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INTRODUCTION

A great pope such as Innocent III evokes various responses from medieval historians, including praise, criticism and scholarly skepticism. Above all, Innocent inspires curiosity. His remarkable involvement in secular affairs, his incredible volume of correspondence, and his skills as a statesman as well as a religious leader, elicit interest from all historians who choose to study him.

One of the many areas of significant interest for scholars is the pontiff’s role in the disastrous events of the Fourth Crusade. Scholarly opinion on this issue has varied significantly in the last century. Authorities have raised questions and formulated a whole range of conclusions. Trends of sympathy and trends of criticism concerning the papal role in the crusade have developed over the years, side by side.

The controversy, as discussed by historians, concerns Innocent’s participation in the Fourth Crusade: To what extent was the pontiff involved in the diversions to Zara and Constantinople? Did he plot, suggest or even tolerate the diversions of the crusaders? Did he have ulterior motives? Or was he genuinely distraught with the course of events? Most importantly, regardless of his personal preferences concerning the diversions,
was Innocent actually in control of the crusade? Did he have the power to influence the outcome of the expedition, or was he merely swept along in the course of events? If he held little actual control, then what degree of influence did he possess?

Historians have tackled these questions with varying degrees of success in the last 100 years. Three very different lines of thought have developed concerning Innocent's role in the crusade. This thesis will evaluate these three stances. The internal development and evolution of the scholarly positions will be traced (and the interconnections discussed), and areas and questions in need of further research will be suggested.

In my research, it became apparent to me that different historians evaluate and emphasize very different aspects of Innocent's control over the crusade. For example, some scholars write extensively on Innocent's role in the diversion to Zara, and say little concerning Constantinople. Others stress Innocent's role in the early organizational stages of the crusade. Still others neglect to discuss the papal role in any detail, preferring to make broad generalizations. In short, scholars choose to discuss those aspects of the pope's role which they either prefer, or know the most about, or esteem the most important.

Hence this historiography does not strive to trace the development of scholarly opinion on any one specific event or
situation of the crusade. Rather, this thesis traces scholarly opinion on Innocent's role in the crusade from a broad perspective: Which scholars (independent of their emphasis) assert that Innocent was in control of the crusade, and which do not? Secondly, of the latter, which scholars are critical of Innocent, and which are not? Finally, which line of scholarly thought (or which convergence of lines) is nearest "the truth"?
CHAPTER I

INNOCENT III THE HYPOCRITE

The vast majority of scholars who have written on Innocent III and the crusade agree on the issue of his control: he had little, or none. However, a few scholars assert that Innocent did have a substantial amount of control, and these are the scholars who accuse Innocent of exploiting the crusade. In short, Innocent can only be accused of plotting or manipulating the crusade if it is assumed that the crusaders listened to him (i.e., he was in control).

One group of scholars who make such an assumption is the Soviets. Soviet scholars are not known for their favorable opinions on the papacy, or the Church in general. Borislav Primov's article, "The Papacy, the Fourth Crusade and Bulgaria," exemplifies the Russian scholars' rather uncomplimentary evaluation of Pope Innocent's role in the crusade.

Primov's work is two-fold. He aims to reveal the papal role in the history of Bulgaria, and, in more detail, he aims to appraise correctly the pope's role in the diversion of the crusade. Primov is critical of western scholars, who excuse and justify Innocent's behavior, and he asserts that his work
In support of Marxist and Progressive scholars. The "Progressive scholar" whom Primov mostly refers to is N. A. Zaborov, who claims that Innocent "... secretly patronised the anti-Byzantine plans of the 'Lectra'...". Also, as is expected from Soviet scholars, Primov discusses Karl Marx: "K. Marx states clearly ... that the pope was not led by the principles of Christian morality. Innocent III pursued his own political aims." 5

Following Marx (and Zaborov), Primov explains that Innocent "... was unable to conceal completely his double-faced and hypocritical policy." 6 Using papal correspondence, Primov strives to show that Innocent, hiding behind Christian morality, exploited the crusade in order to subordinate the Christian East to the papacy.

Primov's explanation of the pope's reaction to the sack of Zara is similar to that of most western scholars. As Primov contends, not only did Innocent disapprove of the attack, but the attack was directly against his policies. However, in the Zara incident (as well as later in the Constantinople diversion), Primov credits Innocent with having more control than most western scholars are willing to allow. According to Primov:
Could Innocent have taken any more decisive steps to prevent the development of events...? There is hardly any doubt that the pope was in a condition to have recourse to such measures. He did not resort to them since he had misgivings that he might frustrate the realization of the Crusade.

Concerning Constantinople, Primov explains that Innocent did nothing to prevent the diversion, and his only fear was that the crusaders, having conquered Constantinople, would neglect to recognize his complete control.

Primov bases his conclusions on his interpretation of papal correspondence (as well as primary narratives), much like western scholars. However, his conclusions differ significantly! While Primov is critical of Innocent and suspicious of his motives, he nevertheless attributes to him a great deal of control over the crusade. Innocent had to be influential to contribute significantly to the diversion of the crusade, as Primov claims that he did.

Along with Soviet scholars, a few western scholars have taken a similarly critical stand on Innocent. For example, Walter Ullmann and Henry Treece both assert that Innocent plotted the diversion. In an older and more known work on Innocent, Europe and the Church Under Innocent III, Sidney R. Packard likewise accuses Innocent of participation in the diversion plans.
According to Packard, Innocent's compliance with the crusaders, despite their attacks on Zara and Constantinople, can be explained by Innocent's private motives — "He saw in their project possibilities of another kind." As Packard explains, Innocent's lack of condemnation of the attack on Constantinople can be understood when Innocent's other motive is taken into consideration — he wanted to see the Eastern and Western churches united. Thus Innocent was allured by the hope of uniting the two churches, and he "... actually used frankly military and political agencies for the purpose." Packard concludes that the projects which were to justify Innocent's compromises with right and justice were not successful. Innocent neither Latinized the Greek church nor united the Eastern and Western churches.

