered battle because they saw the war with “uncomprehending eyes.”⁵ They had no idea what they were getting into. His criticism was clear as he stated, “Make me a soldier, Lord. By all of man’s hopes and fears/ . . . Make me a man, O Lord/ . . . By all delights that I shall miss, help me to die, O Lord.”⁶ With the words, “help me to die,” Hodgson illustrates that these young boys are begging for the chance to be brave soldiers, to become men, but they were doing so without fully understanding the reality of war. They were, in actuality, begging to be sent to their deaths, oblivious to the horror and brutality that they would face on the battlefield. Hodgson’s literature demonstrated, just as Owen’s, that people had been given an idealistic image of battle, and that these soldiers were being sent to war with little preparation or regard.

A new trend in literature developed during and after the war called “modernism.”⁷ Modernism was a style of literature and art that strayed away from any of the literary or artistic trends of the nineteenth century, disregarding order, romanticism, and logic.⁸ Literature also started to become more and more graphic. The new weaponry of World War I—mustard gas, tanks, trench warfare, machine guns, and artillery shells—had the ability to cause more damage than any previous technology of war. In a similar manner, the authors and poets of this time depicted their realities in a graphic manner that was new to popular literature. Ernest Hemingway used this new trend in *A Farewell to Arms* as he graphically depicted the violence and unforgiving,

⁴ Wilfred Owen, *Dulce et Decorum Est*.

⁵ W. N. Hodgson, *Before Action*, *Internet Modern History Sourcebook*, <http://sourcebooks.fordham.edu/Halsall/mod/1914warpoets.asp> (accessed November 9, 2016).

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Otto Dix, *Flanders Field*, in *The First World War: A Brief History with Documents*, ed. and trans. Susan R. Grayzel (Boston: Bedford/ St. Martin’s, 2013), 147-148.

⁸ Robert M. Kirschen, *Modernism*, <https://faculty.unlv.edu/kirschen/handouts/modernism.html> (accessed November 9, 2016).

necessary brutality of war.⁹ Hemingway had served as an ambulance driver in World War I. His critical portrayal of the war within his book reflected both his time of service and also his mental state after he returned home from a journey that seemed unworthy of the tremendous sacrifices made by so many.

Another example of a graphic portrayal was in Ernst Junger's *Storm of Steel*. In one standout scene, he described facing off against British Indian soldiers and taking them as prisoners while they screamed from wounds—suffering as they struggled to live or die. He went on to illustrate the unapologetic harshness of men at war: “the mixture of the prisoners’ laments and our jubilation—had something primordial about it. This wasn’t war, it was ancient history.”¹⁰ Here Junger encapsulates the reaction of the soldiers during this “Great War,” which had reduced them to their base selves in a scary, seemingly unnatural, way. In some aspects, the sheer brutality of this war had taken men back to an uncivilized time. An even more serious problem was that this relapse into an uncivilized world would be temporary. Eventually, these men would have to return home, where they would be expected to adhere to the norms of “modern civilization” once again.

Herbert Read's poem, *The Happy Warrior*, follows this popular violent trend: “He cannot shriek. / Bloody saliva / dribbles down his shapeless jacket. / I saw him stab / and stab again / a well-killed Boche. / This is the happy warrior, / This is he”¹¹ Just as Junger's words illustrated soldiers' primordial “jubilation” as they were participating in the violence, Read's senseless, stabbing soldier was happy as well. In these lines Read exemplifies the wavering mental states these young men were experiencing as they terrifyingly fought under constant attack. The “happy warrior” was happy because he had broken from reality and was reduced to the base sense of self that is solely driven, and pleased, by the instinct to fight and kill one's enemy. The poet demonstrates that to be a “good” soldier—to be “happy” in war—a man must suppress the part of himself that separates us from senseless animals, our humanity. This revealing depiction of men at war, coupled with the popularization of violent literature, exposed more and more people to the realities of war back at home. Rather than garnering support for the war effort back home, this exposure to what these sons, husbands, fathers, and brothers were going through only added to their criticism of the war effort.

