

1 – Introduction

It was in 1291 when Acre, the last outpost of the Crusader Kingdom in the Holy Land fell, and the two hundred years of Frankish occupation of the Latin East came to an end. Considering all the previous conquerors of the Levantine region theirs was not a very enduring rule; nonetheless, the remains we see today are incredibly impressive. In these two centuries of Latin control, the Near Eastern landscape saw among numerous other constructions such as churches, villas, towns and cities, the rise of hundreds of castles in a wide variety of forms, sizes and places, dotting the Holy Land. It is on these castles that we will be focusing in this thesis. In all the research that has been conducted on the Crusades in the Near East, castles have received a considerable amount of attention. However, this attention has predominantly been of a descriptive nature and directed towards the military aspects of castles, treating them solely as defensive structures. While there are several studies that try to escape such conceptions, this thesis proposes that more work can be done and that an effort must be made towards an archaeology-based and more analytical approach that leads to an interpretative study of crusader castles. In this introduction I will discuss the topic and its related problems in approach and terminology, set out the framework and approach to the study of this particular artefact, and develop the objectives, research questions and aims that will determine the research.

1.1 THESIS

This thesis is devoted to crusader castles and has a geographical focus on the Near Eastern regions. The initial source for the idea to study crusader castles of the Levantine area arose from the desire to bring an archaeological component to historical studies. Especially the crusades as an object of study has seen an immense amount of works by historians, and although I do not attempt to criticise these studies for

neglecting archaeology, I do believe that putting material as the central focus in crusader research can result in new and interesting knowledge about this period.¹ It already proved to be so when we look at some recent archaeological work on castles in the Near East among which two studies in particular threw new light upon how we can conceive castles in this period and area. One is the work of Ronnie Ellenblum, the other of Denys Pringle.² While we will review both studies extensively in the coming chapter, it suffices to say here that these scholars both tried to approach castles from a more holistic perspective. Pringle with his analysis of the fortresses Castrum Rubrum and Belmont tried to give attention to the ways in which castles were actually used by the Franks, and how they fitted into the wider military and political history of the Latin East. Ellenblum focuses on the geographical distribution of castles and tries to connect Frankish military architecture to the political environment in which it was built. He divides the twelfth century into three parts based on the frequency and number of military conflicts of the Franks and their enemies. His conclusion is that castles in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem were not always erected against immediate danger

1. I certainly do not criticise historians for having a text-based approach, but merely for the way they approach the text. When text is treated as material culture and not as evidence about the past, the meaning of texts will give insights into the self-knowledge of people and is able to say something very meaningful about the construction of past identities. Or as Moreland puts it: "A contextual approach expansive enough to include the idea that people and communities constructed themselves through their engagement with objects and texts, would seem to transcend the disciplinary boundaries between archaeology and history" (Moreland 2006, 142).

2. These works comprise "Crusader Castles and modern histories" by Ellenblum 2007, and Pringle's work on the Red Tower published in 1986 and his more recent research with Harper on Belmont published in 2000.

from outside. We can see that the employment of archaeology has brought the study of crusader castles to a new phase, where it is used in such a way that it is not only a complement to castle-studies, but is also able to assemble more comprehension of how it reflects on Frankish society.

To give space to an archaeologically centred approach is not only the source for the idea of this thesis, it is also what makes it significant as research. For many years historians have set the agenda for the study of the medieval past, an agenda in which the primary task of archaeology was to provide the elucidation of the historian's text.³ However, where historians used to be accustomed to employ archaeology in a static way as a sort of visual theatre in which historical events and persons acted, these days it is more and more widely acknowledged that material culture plays an active social role and is able to generate new knowledge of the historical past. This active role of material culture, emerging from post-processual approaches to archaeology, points to its importance in the construction of social and cultural identities of human beings and their communities in the past.⁴ However, it also plays a significant part in the way people interacted with each other on a daily basis, in which material culture provided a way to reflect on power issues and hierarchy, controlled social relations and created social and cultural boundaries, and was able to transform social status and identity. To place material culture at the centre of research will however not ensure a less biased approach in which one focuses directly on the unconscious products of a society. Although material objects seem to be less explicit than texts, they were also created to communicate, so the assumption made by some scholars that material culture is the unintended material by-product of the past must be approached with great caution. Furthermore, it has been known for quite some time that the archaeological record itself is far from an unbiased source.⁵