Packard's conclusions are more sympathetic to Innocent than the Soviet historians, but Packard is obviously critical of Innocent's conciliatory attitude. Unfortunately, Packard's work is not footnoted, and hence it is difficult to ascertain which sources Packard emphasized in his research on the crusade. There are no footnotes or bibliography because the book is a part of the Berkshire Studies in European history, and in these studies, "... the trappings of scholarship... have been purposely omitted. Each author... is sufficiently a specialist to be familiar with the sources."
A second look at this connection -- scholars attributing to innocent control and at the same time accusing him of plotting the diversion -- is in order. For it is very interesting that only the harsh "critics" of Innocent are willing to assert that he was in control (to at least some substantial degree). Those scholars who are less critical of the pope, and judge him to be either blameless or relatively blameless, can only assert that Innocent lacked control. For if Innocent had been in control, and then the crusade had been diverted to Constantinople, Innocent would have to be held responsible for the unfortunate event.
CHAPTER II

INNOCENT III THE INNOCENT

There is a trend among many scholars, past and present, to view Innocent as completely blameless concerning the diversion of the crusade. In general, these scholars assert that although Innocent did his best to direct the crusade to its rightful destination, he simply was not in a position to control the crusade. This was the pope's great misfortune.

At the present, these scholars are best represented by Innocent's biographer, Helene Tillmann. Tillmann's work represents a high point in the evolution of the above-mentioned theory of Innocent's role in the crusade. A discussion of scholarship prior to Tillmann will illuminate the evolutionary development of this scholarly stand.

One of the oldest books on the crusade (and now out-dated to a large extent) is Edwin Pears' *The Fall of Constantinople*. Pears is one of the earliest authors to contend that Innocent was totally blameless for the diversion of the crusade. Pears asserts that Innocent was very angered by the expedition to Zara, and likewise the expedition to Constantinople. Innocent's long and careful preparations for a crusade to the Holy Land were
defeated by Philip, Boniface and Dandalo.\textsuperscript{18}

According to Pears, Innocent disapproved of the diversion to Zara, and he ordered the crusaders not to attack the city. However, after Zara was attacked (and hence his orders disobeyed) Innocent nevertheless absolved the crusaders -- on the condition that they did not attack the Greeks.\textsuperscript{19}

When Innocent learned of the crusaders' plans to go to Constantinople, he declared that they had no right to interfere. His wish was that they proceed to the Holy Land, and he believed that they would do so. Explains Pears:

Though Innocent had abundant evidence which showed him that influences were at work to prevent the crusade accomplishing its legitimate object, he did not know how strong these influences were . . . He had seen an army collected together with the utmost care, its plan of action carefully considered, submitted to himself and adopted; he knew of no reason why this plan should be abandoned.\textsuperscript{20}

Once Constantinople was conquered, contends Pears, Innocent was indignant and angry. His only consolation was that the conquest appeared to have brought about the union of the two churches, and yet this consolation was not enough to overshadow his disappointment at having lost his crusade.\textsuperscript{21}

Pears' discussion of Innocent's absence of control is rather simplistic. In brief, well-meaning Innocent was duped by ill-meaning Philip, Boniface and Dandalo. The pope's role in the
crusade evokes sympathy from Pears, not criticism.

After Pears, in the first half of the twentieth century, several biographies on Innocent were written by equally sympathetic scholars. The first of these biographies, *Innocent the Great* by C. H. C. Pirie-Gordon, contains very little concerning Innocent's role. Pirie-Gordon narrates the events of the crusade as if Innocent played no role at all, but rather was simply distraught with the outcome.

The second of these biographies, *Innocent III* by Elliott Binns is contained within the series "Great Medieval Churchmen." Binns' evaluation of Innocent's role in the crusade is less simplistic than Pears (although equally charitable), and more detailed than Pirie-Gordon's.

In his preface, Binns explains the scope of his book (to view Innocent as contributing to the life and thought of the Church), and his use of the sources:

> The present work contains few references to authorities. This is due in part to limitations of space, in part not to discourage the general reader. Behind every statement, however, there lies detailed research. My work has been based in the main on a study of the original authorities...

While Binns' sources may be rather obscure, his evaluation of Innocent is not. Innocent is described as honest, religious and "...faithful to what he felt to be an eternal principle."
Binns is sympathetic to the problems that Innocent encountered with the crusade, as illustrated by his opening discussion on "The Eastern Question:"

Everywhere... the inroads of the commercial spirit showed itself in an eagerness to exploit the crusades... Human passions and selfish ambitions are the real motive. Against all these Innocent felt obliged to contend; he at least would be satisfied with no mere lip service.26

According to Binns' account, when Zara was attacked, and Innocent heard about this disobedience of his prohibition, "... he at once excommunicated all concerned in it."27 However, when the crusaders expressed remorse, Innocent forgave them -- but not the Venetians, who refused to do penance. Innocent instructed that henceforth the Venetians could only sail the ships, and not actually fight. As Binns suggests, perhaps Innocent realized this distinction was impossible to observe, "... but something had to be done to show his disapproval of the conduct of the crusaders, and to abandon the whole expedition was out of the question."28

According to Binns, an attempt was made by the host to obtain Innocent's permission to attack Constantinople after Zara had been captured; "... naturally it was indignantly refused."29 But when the crusaders went ahead and took Constantinople, Binns explains that Innocent had no choice but to accept the situation. In this explanation, Binns is beginning to pick up on the
complicity involved.

Binns credits Innocent with no prior plotting or intrigue; "That the pope was sincerely desirous of keeping the crusaders true to their original intention . . . I do not doubt for a moment."\(^{30}\) Innocent's high hopes both for the crusade and then for the new Latin Empire were shattered by no fault of his own.