After the war, people were unsure how to reshape society. This uncertainty turned into societal criticism for the lives and innocence that had been lost during the war, which was reflected in literature. In 1928, Erich Maria Remarque published *All Quiet on the Western Front* which became extremely popular: “both the novel and the film version that appeared in 1930 decisively shaped how the war was remembered and understood, as the utter waste and indeed betrayal of a young and idealistic generation.”¹² The book exposed the internalized and

⁹ Ernest Hemingway, *A Farewell to Arms* (New York City: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1929).

¹⁰ Grayzel, *The First World War*, 152.

¹¹ Herbert Read, *The Happy Warrior*, *Internet Modern History Sourcebook*, <http://sourcebooks.fordham.edu/Halsall/mod/1914warpoets.asp> (accessed November 9, 2016).

¹² Grayzel, *The First World War*, 153.

undiscussed feelings of the soldiers during the war and how they felt going home. A glimpse into the returning soldier's conscience was captured when Remarque wrote, "Had we returned home in 1916, out of suffering and the strength of our experience we might have unleashed a storm. Now, if we go back we will be weary, broken, burnt out, rootless, and without hope. We will not be able to find our way home."¹³ Remarque's character has yet to return home, but he was writing this book from a postwar perspective that allowed the reader to infer that Remarque, and veterans like him, had felt weary, broken, burnt out, rootless, and without hope when they had returned home from war. This book, like other literature of this era, resonated with those who had experienced war first hand, even as it also fueled criticism from those who did not fight during the war, but who now nevertheless experienced its residual effects. Individuals such as Helen Zenna Smith, who gave a feminine response to *All Quiet on the Western Front* in which she suggested that others, including non-combatants, were also deeply affected by the violence and the tremendous loss of life that occurred during the war. Her perspective was quite controversial, for at the time there was great animosity between combatants and noncombatants. Susan Grayzel notes that Smith's work "illustrates [that] the war generation's attitude toward authority, its skepticism about heroism, and its appreciation of war's futility and waste" was felt by everyone who lived through the war, and was not singularly applicable to only the men who were killed.¹⁴ Smith's work captures that criticism of the war that was prevalent throughout Western societies. Individuals from all walks of life, not just the combatants, felt that their inner feelings and the trauma that they had experienced as a result of the war were going unheard and ignored.

Beyond criticism, postwar literature illustrated just how much these men who lived through war had lost in the spiritual and mental—and not just the physical—realm, along with the bleakness they felt as they returned to an uncertain world. In Wilfred Gibson's *Back*, he wrote, "They ask me where I've been / and what I've done and seen. / But what can I reply / who know it wasn't I, / but someone just like me, / who went across the sea / and with my head and hands/ killed men in foreign lands . . . / though I must bear the blame, / because he bore my name."¹⁵ As demonstrated by Junger's and Read's works, during war men were expected to dehumanize themselves as they were forced by the war to tap into a darker side of human nature. Gibson's poem illustrated that to return to one's pre-war self—to jump back into society as if one were unchanged and unaffected by the violence and killing partaken during the war—was virtually impossible. These men were no longer the same innocent, naïve individuals who had gone off to the war, yet neither could they remain the men they had been compelled to become during the war. Gibson's reflection represented the uncertainty of the future and the fear that a lot of men felt after the war during this assimilation period, feelings that were reciprocated worldwide.

¹³ Ibid., 157.

¹⁴ Ibid., 158.

¹⁵ Wilfred Gibson, *Back* (1878-1962) *Internet Modern History Sourcebook*, <http://sourcebooks.fordham.edu/Halsall/mod/1914warpoets.asp> (accessed November 9, 2016).

Another literary example illustrating men's attitudes during the postwar period was T. S. Elliot's *The Waste Land*, which has been praised for its accurate depiction of postwar society by critic I. A. Richards. Richards felt that Elliot's work represented the shared postwar "sense of desolation, of uncertainty, of futility, of the groundlessness of aspirations, of the vanity of endeavor, and a thirst for a life-giving water which seems suddenly to have failed."¹⁶ T. S. Elliot's work showed that these men returning from war were having difficulty assimilating back into their society and experiencing this postwar emotional tension. Yet few were talking about these troubles and emotions with which these men were struggling with except authors such as Elliot, Remarque, and Gibson through their expressions in literature.¹⁷