The way we must reflect upon material culture is broad, for archaeology comprises all forms of materi-

al culture: buildings and landscapes as well as ceramics, tools and ornaments are considered and treated as artefacts to capture the material entirety of past societies. How they are treated is a different undertaking which also requires attention because, as Roberta Gilchrist explains: "*Too often the archaeology of literate societies has painted the descriptive backdrop to history which has been written through documentary sources.*"⁶ It is then a vital issue in respect of this research to develop a bottom-up approach which starts from the artefact and then expands to wider social and cultural aspects relating to that artefact, to eventually place it again within a society. Additionally this implies of course that, although archaeology is put in the foreground in this approach, historical accounts are not disregarded. It just means that they come in at a later stage as socio-cultural reflection and do not represent the core of research.

The particular idea of studying castles in the Levantine area was triggered by the way in which these structures were conceived and studied by scholars. All (with a few notable exceptions) approached the castles from a militaristic perspective without providing any context, and archaeological attention is lacking.⁷ Although the structure today might be the only visible monument of the crusader period, it does not mean it can be divorced from the rest of medieval society. This militaristic predominance occurred because historians of the 19th century largely regarded castles as an aesthetic object.⁸ It is intertwined with the isolation of the castle from its environment to an extent that the militaristic view saw no other option than to detach the castle from all other housing, and because the militaristic tradition was focused on architecture, the rest of the landscape was ignored.⁹ Wheatley explains that it has not often occurred to scholars to treat medieval castle architecture as ideological because defence is such a practical consideration, rooted in engineering, technology and military

3. Austin 1990, 13

4. Paynter 2000, 11, Moreland 2006, 139, and Barret 2001

5. Moreland 2006, 138

6. Gilchrist 1994, 43

7. In this respect castles from the Near East are comparable to Scottish royal and lordly castles, which, according to Oram, have been largely bypassed by debates on origin, function and symbolism and have seen little archaeological work. Oram 2008, 165-8

8. Ebner 1976, 15

9. Creighton 2002, 2; Austin 1984

strategy.¹⁰ When dealing with a specialised issue such as castles there is always an inherent risk to forget the social and cultural setting. We celebrate results of decades of research and work on castle plans, art and architectural details or interesting defensive measures, but we tend to forget or even evade connecting those material aspects more than superficially with the communities that built them.¹¹ Besides, in many cases the research has lacked an analytical part and has been caught up in endless descriptions of fortresses without any interpretation concerning their wider importance, meaning and use. Therefore, another aim besides bringing an archaeological element into the research is to offer an analytical and contextual study of Frankish fortresses which goes beyond a mere description of the castle.¹²

What I aspire to do in this thesis is to provide an analytical study that expands on the efforts of Pringle and Ellenblum and pulls back from militaristic determinism and descriptive works. Therefore an angle had to be found to approach castles in such a way that they are able to shed light onto social functions and behaviour without disregarding historical context. The entry I have chosen to accomplish this is to examine the spatial qualities of castles. This means that instead of focusing on the furniture, decorations or the bricks and walls of a castle, the structure of space and the movement through it becomes the centre of research. The importance of this approach is already emphasised by McNeill who says that the nature of the power that castles embody is reflected in the structure of the castle and that we therefore need to study the structure to deduce it.¹³ Space is in this respect considered an artefact that can be scrutinised in the same way as material culture, because space, like all other archaeological artefacts, reflects, cre-

ates, and orders society. Studying the ordering of space and circulation patterns in castles is not new (see for instance studies by Faulkner, Dixon, Mikkola, Fairclough, Mathieu, and Gilchrist)¹⁴ and has gained in popularity in recent years. Castles, being structures with complex circulation patterns whose subtleties do not become instantly evident to the modern viewer, appear to be not only very appropriate for these sorts of analyses, but the research could even provide new knowledge on how these castles were used by its occupants.

The method that will be used to show the relationship between space and society and to compare buildings of different forms and sizes is space syntax. The book that introduced this method to a wider audience was “*The Social Logic of Space*” published in 1984, and written by Bill Hillier and Julienne Hanson of UCL. What space syntax does is to investigate the relationship between human societies and space from the perspective of the structure of inhabited space. It does this by configuring inhabitation, which means turning the continuous space into a connected set of discrete units. To these units one can apply different markers that can again point to different people or activities. More importantly, in this way, different rules of behaviour and conventions can be associated with different parts of the space. Subsequently, different social aspects of castle life can be explored in this way, for instance the way in which the inhabitants dealt with matters of privacy, how power issues were reflected in space, and how public and private space was negotiated. Further, it is possible to look at social interaction between people in a building and how space both controls and creates this. However, we must take into account in this respect that space syntax research originated from architectural studies and what is important to explore here is which complications a methodology will bring that is not originally designed for archaeological purposes.