Joseph Clayton is the author of Innocent's next biography, *Pope Innocent and His Times*,\(^{31}\) Clayton is equally charitable to the pope, but he discusses the crusade in less detail than Binns. Like all of the scholars discussed thus far, Clayton does not examine in any depth the question of Innocent's control. As Clayton explains, in all simplicity, "The pope's heart was set on the recovery of the Holy Land, but his Christian subjects decided otherwise."\(^{32}\)

The last biography written before Tillmann's, Charles E. Smith's *Innocent III: Church Defender*,\(^{33}\) contains very little about the diversion of the crusade. Instead, Smith discusses Innocent's attempts to consolidate the new Latin conquest, and his failure to do so.

Smith stresses that Innocent continued to desire, even after the conquest of Constantinople, that the crusaders go on to the Holy Land. By the use of Innocent's correspondence, Smith concludes that Innocent clung to the hope that the cru-
sade might be resumed. Even up until his death in 1216, Innocent was preaching for a crusade to recover the Holy Lands.

As a biographer, Smith is less obviously sympathetic toward Innocent than those preceding him, but he is certainly not critical. Also, more than other scholars, Smith is intrigued by rather diverse aspects of Innocent's papal role. Thus his book serves to expand the scope of scholarship on Innocent, although he does not comment directly on Innocent's role in the diversion.

Helene Tillmann's book, Pope Innocent III is the most recent biography on the pontiff, and certainly the most thorough. She is obviously a first-rate biographer and a good scholar. However, even Tillmann resorts to simplistic explanations, neglecting to deal with the complexity involved in the events and situations of the Fourth Crusade.

In her biography of the pope, Tillmann includes one short chapter on Innocent's involvement in the crusade. Throughout this chapter, as throughout the book, her text is carefully footnoted. The majority of these footnotes refer to Innocent's correspondence, and it is obvious that Tillmann is extraordinarily familiar with Innocent's letters. She relies heavily on these letters to support her conclusions.

Tillmann devotes much of the chapter on the crusade to a discussion of Innocent's incentives to launch the crusade. She
advises that

Those who see political calculations at the bottom of all of Innocent's activities could deduce his crusading ardour with greater reason from the recognition that the Christian world was threatened by the Moslem world, and that the Christian states in the orient were an outpost of occidental Christianity.36

The motive behind Innocent's crusade was to fight for the liberation of the holy places, for Innocent believed that "... he, as the first servant of the King of Kings, as the Vicar of Christ, was most strongly responsible for the salvation of the Lord's inheritance."37 Tillmann asserts that this was Innocent's overriding concern, and that all other concerns fell behind it. "On a solemn occasion... he assures the fathers that he is prepared to travel to the ends of the earth, in order to rouse kings, princes and peoples with a strong voice, so that they may rise to fight the Lord's battle..."38

As Tillmann explains, once the crusade was underway, Innocent attempted to maintain the holiness of the endeavor. "He was at pains to keep alive in those who had taken the cross the awareness that they were preparing themselves for a holy war..."39 All of Innocent's attempts to organize the crusade into a holy adventure were undermined by the Venetians and their misuse of the crusading army. According to Tillmann, "... the first crusade which Innocent set on foot truly became the most pain-
ful disappointment of his life."40

Tillmann does not discuss in any detail Innocent's involvement in the expeditions against Zara and Constantinople other than to stress that Innocent "... opposed both enterprises as far as he could without jeopardizing the crusade itself."41

As Tillmann discusses Innocent's reaction to the Greek adventure, she argues that Innocent was unlikely to have plotted (or even desired) the adventure. "Innocent regarded the Greek adventure as a loss of time and of energy for the Holy Land, which was made up for, at best, by an uncertain advantage."42 When the Latin Empire was established, however, Innocent was pleased, and he realized that "... in the interests of the union of the Churches and of the Holy Land, nothing was left for him but to give up any hopes for the crusade for the time being and to sustain the shaking edifice of the Latin Empire."43

Hence, as the scholars before her, Tillmann regards Innocent as relatively faultless (and uninvolved) in the course of events which led to the diversion of the crusade. Innocent's compliance with the diversions stemmed not from ulterior motives, but from his desire to preserve the crusade.

In her conclusion, Tillmann raises a controversial question. She contemplates whether Innocent may have asked himself
"... whether it would not have eventually been wiser and more successful to walk straight on in the royal ways, rather than to keep on making well-calculated allowances for what, for the moment, appeared to be useful and necessary."  

This question represents a sophistication thus far unseen. Although she refrain from directly criticizing the pope, or suspecting his motives, she at least ponders over his behavior, and encourages the reader to do likewise.

Since Tillmann's work, the sophistication involved in the discussion of the papal role has steadily increased among scholars who defend him. Scholars no longer argue that Innocent was simply a good, religious man, and therefore uninvolved with the diversions. Recent scholars have attempted to utilize papal letters and other sources in detail, to establish Innocent's guiltless role in the crusade. The two best examples of such scholarship are the works of Alfred John Andrea, and Joseph Gill.

In Alfred John Andrea's article, "Pope Innocent III as Crusader and Canonist: His Relations with the Greeks of Constantinople, 1198-1216," Andrea offers a new aspect to be considered concerning the papal role. Andrea emphasizes Innocent's faith in the French knights in the crusade. Innocent's policy was "... to trust in his crusaders' ability and determination to keep the Venetians from perverting and diverting the cru-
Even after the unfortunate incident at Zara, the pope is lenient toward his crusaders, and his correspondence indicates his "... continued trust in their ultimate obedience to the Roman See." But to insure their loyalty, Innocent had the French leaders sign a special oath of allegiance after Zara.

In his discussion of the events leading to the diversion to Constantinople, Andrea explains that Innocent "... honestly believed ... that the French crusaders would never allow his crusade to be tainted for a second time. The alternative to this belief was to admit that he had absolutely no control over the flower of pious Christian soldiers." Unfortunately, this was apparently the extent of Innocent's control, for the pious soldiers did taint the crusade again, and Innocent could only "... make the best of events beyond his control."