Some would say that postwar literature does not represent postwar society because, after the war, many countries had economic improvements and a lot of social progress. Here in the United States we refer to the postwar era as the roaring 1920s, that decade that witnessed Prohibition and the ratification of the 19th Amendment granting women the right to vote. However, these times of gaiety were short-lived and, within two decades, unresolved feelings from the war came once again to a head. Tensions left over from the war, discombobulated societies, and the uncertainty felt by these war-battered soldiers is arguably what enabled men such as Hitler to rise to power. He capitalized on people's pain and promised a better future where the sacrifices that these men made would be valued, which found a ready audience at the time in the disenchanted soldiers who had fought in the first war. This culmination of feelings that would eventually come to head shows that, while the postwar era may have seemed like a time of prosperity, simply looking at the physical aftermath and political events occurring after the war neither adequately explains how the average person felt at the time nor does it accurately reflect the feelings of veteran soldiers. The literature of the time, on the other hand, captured the difficult emotions and inner tensions of society because it was produced, and consumed, by those who had experienced the war, and its effects, firsthand.

The First World War was unlike any of those conflicts that had preceded it. As can be seen through the world's naïve way of handling postwar society, it truly shocked the world. Those who came back from the war were returning to an unrecognizable world in which they were not supported. The literature of the war showed that young men were being sent to fight with an idealistic view that glorified fighting and were unprepared for the horror they encountered. Many perceived this lack of preparation as a manipulation of the powers that be, and this garnered a massive criticism of the war. Literature directly reflected the soldiers' accounts of the true and accurate horror of war. The legacy of World War I was not one of glory, but rather, one where a whole generation had been lost either in death, or else within the unrecognizable world to which they returned. Through World War I and postwar literature we

¹⁶ See the discussion of Richard's criticisms in Pericles Lewis, "The Waste Land," *The Modernism Lab at Yale*, available at: https://modernism.research.yale.edu/wiki/index.php/The_Waste_Land (accessed November 9, 2016).

¹⁷ A notable exception here was Charles S. Myers ("A Contribution to the Study of Shell Shock," *The Lancet*, 1915, vol. 1, 316-320), who along with others first began talking about "shell shock." At the time, however, this condition was ill-defined and poorly understood. Interestingly, the poet Siegfried Sassoon and also Wilfred Owen spent time studying such patients at the Craiglockhart War Hospital.

Rutkowski

learn that we must recognize that soldiers need understanding, support, and the space available to properly assimilate back into peaceful, civilized society. If we do not make these necessities available, then these soldier's unsettled feelings will culminate into anger, distrust in government, and may even lead to another war.

Reinhard Heydrich's *Kristallnacht* Order: A German Cultural Catalyst

Eric Woodruff

Within any political system, officials at the top may exploit their authority to mobilize their ranks towards an objective—usually imagined by the officials themselves. They do so knowing that the lower ranks will follow their orders, more often than not, without question, especially when the system has been designed around this concentration of power. Commands and goals are made public by the officials to allow for transparency between the administration and the masses. At the same time, however, keeping the aims of the administration clandestine from the public can also be politically expedient. Thus Nazi Party members attempted to mask the violence that was planned for the night of *Kristallnacht*, November 9-10, 1938, which called for a physical assault on Germany's Jewish population, along with their residences, businesses, places of worship, and cemeteries.¹ The German public, led by Nazi Party members, SA members (*Sturmabteilungen*, more commonly known in English as "Storm Troopers"), and Hitler Youth dressed in civilian clothes, rioted through the streets, destroying anything Jewish they could find.² Concealing their plan at the time seemed to pose no challenge for the Nazi Party since events prior to this night had already demonstrated that the German public would comply with orders without much questioning. From the Reichstag Fire Decree to the Nuremberg Laws, the German public as a whole seemed to go along with everything without protest. The cooperation between the Nazi party and various groups within German society is demonstrative of the ways the Nazi ideology permeated German culture at the time. By acting as a tipping point in the allowance of violence towards Jews in Germany, however, the *Kristallnacht* Order quickly became the catalyst for anti-Semitic acts committed by both members of the central administration and Nazi sympathizing groups that, in turn, led to more widespread ethnic and racial violence under the Nazi regime.