10. Wheatley 2004, 2 For a good overview on the study of castles, see Liddiard 2005, 1-11

11. Eriksson 2001, 50

12. Offering an analytical approach is of course not meant within a positivistic sphere, but rather within an interaction sphere of conducting analyses. Research questions are developed in a process of interaction with the social context in which we work and therefore the analysis of the data is very much an activity which involves interpretative processes on the part of the researcher.

13. McNeill 1997, 235

14. Faulkner 1958 and 1963; Dixon 1990 and 1998; Mikkola 2001; Fairclough 1992; Mathieu 1999; and Gilchrist 1992 and 1999

1.2 CASTLES

Castles are a very popular topic amongst all people, both scientific and recreational, who are interested in the medieval world. This is not strange, as castles are amongst the most visible remains of the past, they can be found in every European country and they are endowed with a sense of mystery, royalty, knight-hood; everything that can be considered romantic and adventurous in the Middle Ages. Castles breathe history. For those who wish to study them in a scientific realm however, castles are almost as impenetrable a subject as they once were to enter. They are one of the most ambiguous terms that can be found in historical literature, and finding a clear definition is almost impossible. The term can be compared with the word city: everybody knows what it is and can point to one, however nobody can give a proper definition that covers its complexity.

That castles could be found all over Europe and the Near East also poses a historiographical problem. Scholarly works followed different traditions in each country, as a consequence of castles being part of national heritage and there are almost no integrated approaches. Instead there are French, German and English traditions that publish largely in their own language, focused on castles in their own country, and having very divergent views on how castles must be approached. For instance, England came out of a long-time militaristic and functionalist tradition. In the 1990s the focus shifted towards more postprocessual approaches. However, this led to a neglect and sometimes even abandonment of the idea that castles had military functions.¹⁵ The French faced a similar development as in England, although its postprocessual approaches are more moderate than the English.¹⁶ The German tradition used to have a func-

tionalist approach, however, they do acknowledge the castle's multifunctionality.¹⁷

The first point of importance when it comes to defining a castle is to realise that the word is a modern construct. While there is no single term to describe this type of construction, it is necessary to define what we mean by castle and how we approach the building, and it is therefore superfluous to differentiate between several definitions of the same sort for the remaining parts of the thesis. Because of its modern terminology, it is redundant to make a differentiation between the numerous terms that exist to describe this building; castle, fortress, stronghold, *castellum*, they are all similar words and not one stands for a specific type of structure as a historic representation. Differentiating in hall houses, *burg*, palaces, towns and cities with castles, and tower houses, castles or fortresses is therefore only important as an etic distinction to support the scholar, without any emic significance. Castles do not represent different types of architecture, nor different households or settlements, and these terms therefore represent diverse components and descriptions of the same whole, rather than being a real definition. An example of a view on castles by contemporaries can be found in written sources, such as for instance the text about the construction of Saphet. This text celebrates the military strength of the castle and its function in the defence of the Holy Land.¹⁸ In general, many texts emphasise a castle's martial functions, however, not all, and an example of this can be found for instance in allegories. In one of these studies Whitehead describes that some texts employ the castle to stress the '*unassailable front of virginity*', others highlight the defence of the virtues against the '*onslaught of the vices*' and that still further texts ignore any siege element and use castle topography simply as a way of organising and presenting the basics of

15. An example of a scholar from this tradition is Matthew Johnson, who argues that many castles (many Late Medieval and all the Renaissance castles) never even possessed a military function. Johnson 2002

16. André Debord promotes this view expressed in many of his publications among which 'Aristocratie et Pouvoir' from 2000 is the most recent. Debord also argues for a more contextual approach in the castle as research subject as well as the research itself. "Ce n'est que de leur conjonction que pourront naître de véritables typologies et que la fouille ne courra plus le risque d'être anecdotique ou simple illustration, plus ou moins forcée,

d'une histoire élaborée en dehors d'elle, mais vraiment une des bases fondamentales d'une véritable problématique historique." Debord 1987, 51

17. As Zeune states: "Die Burg wird hier als Herrschaftssymbol, als Statussymbol, aber auch als multifunktionaler Bau interpretiert . . ." Zeune 1997, 11