Andrea notes that most of the primary sources claim that the diversion to Constantinople was pleasing to the pope, but that in reality this was not so. "The reason for the widespread ignorance ... of the pope's true sentiments must be ascribed ... to a conspiracy of silence in the highest echelons of the crusade army."

In perceiving Innocent as blameless, and disappointed with the diversions, Andrea resembles Tillmann. Yet Andrea's emphasis
on Innocent's total faith in his French crusaders, and Innocent's total disillusionment with their actions, is a unique stance. It is difficult to believe (and Andrea does not provide sufficient support) that Innocent knew so little about the French nobility that he had total faith in their obedience to him!

Despite this, Andrea's work points to a new and appropriate direction for scholarship on this subject: What exactly was Innocent's relationship with the crusaders, and how was it that he completely lost control?

Joseph Gill is another scholar who is very sympathetic to the papal role in the crusade. In his article, "Franks, Venetians and Pope Innocent III," Gill asserts that the Fourth Crusade most certainly did not set out to Zara or Constantinople with the blessing of Innocent.

Gill's examination of the sources is detailed and thorough. His emphasis is on Innocent's correspondence, like Tillmann. Concerning Zara, Gill contends that Innocent fiercely opposed the diversion; "... [Innocent] did not merely excommunicate the attackers after the assault, but threatened excommunication beforehand. . . ."52

This assertion does not differ significantly from the majority of western scholars, but Gill's position on Innocent's role in the diversion to Constantinople is more unique. Gill contends
that Innocent, from the moment he first heard about the crusaders' plans to go to Constantinople to the moment he heard that the city had been conquered, fervently opposed the diversion. Along with the papal opposition, the mass of the crusading army also opposed the diversion, explains Gill.

Gill confirms his contention that Innocent persisted in his opposition to the project with the papal legate's queries of early 1203. Gill explains:

"Had the pope been in favor of the diversion, there would have been no sense in the legate's asking what to do when 'he had heard it for certain that they meant to go to Constantinople' - he would have known the answer without asking: it would have been 'go with them.' Instead he was told that the Venetians must promise not to take up arms against Christians, otherwise he should go to Syria leaving the crusade to its fate. That is far from suggesting that 'The Fourth Crusade set out for Constantinople with the consent, if not with the blessing of Innocent III.'"

Even after the conquest of Constantinople, Innocent continued to disapprove. He criticized Montferrat for acting "... against justice and with unrighteousness, nay rather with usurped power ..." when Montferrat attempted to justify his actions.

Gill concludes his article with quotes from Innocent (not footnoted), who strongly urged the crusaders at all times to "... put aside all specious excuses and go to Palestine." As Gill concludes, "To label these adjurations as a half-hearted condemnation is an injustice to the reputation of Innocent III."
Gill's use of the sources to defend his conclusions is very well researched and structured. He exemplifies a scholar who utilizes sources in an appropriately sophisticated fashion in order to conclude that Innocent was blameless. Once again, Innocent's loss of control is only to be pitied.\textsuperscript{57}

Some modern scholars who view Innocent as guiltless continue to rely on simplistic explanations for their "proof." One such author is John Godfrey, whose book, \textit{The Unholy Crusade}\textsuperscript{58} is a popularization of the Fourth Crusade. Godfrey's book is intended for (and probably only worthwhile for) the general reader. He considers it unnecessary to load the book with references, and his bibliography is likewise limited. His two recurring notes are to the works of Runciman, and the narratives. Godfrey's work is worth discussion here because he serves as an example of how scholarship can regress, and how historians can fall back on old simplifications.

Godfrey, without actually discussing his reasoning, excludes Innocent from any responsibility for the diversion. His evaluation of the papal role in the Zara diversion is rather unique. Godfrey argues that the papal legate at first objected strongly to the Zara proposals, and informed Innocent about the plans. Innocent, indignant, wrote to the crusaders and ordered them not to attack Christians. Then explains Godfrey, "The pope's legate suddenly changed his mind completely, and accepted that
it might . . . be better for the Zara attack to go ahead than for the whole crusade to be abandoned . . . The Church therefore gave its official blessing to the Zara attack." When Innocent heard of the sack of Zara, he was furious, but he forgave the crusaders.

Concerning Constantinople, Godfrey asserts that Innocent had a difficult time coming to a conclusion on the question: "The truth is that for several months during 1202 and 1203 Innocent simply could not make up his mind . . . " Finally he wrote to the crusaders and ordered them to go directly to the Holy Land, but he was too late. Godfrey further explains that Innocent was happy to hear about the conquest of Constantinople, because "... to his tidy, canonical mind, the conquest of the Eastern Empire necessarily entailed the organic union of the Greek and Latin churches." Godfrey's evaluation of Innocent is not altogether consistent (although the possibility does exist that Innocent was likewise inconsistent in nature). At one point Godfrey refers to Innocent as a realist and later, he refers to Innocent's "... tidy, canonical mind" (see above).

Godfrey fails to discuss, also, how the expedition to Zara could have been officially blessed by the Church, when the Abbot of Vaux, at the gate of Zara, exclaimed in the name of the pope, that Christian Zara was not to be attacked.
Thus the contention among scholars that Innocent was blameless (as well as not in control) can be seen as progressing from a simplistic to a more complicated (and thorough) approach. Excluding authors such as Godfrey, who write for general audiences, serious scholars have developed increasingly sophisticated methods of evaluating sources and drawing conclusions. Yet, this scholarly position on Innocent is far from conclusive. Even historians such as Tillmann and Gill have yet to incorporate fully the complexity of Innocent's role into their evaluations. Many factors have been left unconsidered. It is here that we turn to a group of scholars who have considered at least some of these other factors, and who have reached rather different conclusions concerning the pope.
CHAPTER III

INNOCENT III THE REALIST

A third group of scholars contend that Innocent was politically motivated to compromise in the Fourth Crusade, and thus he cannot be seen as completely blameless. This group of scholars has been most strongly influenced by the work of Achille Luchaire, but much scholarly progress has occurred since Luchaire's day. At the present, this scholarly position is best represented by Donald E. Queller in his book, The Fourth Crusade.