Antisemitism in Germany did not suddenly appear with the emergence of a stronger Nazi Party. Throughout Germany's history, along with that of most of the rest of Europe, resentment and persecution of Jews took place periodically. William Brustein and Ryan King concluded in their article, "Anti-Semitism in Europe Before the Holocaust," that "the number and nature of European anti-Semitic acts before the Holocaust [and subsequently prior to *Kristallnacht*] varied significantly over time and across countries."³ In Germany's case, the foundation for intense

¹ "The 'Night of Broken Glass,'" *United States Holocaust Museum*, available at: <https://www.ushmm.org/outreach/en/article.php?ModuleId=10007697> (accessed February 16, 2017).

² *Kristallnacht: A Nationwide Pogrom*, *United States Holocaust Museum*, available at: <https://www.ushmm.org/wlc/en/article.php?ModuleId=10005201> (accessed February 16, 2017).

³ William Brustein and Ryan King, "Anti-Semitism in Europe Before the Holocaust," *International Political Science Review*, vol. 25, no. 1 (January 2004): 35-53 at 48.

anti-Semitism had been laid in German culture long before the rise of the Nazis.⁴ Henry Singer, a Jewish man born and raised in Berlin, wrote about his experience of living in Berlin prior to *Kristallnacht*, saying, “[T]he anti-Semitism in Germany was there before Hitler came to power. He just openly sanctioned it.” To illustrate his point, he went on to detail a story of when, as a kid, he was playing with a German boy who, upon losing, told young Henry that he hoped he would take an “Einbahnstrasse nach Palestina [take a one-way street to Palestine].”⁵ Not unique to one individual, events like this had happened time and again to Jewish individuals residing in Germany prior to the existence of both the Nazi Party and the *Kristallnacht Order*. With such a culture conditioned in racist ideologies and already having established a precedent of abuse towards Jews, it was easy for the Nazis to obtain support for the pogrom of *Kristallnacht*.⁶

The violence of *Kristallnacht* followed closely on the heels of the Reich Propaganda Minister Joseph Goebbels’ assertion earlier on November 9th (incidentally, also the anniversary of the “Beer Hall Putsch” of 1923) before an assembly of leading Nazi Party members that ‘World Jewry’ had conspired to commit the assassination of Nazi embassy official Ernst vom Rath in Paris. Goebbels told his audience that “the Führer has decided that . . . demonstrations should not be prepared or organized by the Party, but insofar as they erupt spontaneously, they are not to be hampered.”⁷ Party leaders circulated a set of instructions giving both implicit and explicit commands to the German police force (comprised of members of the *SS*, or *Schutzstaffel*, and the *Gestapo*, the *Geheime Staatspolizei* or Secret State Police). As the riots got underway across Germany, Reinhard Heydrich, then the second most powerful man in the *SS* behind Heinrich Himmler, sent a telegram containing specific instructions that simultaneously set limits on police intervention and legitimized the acts that the administration anticipated were being committed. According to Heydrich’s *Kristallnacht Order*, those Germans who were “rioting” in response to the death of vom Rath were to take no measures endangering (non-Jewish) German life or property; looting (even of Jewish possessions) was forbidden; foreigners (including even Jewish foreigners) were not to be subjected to violence; and the rioters were to remove all historical synagogue archival materials prior to vandalizing the synagogues and other properties of the Jewish communities, and they were to transfer those archival materials to the Security Service (*Sicherheitsdienst*, or *SD*). The orders also indicated that police officials should arrest as many Jews, preferably young healthy men, as the local jails could hold.

⁴ Ibid., 38.

⁵ Henry Singer, “The Antisemitism in Germany was there before Hitler came to power,” in *What We Knew: Terror, Mass Murder, and Everyday Life in Nazi Germany: An Oral History*, ed. and trans. Eric Johnson and Karl-Heinz Reuband (Cambridge, Mass.: Basic Books/Perseus, 2005), 14-18 at 14, 16.

⁶ For more on the historical and intellectual antecedents of anti-Semitism in Germany, see the excellent discussion by William L. Shirer in his *Rise and Fall of the Third Reich: A History of Nazi Germany*, rep. ed. (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2011), 90-113.

⁷ *Kristallnacht: A Nationwide Pogrom*.