18. In 'De constructione castri Saphet' translated by Huygens 1981

virtuous conduct.¹⁹ What almost always seems to be important in all texts however, is the link with high social class. These notions do not lead us in any case towards an exact definition, but it shows us that besides a practical use, castles had an important ideological function. Further, it shows us that contemporaries also had no fixed idea of what a castle was or what it represented. This means that what we denote as a castle had a fluid meaning for its contemporaries and that is the way we should approach it as well. Ellenblum proposes that in some cases a definition is superfluous. There is no doubt that places like Jerusalem, Antioch and Acre were cities, and sites such as Belvoir, Margat and Crac des Chevaliers are castles.²⁰ However, these definitions are not based on standards of what a castle is, but more on intuition. What is essential is to approach these structures in all their diversity and especially, as noted by Coulson *‘the social involvement of castles.’*²¹

Because the definition of a castle is not clear, I wish firstly to approach this subject broadly and the term loosely. However, the fact that these castles for the Near Eastern case were approached by scholars in a militaristic way significantly influenced the outcome of the results and the way we now see these structures. This does not mean that we will ignore the military aspects of the castle, however, as Johnson says: *“the military view is not so much wrong as only a part of the story.”*²² It is important not to put its military function as a part of the definition. This brings us to the second recognition regarding the designation of castles: the military-domestic dichotomy. Castles had a very varied number of functions and according to Johnson the military might not always have been one. If this is true, it is based on material from England alone and whether this applies to the Latin East is still debated. However, even when its military role does not seem apparent, that castles solely represented elite residences was certainly also not always the case. According to Thompson we have to bear in mind that the prime consideration of castle builders was to make the site

defendable, but this thought, which we already explained, comes from a long tradition of military focused studies, primarily based on the fact that only the fortifications survived.²³ Coulson believes that the function of administrative centre was more significant, he states: *“Castle’s normal existence was administrative, the office and the home of the skeleton residential staff. The fact that fortification was occasionally vindicated by violence does not mean that war determined castle design.”*²⁴ Although I believe it is dangerous to have a preconceived idea of what a castle is before we begin to study them (as noted by Johnson 2003, 5), it is important to realise that the castle’s layout and architecture is not fundamentally based on military considerations.

An interesting example that shows the place of military appearance in castles comes from England, where there was no interest whatsoever to make fortresses well defendable prior to 1154 when the country was in a state of war and defensive structures were necessary, while later, when the danger was no longer lurking, we see highly defensible structures coming up.²⁵ Was this out of fear that something might happen again? It could be that the taste for martial activities in the life of the aristocracy in tournaments spilled over into militant architecture and that we are looking at a style, not a necessity.²⁶ The same argument can be applied to the Frankish Kingdom of Jerusalem, where the number of castles increased when the area became more stable in the twelfth century.²⁷ With the previous considerations in mind, we shall now try to construct a mindset to conceive of a castle that respects its multiple layers and still is able to define it without getting lost in modern constructions.

19. Whitehead 2003, 88

20. Ellenblum 2007, 85

21. Coulson 2003, 42

22. Johnson 2002, 4

23. Thompson 1994, 440 and 444. Although we must take into account that this military interest led to the first scientific attention to castles. It was the great defensive structures of Crac des Chevaliers that aroused the enthusiasm and admiration of Lawrence of Arabia.