Modern scholarship on Innocent III begins with Achille Luchaire's biography, Innocent III. In the fourth volume, "La Question d'Orient," Luchaire establishes a theory concerning Innocent's involvement in the Fourth Crusade. It is a tribute to the scholarship of Luchaire that so many historians (while perhaps expanding on it or qualifying it) have adhered to his theory.

In his evaluation of the pope, Luchaire explains that Innocent was a political realist and opportunist. He made the best of situations that were beyond his control (such as the Fourth Crusade), and in so doing, he neglected the ideals
of the Church and the papacy. Luchaire explains, "Innocent III reconnait qu'il est oblige de delaisser le spirituel pour le temporel, et il en rejetta la faute sur la malignite des hommes." 66

Innocent's policies in the Fourth Crusade were developed in relation to the events and situations which arose, and not in relation to doctrine, asserts Luchaire. While Innocent may not have been pleased with the Zara incident, he was lenient with the crusaders because he believed necessity so dictated. 67 Innocent also modified his policies to correspond to political realities with the diversion to Constantinople. As Luchaire explains, Innocent's position on the plan to divert to Constantinople was two-fold. Officially he did not know about the crusaders' plan. Unofficially he knew about it, but he was in no position to control it.

C'est qu'il a conscience que toute opposition serait impuissante; qu'il est moins que jamais le maitre de la croisade; et aussi que les propositions du jeune Alexis s'accordent apres tout avec les visses seculaires de Rome sur l'empire grec et l'Eglise d'Orient. 68

Obviously, Luchaire's position on Innocent differs significantly from that of the scholars in the previous chapter. Luchaire, although he admires Innocent, is not willing to claim that Innocent was so spiritual as to be above political considerations. Rather, Innocent was a practical opportunist. He had
little control to begin with, and it was necessary that he utilize the influence which he did possess, both cautiously and realistically.

Ernest Barker's small book, The Crusades, is a reprint of an article written for the Encyclopedia Britannica. His work illustrates how influential Luchaire's biography was to many historians; Barker follows Luchaire on every point. In his discussion of the literature, Barker cites Luchaire's La Question d'Orient as the main secondary source. Repeatedly throughout the text Barker footnotes Luchaire. No other secondary sources are named.

According to Barker (like Luchaire):

The history of the Fourth Crusade is a history of the predominance of the lay motive, of the attempt of the papacy to escape from that predominance and to establish its old direction of the crusade, and of the complete failure of its attempt.

After discussing the capture of Zara and Constantinople, Barker elaborates on how the crusade influenced the papacy. His explanation is two-fold, and rather confused. First, he proposes that the power of the pope was increased by the crusade, for "The crusaders appealed to Innocent to ratify the subjugation of a schismatic people, and Innocent, dazzled by the magic of the fait accompli, not unwillingly acquiesced." Barker also concludes that the Fourth Crusade was harmful to the papacy
on the whole. The pope lost any power over the crusade — "He had been forced to see the helm of the crusades wrenched from his grasp."^72

In fairness, perhaps a strict analysis of Barker's work is too critical, since the work was originally intended for a very general audience — in an encyclopedia. Barker, however, does illustrate Luchaire's influence (almost dominance) over many historians, especially in the first quarter of this century.

Much like Barker, Charles Diehl's article, "The Fourth Crusade and the Latin Empire"^73 fairly closely follows the work of Luchaire. Diehl explains that the crusade (at least in part) was inspired by worldly aspirations, and (in agreement with Luchaire) that for many of the crusaders, it was very much a business affair.74

Diehl asserts that Innocent's efforts to stop the expedition to Zara were in vain, because the crusaders had no choice but to satisfy the Venetian demands. But concerning Constantinople, Diehl contends that Innocent made little effort to halt the diversion. "The pope, solicitous as always that the crusade should not fall to pieces, allowed matters to go their own way."^73

Steven Runciman is another scholar who follows in the wake of Luchaire. However, his work is less obviously based on
Luchaire, and his melodramatic approach certainly does not resemble Luchaire. In *A History of the Crusades*, Runciman exclaims that "There was never a greater crime against humanity than the Fourth Crusade." Yet however hideous this crime may have been, according to Runciman, Innocent holds little direct responsibility for it.

Runciman asserts that when the Venetians suggested to the crusaders that Zara be recaptured, Innocent sent at once to forbid its acceptance. "But whatever they [the crusaders] might feel about its morality, they could not but comply with it." When Zara was taken, says Runciman, Innocent was aghast, and he excommunicated everyone involved. But once he realised that the crusaders themselves had been blackmailed by the Venetians, he absolved them.

In Runciman's opinion, the plot to divert to Constantinople was conceived by the friends of Philip of Swabia and the Venetians; Innocent had no role in it. Once Innocent knew of the plan, "... it was too late for him to make an effective protest; and if the diversion was really going to secure active Byzantine aid ... and ... achieve the union of the churches, it would be justified." Hence Runciman believes that Innocent was in no position to stop the diversion even if he had wanted to do so. Furthermore, Innocent saw possibilities in the plan which made it desirable. Runciman suggests that
"It might have been wiser in the long run for him to have expressed, however vainly, open and uncompromising disapproval. To the Greeks... the half-heartedness of his condemnation seemed proof that he was the power behind the whole intrigue."\(^\text{80}\)

Once Constantinople had been captured and plundered, and decisions had been made without consulting papal authority, Innocent could see how the Venetians had outwitted the crusaders altogether. Runciman concludes:

The bland hopes of Pope Innocent and the complacent boasts of the crusaders were never fulfilled. Instead, their barbarity left a memory that would never be forgiven them.\(^\text{81}\)

Up to this point, the authorities who follow Luchaire's stance on Innocent have not expanded, or further developed his theory to any degree. In the late 1960's, some scholars began to elaborate on Luchaire's work, and to expose some of the complexities inherent in Innocent's role in the crusade.