Reinhard Heydrich's Kristallnacht Order

1. The Chiefs of the State Police, or their deputies, must immediately upon receipt of this telegram contact, by telephone, the political leaders in their areas – Gauleiter or Kreisleiter – who have jurisdiction in their districts and arrange a joint meeting with the inspector or commander of the Order Police to discuss the arrangements for the demonstrations. At these discussions the political leaders will be informed that the German Police has received instructions, detailed below, from the Reichsfuehrer SS and the Chief of the German Police, with which the political leadership is requested to coordinate its own measures:

a) Only such measures are to be taken as do not endanger German lives or property (i.e., synagogues are to be burned down only where there is no danger of fire in neighboring buildings).

b) Places of business and apartments belonging to Jews may be destroyed but not looted. The police is instructed to supervise the observance of this order and to arrest looters.

c) In commercial streets particular care is to be taken that non-Jewish businesses are completely protected against damage.

d) Foreign citizens – even if they are Jews – are not to be molested.

2. On the assumption that the guidelines detailed under paragraph 1 are observed, the demonstrations are not to be prevented by the Police, which is only to supervise the observance of the guidelines.

3. On receipt of this telegram Police will seize all archives to be found in all synagogues and offices of the Jewish communities so as to prevent their destruction during the demonstrations. This refers only to material of historical value, not to contemporary tax records, and so forth. The archives are to be handed over to the locally responsible officers of the SD.

4. The control of the measures of the Security Police concerning the demonstrations against the Jews is vested in the organs of the State Police, unless inspectors of the Security Police have given their own instructions. Officials of the Criminal Police, members of the SD, of the Reserves and the SS in general may be used to carry out the measures taken by the Security Police.

5. As soon as the course of events during the night permits the release of the officials required, as many Jews in all districts – especially the rich – as can be accommodated in existing prisons are to be arrested. For the time being only healthy male Jews, who are not too old, are to be detained. After the detentions have been carried out the appropriate

concentration camps are to be contacted immediately for the prompt accommodation of the Jews in the camps. Special care is to be taken that the Jews arrested in accordance with these instructions are not ill-treated. . . .⁸

Though written in terse, practical language, Heydrich's *Kristallnacht* instructions were not devoid of a deeper and far more sinister meaning. Henceforth *Kristallnacht* would impose a dark blot upon German history and fundamentally transform German culture.

Much of the authority that gave the order validity stemmed from the position of power held by Heydrich. In the absence of a top-ranking official submitting these orders, there might have been insufficient numbers of those willing to follow the instructions that had been issued. The Nazi party at the time held enough power to have a monopoly on the government, giving each of the party officials a voice that would be heard and obeyed by a majority of the people. This foothold enjoyed by the Nazi party in Germany reached the State Police Main Offices and Field Offices, giving them power over local police and allowing even more power and control as the national police force. As the entity that kept the population under control and enforced the law throughout Germany, the SS and *Gestapo* wielded such immense power that many Germans were intimidated and deterred from insurgence. Heydrich's command over this police force further gave him authority and opened the flood gates of anti-Semitism.

A form of authority not explicitly stated in the *Order* is that of the German people over the Jewish people, a superiority granted to them by a prejudiced classification system promoted by the Nazis. This classification system came out of the Nuremberg race laws that had been passed three years prior in 1935, which no longer recognized the Jewish population as part of the German population in an official sense.⁹ The *Kristallnacht Order* planned and encouraged the destruction of Jewish property and the arrest of Jewish young men. It depicted the Jewish people socially as lower than German citizens, in the process elevating the status of Germans and characterizing the Jews as "Other," thus reinforcing the "us vs. them" culture of Nazi Germany. Heydrich's *Order* served to polarize the people with officially-sanctioned actions, doing exactly what the Nazi officials wanted by separating and isolating the Jews from the German population.

The *Order* begins by directly clarifying which group the pogrom will be targeting, namely, the Jews. Heydrich makes it quite clear whom he considered as "Others" and who therefore merited the aggression of the German population. This no doubt stemmed in part from the previously mentioned intense racism that persisted in Germany's culture long before this, though it is also well known from his leadership in planning the Final Solution that Heydrich's personal racist tendencies closely mirrored those of the Nazi Party. Immediately following this came the stern warning not to harm anything that would "jeopardize German life."¹⁰ Heydrich

⁸ Reinhard Heydrich, *Kristallnacht Order* (November 10, 1938), Jewish Virtual Library: A Project of AICE, available at: <http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/kristallnacht-order> (accessed February 16, 2017).