24. Coulson 2003, 48-9

25. Coulson 1996, 187; 1992, 89-94, 99-102, 1979 73-8, and Platt 1982

26. Coulson 1996, 187

27. Ellenblum 1996, 520-3

When we amalgamate the subject of social space and castles theoretically, it is important to see in what way we conceptualise the castle as a social space. Perhaps it can make a contribution when we regard the castle as *heterotopia* in the way described by Michel Foucault in *Des espaces autres*, as social space between a real place and a utopia (ideal space without place). Although the explanation Foucault presents for the precise definition of a heterotopia is not at every point very clear, there are some reasonable benefits to it that can help us define a castle without the need to have a preconceived idea of what it represents. A heterotopia is described by Foucault as a real place where all other places that can be found within a culture are simultaneously represented, contested and inverted. In this they represent everything but in fact are nothing. A small world which mirrors the outside but is not real life and has restricted access.²⁸ Heterotopias relate to a relational disruption in time and space, and the castle in this respect can be viewed as a spatio-temporal unit as described by Defert, an enclosure where all features of life are regulated.²⁹ Foucault describes the ship as the best example of a heterotopia: “*que le bateau, c’est un morceau flottant d’espace, un lieu sans lieu*”.³⁰ Looking at the castle in this way we can see similarities in that castles, like boats, have oceans of space surrounding them that are not always enterable. Although the comparison fails when we take into account that the castle of course has contact with the world outside. It is the life within that represents a different world, but without a total loss of outside influences. In defining the castle as a heterotopia, it is of course important not to see it as isolated from its environment, for it would make us fall into the same trap as earlier military architecture studies did. However, it was not Foucault’s idea that the space was completely isolated, as according to him heterotopias always presuppose a system of opening and closing that both isolates them and makes them penetrable. It is not completely secluded, but in order to get in one must have permission. Furthermore, heterotopias are formed in the very founding of society and can be connected or disconnected from the world. They

defy normal constructs of space and time. Heterotopias are embedded in social, political and moral oppositions at such intersections of public and private, pleasure and work, that this relates to a very great extent to castles. However, we must keep in mind that this is a metaphysical definition and a theoretical aim at apprehending a castle, not literary what a castle represented! If we consider the evolution of a castle, we see that its physical seclusion (walls and enclosures) evolved at a later stage and also often depended on the context (early medieval town centres consisting of one hall where the lord resided versus the high-medieval colonial situation of Welsh or crusader castles). A castle is a heterotopia in the sense that access is restricted socially, meaning that people (no matter from which class) required special permission to enter the castle or hall; for instance only at certain times when the lord held court or after a special invitation to a banquet. Only sometimes was a castle physically bounded walls. It can thus be considered a heterotopia as the castles represent enclosures in the form of a microcosm, where life is regulated and access is restricted. It tries to mirror real life, but it is another world with all its complexities intact because of its exclusivity and restrictedness (both by social and physical separations). By explaining the castle as heterotopia we can overcome the problem that Matthew Johnson has with his definition of them. He explains the dilemma as: “... *such a story (castles) cannot be reduced to one simple baseline or reality to find explanation. Castles are not ‘basically about conspicuous consumption’ or ‘essentially about social status’ or ‘at heart about balancing defence and comfort’ or ‘fundamentally symbols of power.’*”³¹ Despite his complete discount of any military function and his sometimes uncritical relativistic view on castles, Johnson has a point in that castles do not have one main function, but have a multitude of them.

By defining the castle as heterotopia we have the benefit of both the avoidance of a specific spatial locality with physical properties, and the abandonment of trying to denote the essence of the castle or the preconceived meaning of what it stood for. Instead

28. Foucault 1984, 46-9, Johnson 2006, 75-7

29. Defert 1997, 275

30. Foucault 1984, 49

31. Johnson 2002, 3

we can treat the castle as a distinct social unit, without disregarding environment and outside influence, which mirrors real life in its own special way, as social space without losing its identity or its complexity. It also separates the groups within the castle, that are not society and are not parallel to the whole 'Frankish society', but do represent multiple social personae from the real world that are given another meaning within the castle, and these can now be investigated, scrutinised within the heterotopia.

1.3 THE REGION

The geographical area of our research is located in the Near East. In the days when the Crusades took place and still today, the region has been known as the Holy Land. For our area of research this seems to be a proper description, for it presents not only an emic approach to the area of research, it also denotes the original idea that launched the Crusades, their primary aim through the years, and the way religion played a part in the enterprise. The Holy Land and especially the city of Jerusalem was the most important focal point in the Frankish period in the Near East, in both idea and practice. In Medieval times, people believed Jerusalem to be the geographical centre of the world and we can see this idea reflected in the fact that all maps constructed in this period place Jerusalem in the exact centre.³² Further, Jerusalem was associated with the heavenly New Jerusalem in the Book of Revelations and in this respect the earthly city received a kind of divine glow. However, while Jerusalem was the most important pilgrimage centre, the interest was not only focused on Jerusalem. The land of Palestine was so closely associated with the life of Christ that the whole landscape was perceived as one holy relic.³³ This can be seen as a visual expression of both faith and dominance.