William M. Daly's article, "Christian Fraternity, the Crusaders, and the Security of Constantinople, 1097-1204; the Precarious Survival of an Ideal"\(^\text{82}\) considers the events of the Fourth Crusade, and papal involvement, from a rather different perspective than most scholars. In discussing the Fourth Crusade specifically (his paper includes a discussion of the previous crusades also), Daly concludes that "In the
course of these disgraceful events, the ideology of Christian fraternity between Latins and Greeks underwent its death struggle."\(^{83}\)

Daly contends that Innocent's actions were a contributing element to the tragedy of the Fourth Crusade. Explains Daly, "\(^{84}\)Innocent in effect agreed with and therefore strengthened the assumption that a successful crusade was more important than the preservation of the bonds of charity among Christians.\(^{84}\) Innocent was more concerned with political achievements than spiritual ideals. Daly suggests that Innocent would be held in higher esteem presently if he had sacrificed the crusade for the sake of religious ideals. Innocent failed to pay the price for his high spiritual principles, Daly argues, and for this, he shares in the blame for the tragedy of Constantinople.

Daly's article offers a new aspect to the evaluation of the papal role in the crusade: the betrayal of Christian fraternity. Such new factors, offered by scholars through time, are the building blocks of historical progress -- the catalysts for new insights.\(^{85}\)

Edgar H. McNeal's and Robert Lee Wolff's article, "The Fourth Crusade,"\(^{86}\) is extraordinarily complete and all-encompassing. They discuss all the main events and participants of the crusade including Pope Innocent.
In accordance with D. C. Munro's "The Popes and the Crusades" McNeal and Wolff explain that by deciding to take it upon himself to rouse Europe to a new crusade, Innocent "... was reverting to Urban II's original conception of the crusade as a papal responsibility." Thus from the very beginning Innocent had an exalted opinion of his role in the crusade.

Innocent was not to stay in control for long. The crusaders arranged a joint expedition with the Venetians, "... something quite different from the general crusade of western Europe under papal auspices envisaged by the pope." Nevertheless, Innocent, the realist, accepted the treaty.

McNeal and Wolff assert that Innocent did firmly forbid the attack on Zara, but his commands were disobeyed. After Zara, Innocent forgave the crusaders because he did not wish to jeopardize the success of the whole crusade. He received the delegates who came to Rome kindly, and then gave them a re-proving letter to take back to the crusaders; but the letter is "... not nearly as vigorous in its denunciation of the taking of Zara as one might have expected." In contrast to his disapproval of the Zaran expedition, Innocent was not totally opposed to the diversion to Constantinople. Innocent was well aware of the plans to divert the crusade, but he did not send his letter forbidding the attack until
after the crusade had left Zara. McNeal and Wolff argue: "It seems ... likely that Innocent rather allowed the diversion to happen. Perhaps he felt he could not prevent it." Furthermore, the diversion to Constantinople coincided with papal interests; it would unite the churches, which was one of the papacy's chief aims in foreign policy.

When Innocent first received word of the diversion, he reprimanded the crusaders for their disobedience. McNeal and Wolff do not discuss the pope further.

Obviously these two scholars do not believe that Innocent was opposed whole-heartedly to the expedition to Constantinople. Also, they suggest that Innocent could not have controlled the course of events even if he had wanted to: "Perhaps he felt he could not prevent it" (see above). Therefore, we can see two elements in McNeal and Wolff's interpretation of Innocent: Innocent did not necessarily wish to stop the diversion; and regardless of his wishes, he had little control.

McNeal and Wolff's evaluation of Innocent is more inclusive of the varying factors influencing the papal role than the evaluations of previous scholars. Their work represents a height in the progress of the scholarship which contends that Innocent was a political realist, ready to compromise in the face of unalterable events.
Hans Eberhard Mayer is the author of a well-known, well-written general book, *The Crusades*. Mayer’s discussion of the crusade, and Innocent, is short and concise. Mayer explains Innocent’s conception of his role in the crusade:

In Innocent’s conception of the world there was no room for crusades directed by kings in which the pope’s role was limited to his undisputed right of issuing the summons to a crusade. In his view the whole thing should be under the pope’s control. Despite his ideal, Innocent was unable to realize such control over the crusade. Unfortunately, Mayer, like most scholars, does not elaborate on this conflict between the pope’s perception of his rightful control, and the reality of his control. Through the course of events, in order to preserve the crusade, Innocent sacrificed his ideals. After Zara, Innocent "... still hoped to save his crusade and so he sacrificed principles which ought not to have been given up." After the conquest of Constantinople, Innocent reconciled himself to the fait accompli.

D. M. Nicol is another historian who follows in the vein of Luchaire, but Nicol carries Luchaire’s position one step farther, and accuses Innocent of blessing the diversion to Constantinople. In his article, "The Fourth Crusade and the Greek and Latin Empires, 1204-61," Nicol expresses the conviction that not only was the pope not in control of the cru-
sade, but also he was aware of the fact. Explains Nicol, "The sack of Zara, which he had expressly forbidden . . . confirmed Innocent's fears that the management of the Fourth Crusade was now beyond his control."96

In contrast to the Zara expedition (which Innocent opposed), the diversion to Constantinople plan was more agreeable to the pope, asserts Nicol. On this point Nicol is in agreement with McNeel and Woff, Ruscin, and others — who suspect that the pope's favorable stance on the planned expedition to Constantinople at least partially explains his failure to stop it. Explains Nicol:

... the elaborate promises made by the young Alexius at Zara may have convinced him [Innocent] that an unparalleled opportunity presented itself for securing the union of the Churches and the active cooperation of the Greeks in the Holy War.97

Besides, Innocent had no choice but to sanction the plans if he wanted to retain control over the crusade. If he condemned the plans, he would leave the crusade in the hands of those who were the least Christian.98

In conclusion, Nicol explains that "... the crusade set out for Constantinople with the connivance, if not with the blessing of Innocent."99 Innocent chose not to be (nor could he have been) a forceful opponent.

