

in it if this can be justified by kin connections to educated persons or landed families.

Professor Stirling is mainly writing about social structure. The culture of the community is described largely in an incidental manner. This approach and the theoretical distinctions it implies are part of the author's intellectual background. Yet one feels that the work would have gained considerable depth if the author had been more concerned with the customary attitudes and beliefs of the villagers regarding their social structure. The ferocity of patrilineage relations can surely only be understood in the entire context of the definition of masculinity, the position of women, the code of honour, etc. Indeed, the evidence points strongly in this direction. The author notes that on material grounds the "lineages" are not "corporate." Yet they act together for honour. Honour is obviously at least as important, but probably more important than land.

It can be said then that this work will be indispensable to students of Turkish society or of the Middle East. The anthropologist looking for new twists to exotic theory will be disappointed, but those interested in the facts will find themselves well served. The dust cover suggests that the book has made a wide impact on the "official Turkish world." As one reads the work and sees the lamentations of the villagers concerning the inert octopus of the ancient bureaucracy, one wishes that the observations of the author were more widely available to "officials."

University of Chicago

NUR YALMAN

Harold Lurier (ed. and trans.), *Crusaders as Conquerors: The Chronicle of Morea*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1964. Pp. 346.

Although Constantinople, the prize of the Fourth Crusade, was back in Greek hands by 1261, the Franks continued to hold on to an ever diminishing Principality of the Morea until the fifteenth century. The *Chronicle of Morea* records the first hundred years or so its history. As a historical document in the narrowest sense the *Chronicle* is, as Professor Lurier demonstrates, of rather limited value. The unknown author of the work was a poet rather than a historian, and a patriot before a scholar. His aim was not factual history, but rather the celebration of glorious past deeds, thus the encouragement of further victories in the future. But if the *Chronicle* is all but useless as a narrative source, it is at the same

time, and precisely because of the character and aims of its author, an invaluable source for the social history of the first period of Western domination in the Near East.

It will first of all be of interest to students of feudalism. One problem with which scholars are always faced is that most of our sources derive from a rather late date in the evolution of that institution. The bulk of the materials from Western Europe detail the operations of a society whose origins lay in the remote and all but forgotten past. Only in the Norman Kingdom of England, the Crusading Kingdom of Jerusalem, and the Latin Empire of Constantinople — with its appendage, the Principality of the Morea — can the growth and development of a feudal state be observed in some detail. The author of the *Chronicle* was intensely interested in feudal custom. To him what we call feudalism was *the* natural organization of human society. He remarks, by way of justifying the conquest in terms of the civilization which the Franks brought to the eastern Mediterranean, that before the coming of the Westerners the whole of Greece contained scarcely a dozen castles — the necessary centers of the life of a knightly aristocracy. Correspondingly, he details often to interminable length, the personal and political struggles of the founders of the Principality and their successors. Out of the welter of vignettes of court proceedings, of marriage alliances, of conspiracies and forsaken vows of homage, the reader can gather some impression of the dynamics of the formation and then the dissolution of a feudal principality.

Beyond this, the *Chronicle* offers a fascinating glimpse into the mentality of Europeans at just the moment when they were first becoming self-consciously Europeans. If there is one common thread to modern history it is the unique experience which Westerners have had in the course of their peregrinations across the surface of the globe. They have observed much, absorbed some, and still remained uniquely Western. This process began with the coming of the Crusades. The first knights to reach the Holy Land reacted to the Muslin culture which they found there, after some bloody but necessary preliminaries, by taking it up with such enthusiasm that some all but forgot their own origins. Indeed the two Orders of crusading knights had continually to answer to the charge that they had covertly gone over to the side of the enemy and forsaken the faith. Nevertheless, the Westerners came out of the Crusades and the experience of living in an alien culture convinced of the superiority and rightfulness of their way of life.

On the evidence of this chronicle, the response of the Frankish

knights living in Greece and Anatolia during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries was similar. To a considerable extent the aristocracy of the Morea, like their counterparts in the Holy Land, went native. The Greek language of this version of the *Chronicle* is sufficient proof, as is also the introduction into their political vocabulary of many terms foreign to their original homeland but consistent with the traditions of Byzantium. Thus, while at Paris the king might be addressed simply as "Sire," in the *Chronicle*, thanks are rendered to "his crown and his majesty." Furthermore, after the initial conquest the two nations seem to have lived side by side in an easy-going accommodation to each other. Frank and Greek, theoretically enemies, were allied almost as often as Frank and Frank, theoretically bound by ties of feudal obligation. In spite of this, to the chronicler there is an essential difference between the two peoples, and that difference justifies the presence of the Franks in the Morea. Sometimes he records their title to the Principality as stemming simply from the right of conquest. More often, however, the justification is in terms of culture: the Franks took possession of Greece only because none of the natives were worthy of the honor. Both peoples are Christians, but the Greeks by their mendacity confess that they are no more the servants of the True God than are the heathens. The Franks fight honorably on horseback and face to face with the enemy; the Greeks, like the barbarian Turks fall on them from the rear and win their victories by craft and cunning. The conquest of the Byzantine state is seen by the chronicler as part of a larger movement of the Westerners, one which had previously carried them to the Holy Land, and one which was also bringing them, under the leadership of Charles of Anjou, the brother of the King of France, into southern Italy. And this expansion was not accidental, on the evidence of the author's attitude, but a necessary result of their cultural superiority. The *Chronicle*, in a word, deserves a place at the head of the long list of literature of European colonialism.

Professor Lurier's translation is quite readable, and it appears faithful to the quality of the original. His introductions both historical and philological are relevant and his extensive footnotes are most helpful in correlating the often confused accounts of the *Chronicle* with the actual course of events. He is to be commended for making this fascinating work available to a wider circle of readers.

Michigan State University

RONALD P. GROSSMAN