⁹ "Nuremberg Race Laws: Translation: Reich Citizenship Law of September 15, 1935," 2017, *United States Holocaust Museum*, available at: <https://www.ushmm.org/wlc/en/article.php?ModuleId=10007903> (accessed February 19 2017).

¹⁰ Heydrich, *Kristallnacht Order*.

included this to remove any possibility that the pogrom might become more of a riot than an attack directed toward the Jewish population. Also, the example given in this portion (see above, paragraph 1a.) provided the police force with an idea of what types of attacks that the participants might carry out during the night. The sanctioning of the destruction of Jewish synagogues only when there was no danger of harming of any other part of the surrounding German neighborhood would no doubt have given the police force the idea that any and all buildings qualifying as such could, and indeed should, be set ablaze.

Heydrich's *Order* then shifts to non-religious Jewish establishments, focusing on the homes and businesses. This section gave the police the power to arrest any who were looting the establishments that had been destroyed. Heydrich's reasoning here appears to have been simple; the Nazi Party wanted to confiscate all of the valuables and other items for the Party instead of allowing the "rioters" to seize the wealth. At the same time, this would ensure that the rioters retained their focus upon the destruction of Jewish property and the arrest of healthy Jewish men. Lastly, the order that the police force should directly supervise the destruction gave the police both a domineering presence and authority during the night. With the police standing directly at the sites of destruction, those participating would be afraid to go against the police and extend the destruction to non-Jewish establishments even though the rioters during this night held no qualms in the destroying of Jewish property in front of the police force. Heydrich's instructions prohibiting the destruction of non-Jewish German property served to further the idea that the preservation of "us" held more importance than the destruction of "them."

The conclusion to Heydrich's command held the most important implications. First, the wealthier and healthier Jews were ordered to be arrested, leaving their property and businesses open for the Nazi Party to loot them. The healthier the Jewish male, the more highly valued he was because he could be put to work at one of the concentration camps. Heydrich's *Order* designated these camps to house the arrested Jews. This was a process that would continue throughout the reign of the Nazi Party. The shipment of some 20,000 Jews to concentration camps in the days after *Kristallnacht* led directly to the build-up of these camps and, with hindsight, gave Heydrich's *Order* even more importance because it served as the precursor to the establishment of bigger, more effective, and, ultimately, more lethal concentration camps.¹¹

The underlying message that Heydrich gave, namely, that of polarizing the Jewish population to allow for the continuation of the plans that would discriminate against and further segregate Jews and, though not fully stated at the time, later attempt to exterminate them, is quite clear. The targets are exclusively Jewish-owned businesses, places of worship, and so forth. No other groups are mentioned. Heydrich's guidelines were a reflection on the ideology of the German officer that issued them, giving further insight into the motivations of the Nazi system. Lacking any compassion whatsoever for the Jewish race, Heydrich held no sympathy for the havoc these orders would wreak. Along with this, anti-Semitism was perpetuated through the idea that others should join in the racial and ethnic hatred and violence. Meanwhile, by limiting

¹¹ Edouard Calic, *Reinhard Heydrich: The Chilling Story of the Man Who Masterminded the Nazi Death Camps*, trans. Lowell Bair (New York: William Morrow and Co., 1985), 193.

the arrests to only those who looted Jewish houses/establishments, Heydrich alleviated any fears of retribution by the aggressive state police force that German citizens might have harbored. In doing so, the Jewish community was put in a state of helplessness as the Germans were emboldened to join in the violence directed against the Jews, which now became elevated to the status of one's patriotic German duty.¹²

It was paramount, of course, that these motives be kept secret from the public. The Nazi government's main goal was to manipulate the German people into carrying out Heydrich's *Order* with the conviction that these acts were their own doing.¹³ Participation needed to be organic and voluntary; forced or instituted involvement would effectively be impossible. Carefully and cleverly utilizing the racist attitudes that were already present in the German population, the Nazis coaxed out the violence. And despite there being no clear evidence as yet of the eventual extermination, an outbreak like *Kristallnacht* was imperative to the future plans of the Nazi government.