At this point the division between the two main groups
of scholars (roughly Luchaire's and Tillmann's) can be seen in a new form. Both groups accept that Innocent had no control, but they differ on the following: What would Innocent have done if he had had control? The group led by Luchaire hint that Innocent would not necessarily have vehemently opposed the diversion to Constantinople. The group represented by Tillmann contends that, without question, Innocent would have forcefully opposed the diversion.

All of the scholars thus far have emphasized the Latin sources in their research, and this gives a particularly one-sided version of the crusade. Charles M. Brand's *Byzantium Confronts the West 1160-1204* discusses the crusade from a very different perspective — the Byzantine point of view. Unlike Luchaire, who is very Latin oriented, Brand approaches the issues from the Eastern view. Despite his differing perspective, Brand concludes (like Luchaire) that Innocent was a political realist, and a practical statesman.

Brand discusses Innocent's relationship with Alexius III prior to the fall of Constantinople in some detail. Also, more generally, he discusses the inherent tensions between Rome and Byzantium; he sees these tensions as influential on the events of the Fourth Crusade.

Brand asserts that it was politically advantageous for Innocent not to support Prince Alexius and the diversion.
The pope . . . decided to stand by the existing political alliance in the face of Prince Alexius' tempting offers. Because of the still strong facade presented by the Byzantine Empire, he was unwilling to gamble on the crusade's success; he also feared an enlargement of Hohenstaufen authority.

Thus the political alliance remained intact. Innocent did not support the diversion, for political reasons. However, "... the walls of Constantinople proved less firm."103

Kenneth H. Setton's The Papacy and the Levant 1204-1374 contains a rather lengthy discussion of Innocent's relationship with the crusaders (via correspondence) and the Byzantines after the Latin conquest. This discussion is very well noted, and provocative; Setton's use of the sources is admirable.

Since his work is primarily concerned with events after 1204, Setton's discussion of the papal role in the crusade is expectedly brief. Setton asserts that the pope's efforts to influence the course of events were in vain, for "Innocent . . . had lost all control over the crusade."105 With such general statements, it is not easy to discern Setton's exact position on Innocent's role prior to the conquest. His discussion is geared toward the post-conquest papal role. However, Setton does recognize the complexity involved in the papal role in general, and the various influences acting upon the papal decisions (especially political). Thus, I choose to categorize his work
along with the scholars who follow Luchaire's general position.

The most recent scholar to expand on the basic stance of Achille Luchaire is Donald E. Queller, *The Fourth Crusade: The Conquest of Constantinople 1201-1204*. In his book, Queller discusses the Fourth Crusade as a series of events -- events which the crusaders found themselves caught up in. Innocent's actions can be seen likewise in the context of the events which occurred; the pope did not plan, nor hope for, the diversions. He dealt with them as they occurred.

Queller discusses Innocent's role in the crusade in depth. He evaluates Innocent's role in each event of the crusade, beginning with the crusaders' choice of Venice for transportation. In the latter, Queller concludes that the scholarly arguments which claim that Innocent was in favor of the choice of Venice are equally off-the-mark as those who claim that Innocent was not in favor. Queller explains, "Innocent neither encouraged nor discouraged the choice of Venice, which was the only port able to serve the crusaders' purposes." Besides, even if Innocent's preference had been evident, it would not have held much influence. "Innocent's vision of papal leadership was already anachronistic in an increasingly secular society." Queller discusses Innocent's reaction to the crusader-Venetian treaty here, as well as in his article, "Innocent III
and the Crusader-Venetian Treaty of 1201."

Concerning Zara (and everything else as well), Queller asserts that Innocent's policy was to adapt himself to situations which he could not change. Innocent's primary concern was to preserve the crusade, and this concern always influenced his actions. In discussing the papal legate's role in the diversion to Zara, Queller explains that the legate strove to prevent the crusade from breaking up at all costs; this policy was consistent with Innocent's. But Innocent could not publicly condone the attack of a Christian city; he sent a letter to forbid the attack. Queller criticizes, "... Innocent enjoyed throughout the crusade the desirable fruits of evils for which he managed to evade responsibility." This is one of the strongest criticisms thus far expressed by scholars who follow Luchaire. Queller also differs from most scholars, who stress that Innocent did all that he could to prevent the expedition to Zara. According to Queller, even if Innocent had tried his very best to prevent the attack, his efforts would have been futile. "The pope had no control and only a little influence over the course of events."

Once Zara was attacked, the crusaders sent envoys to Innocent to beg his forgiveness. Innocent realized that the crusaders' actions had been dictated by necessity, and he was willing to forgive them. "The envoys' plea for absolution
satisfied Innocent's religious scruples . . .". As Queller understands, Innocent was more angered by the crusaders' disobedience of papal authority than angered by the actual attack of Zara.

After Zara, the pope excommunicated the Venetians (unlike the crusaders). However, Innocent once again compromised his religious scruples to preserve the crusade; he allowed the crusaders to maintain contact with the Venetians.

Concerning Constantinople, Queller says that "The best interpretation of Innocent's role at this point is that he allowed to happen what he had no power to prevent." The tardy letter which Innocent sent to the crusaders, forbidding the attack, was simply for the record. While other scholars have implied this, Queller is unique in stating it. As Queller understands, Innocent was not involved in plotting or planning the diversion. He had little control to speak of. All that he could do was to bend with the course of events. "The irony and tragedy is that all the compromising did not achieve his aim." Unlike modern scholarship, Luchaire did not discuss Innocent's actual control or perception of control in any detail. Scholarship today has advanced a more complicated interpretation of "Innocent the realist" and "Innocent the opportunist." Such scholars as Queller, McNeal and Wolff, and others, have incorporated a multitude of factors into their evaluation of the
pontiff's crusading role, and the result is a more insight-
ful, thorough, and progressive "theory" on Innocent.
CONCLUSIONS AND REMARKS

The Fourth Crusade was an extraordinarily complicated affair, and there can be no simplistic explanation for Innocent's role in it. After all, Innocent himself was a rather complex person! Thus, scholars such as Primov, who contend that Innocent was a hypocritical villain (as well as scholars who contend that Innocent was a blameless hero), apply explanations which are too trivial. A multitude of factors influenced Innocent's role in the crusade, including his political ambitions, his papal responsibilities, and the crusaders' perception of his position.

I have shown that the scholarship on Innocent has advanced toward an increasingly sophisticated explanation of the papal crusading role. Innocent's character is now seen in a more multi-dimensional light. Less emphasis is placed on his actions as either "right" or "wrong;" instead, scholars evaluate his actions within the context of the events which occurred. It is very possible that Innocent was, at the same time, both politically motivated and spiritually motivated. His role was a very complex one, and we should not be surprised to find inconsistencies in it.
Scholars who have followed in the path of Luchaire today hold the most accepted conclusions on Innocent's role in the crusade: Innocent held little control over the crusaders. But because he was a practical and sensible man, he made the best of bad situations once they had occurred, and drew advantages from them.

Despite the advance in scholarship, many questions arise concerning Innocent's role which are left unanswered. For example, why is there such a scholarly emphasis on Innocent's perception of his control? Certainly this is a valuable topic for study, but the crusaders' perception of Innocent's role is at least equally important. What did the crusaders believe about their relationship with the pope? How did they perceive his influence over their crusading actions? How close is this to the reality of his control?

To begin to answer such questions, historians must refer to the primary narratives of the Fourth Crusade. Villehardouin and Robert of Clari were two crusaders (one a leader and one in the ranks) who participated in the crusade. Their narratives are very revealing of the crusaders' perception of the papal role: Villehardouin and Robert of Clari barely mention Innocent in their narrative. No active role is attributed to the pope. This absence of comment in itself reveals much; authorities must examine these and other sources more closely.
Another question which arises is the following: if it was inevitable that Innocent could hold no control \(118\) (because of the increasing secularization of society, or because of the impossibility of controlling military operations in Venice from Rome), then how can scholars criticize Innocent (as so many authorities do) for making the best of uncontrollable situations once they occurred?

Although scholarship has developed relatively sophisticated explanations for Innocent's actions in the crusade, we need to go one step farther. Historical scholarship is in need of a study of the pope's role in the crusade which will take into consideration the multitude of factors influencing Innocent's behavior. Authorities must evaluate the papal crusading role with the complexity that the topic warrants. Scholars who follow Luchaire have come the closest to accomplishing this task, but their conclusions are still forcefully challenged by scholars such as Tillmann and Gill. Scholars of Innocent must return to the primary sources. Credit is due to Innocent.
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Written largely to verify as genuine relics which the crusaders brought back, this source provides occasional details on the Fourth Crusade.


As above, a work mainly to authenticate relics.


Once again a chronicle emphasizing relics, this work is based on the participation of the bishop Nivelon of Charisly. It must be kept in mind that when works are written by and for ecclesiastics, there will be no criticism of Pope Innocent.


This chronicle is based on a collection of sources found in Russia. The chronicler writes an apology for Innocent’s role in the crusade.


Dates and events of the Fourth Crusade are recorded with precision in this source, which is perhaps the journal of one of Boniface’s friends.


A continuation of the chronicle of William of Tyre, written in Syria.
Gaeta Innocentii P. P. III. Ed. in Migne, PL, ccxiv: 19-227.

An anonymous biography of Innocent. This source is valuable in that it complements the pope's official records, but it is obviously biased. The biographer deeply admired Innocent, and he painted a very rosy picture of him.


A letter written by Hugh of St. Pol, who was one of the highest leaders in the crusade.

Innocent III. Epistolae. In Migne, PL, ccivcccxvii.

Registra de negotio Romani Imperii. In Migne, PL, CCXVI.

The letters to and from Innocent III are the single most valuable source on the pope's role in the Fourth Crusade. However, taken alone, the pope's correspondence can show a distorted picture of events. It must be kept in mind that the correspondence was an official papal record.


The source which best represents the Greek point of view on the crusade. Choniates was a Byzantine statesman.


Peter was a participant in the crusade and the nephew of Abbot Guy of Vaux-de-Cernay. Peter narrates the story of those crusaders who left the crusading host and made their own way to the Holy Land, rather than disobey papal commands.


Potthast provides a brief description of each papal letter, and a reference to where the source may be located.


A trustworthy source on Philip II, with a narration on the Fourth Crusade.

Another chronicle on the Fourth Crusade, written by a cleric.


Robert of Clari was a simple knight who participated in the Fourth Crusade. His eyewitness account is a valuable source, for it offers information about the men in the ranks of the crusade (and hence their views on religion, the papacy, etc.). It must be remembered, however, that Robert is often misinformed on details of events; he was in the ranks of the crusaders, not among the leaders.


A western chronicle on the crusade.


This chronicle is the most informative and reliable narrative on the Fourth Crusade. Villehardouin was an active participant in the crusade, frequently serving as spokesman and representative for the leaders of the crusade. His detailed, first-hand account is based on his experiences in the events of the crusade, and his writing style is clear and straightforward.
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