This promotion of violence through *Kristallnacht* led to the bigger event that has darkened Germany's history: the Holocaust. Without *Kristallnacht*, the next phases of transferring them to concentration camps would have been far more difficult since the Jews would not have been already prepared for shipment. The very last part of Heydrich's *Order*—"after the arrests have been carried out the appropriate concentration camp is to be contacted immediately with a view to a quick transfer of the Jews to the camps"¹⁴—gives a glimpse at the ultimate goal. The plan to move the Jewish population to these camps was the Nazi leaders' goal all along. Thus they used *Kristallnacht* to gain the people's acceptance so that the next steps in a larger, vaguer plan could be undertaken. A vital part of genocide is the movement of people, forcing them away from their homes and leaving them in a state of confusion, making it easier to intimidate, exploit, and, ultimately, kill them. The Nazi government had clearly made Jewish towns and cities unsafe for Jewish people, making their relocation necessary and even inevitable. Heydrich's *Kristallnacht Order* made all of this possible because it sanctioned the police force's and the people's terrorizing of the Jewish population in their homes.

The events and atmosphere of Germany after the events of this night became increasingly brutal towards the Jewish population; the concentration camps noted in the *Order* became places of industrial killings, the forced movement of Jews into dilapidated ghettos, and the overall opinion of the public towards the Jews declined further. Josef Stone, a Jewish individual who managed to leave Germany after *Kristallnacht*, says in his account that "nobody went outside. No one felt secure, no one. You didn't trust your next-door neighbor because you didn't know what they were going to do to you. Neighbors who formerly came to your house, and were

¹² Ibid.

¹³ "The 'Night of Broken Glass.'"

¹⁴ Heydrich, *Kristallnacht Order*.

neighborly and friendly, all of a sudden refrained from even saying hello to you.”¹⁵ The treatment of Jewish people clearly changed. No longer could Jews trust their German neighbors to be kind, caring individuals, nor could they feel secure in their own homes. The night of *Kristallnacht* allowed the prejudices that already existed to be acted upon more openly and without a social stigma telling individuals that these actions should not have been taken. At the same time, there was genuine reason for fear among the German population, for those who did not share these racist views, but who resisted the Nazis, were also imprisoned and exterminated when caught. Despite the danger, however, a number of members of this Nazi opposition movement continued to hide Jews and helped to facilitate their escape whenever possible.¹⁶

Janet Jacobs concludes that “Kristallnacht commemoration has come to represent the wounding of God in the genocide of the Jews.”¹⁷ Established through Heydrich's *Order*, *Kristallnacht* has had a devastating impact upon Germany's subsequent history. The anti-Semitic attitudes and actions that this night sanctioned for German citizens marked the beginning of the Holocaust, the event that holds more significance in the history of massacres and genocide than any other (with the possible exception of the Armenian Genocide of 1915). From the polarization of the German people to the control over the police force, Nazi Germany proved its capability to transform the German culture into one of hate and violence, not through introducing new ideas, but from emphasizing ones that have existed for years prior.

¹⁵ Josef Stone, “All the people on the sidewalks started yelling at us,” in *What We Knew: Terror, Mass Murder, and Everyday Life in Nazi Germany: An Oral History*, ed. and trans. Eric Johnson and Karl-Heinz Reuband (Cambridge, Mass.: Basic Books/Perseus, 2005), 35-40 at 35.

¹⁶ Here one immediately thinks of the theologian and Confessing (anti-Nazi) Church pastor, Dietrich Bonhoeffer, who paid the ultimate price for his actions as part of the German resistance, controversially at times, not only to oppose and attempt to assassinate Hitler, but also to help as many Jews as possible escape through Switzerland. See Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *The Cost of Discipleship* (New York: Macmillan, 1963), esp. 11-35 (“Memoir” by Gerhard Leibholz); and the excellent biography by Bonhoeffer's student, Eberhard Bethge, *Dietrich Bonhoeffer: A Biography*, rev. ed., ed. Victoria J. Barnett (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000).

¹⁷ Janet Jacobs, “Memorializing the Sacred: Kristallnacht in German National Memory,” *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, vol. 47, no. 3 (September 2004): 485-498 at 497.