Deconstructing the Holy Land into etic perspectives, it comprises parts of the countries of Lebanon, Turkey, Israel/Palestine, Jordan, and Syria. In an environmental and climatological perspective, this region, like many in the Mediterranean area, is distinguished by its diversity. It consists of coastal plains, highland ecological frontier zones, broad plateaus (north of Jerusalem), large valleys, long narrow ridges with flat tops and sharply sloping sides separated by deep narrow *wadis*, but also foothills which consist of moderate and low hills.³⁴ In the Frankish period four states were formed: the County of Edessa, the Principality of Antioch, the Kingdom of Jerusalem, and the County of Tripoli.³⁵

The reason why this area has been chosen as the stage for our research lies in the earlier attention that the area was given regarding crusader castles. It is true that when one wants to provide new knowledge on crusader castles as a structure, areas in the Baltic and Spain, Greece and Turkey are more appropriate, for these are neglected areas when it comes to crusader castle studies. These areas are in need of basic research like excavation, plan reconstruction and historical research, and it is too early to try interpreting the material; first one has to properly gather and analyse the material. The Holy Land was the primary goal in the period of the Crusades and this is certainly reflected in studies directed to the same subject. However, when it comes to providing an analytical and interpretative study of crusader castles, all are in need of attention. The area of the Holy Land has been selected precisely because of the earlier attention; we are in the situation where data is meticulously collected but not fully analysed yet and thus a body of work exists that we can expand upon. It is exactly this kind of data that is essential for the method we are trying to employ in the current research.

32. Hanawalt and Kobińska 2000, ix, from Derek 1994 and Jackson 1989. The impact of the crusades on spatial organization can be seen in the world map and the map of Palestine with new influences going together with the careful mapping of biblical events. Hiatt 2005, 64-6

33. Riley-Smith 1986, 20-5. Not surprisingly we see numerous churches being built and rebuilt in Jerusalem and other places in the Holy Land after the entering of Jerusalem on 15 July 1099 to create a 'New Zion'. Hamilton 1977, 105-16

34. Finkelstein and Lederman 1997, 103-7, Magness 2003, 76

35. It is important not to equate these with modern political boundaries. Political borders were very rare in the Middle Ages, and medieval political communities were characterised by their centres or by their common association with a ruler rather than by their physical space. Ellenblum 2002, 105-19, 2007, Brauer 1995, 36. Castles did not function to create or to guard borders in any way as the recent study of Ellenblum taught us; they demarcated feudal centres rather than borders. Ellenblum 2002, and 2007

1.4 OBJECTIVES

Not the answers need to be original in this research, but new and resourceful questions that have the power to lead us to the unexplored areas of Frankish life in the Near East. For this thesis, the central objective is the new approach and methodology that will treat castles contextually, analytically and as a social phenomenon, with the structure of space as its base. Related research questions are formed to direct the research to social aspects of crusader castles in the methodology and in order to create boundaries.

The main research objective is to look at how social space was negotiated within crusader castles and how this reflects the social, cultural and political landscape of the Frankish East.

The specific research questions that are tied in with this objective are threefold:

1. How is space negotiated between the castle's military function and its function as residence?
2. How is religious space negotiated within crusader castles?
3. Is there a difference visible in the use of space between castles of military orders and castles of individual aristocracy in the Frankish Near East?

The point of departure of this research is the hypothesis that buildings embody the social and cultural meanings of those who constructed and/or inhabited them and that it is therefore possible, by studying circulation patterns and configuration, to obtain additional insights into how a society dealt with certain social and cultural values.

The research questions can be divided into a part that focuses on the functioning of the castle (questions one and two), and a part that is directed to the society and the castle as a social construct (question three). The first research question relates directly to the functioning of a castle and tackles an ancient debate in castle studies: defence vs. residence. We must note however that this is not a question meant to decide whether a castle was residential or military, because both play a role. We know that defence was never the only function of a castle, that it was always also a residence and that its economic functions and its function as a feudal centre sometimes also were a vi-

tal part of its existence. What we wish to know is the relationship between a castle's militaristic and other social functions, and the importance of these functions for the everyday life of its inhabitants and their implications. How are these activities reflected in the spatial layout of the castle? How much time and space was devoted to military functioning and how much to residential activities? In what way were these activities spatially structured and can this give us more clarity on how particular castles were used and conceived? Until recently, defence was always considered the main function of castles in the Latin East. The Latin East is regarded as a frontier zone where battles and war were the main activities in which its inhabitants were involved. When we compare this to European castles, then it must be evident that some of those are built more for the functions of status symbol and a comfortable residence, where the defences are often purely a decorative element of the castle. I believe both these views need to be reevaluated.

Another very important additional question that Coulson paid less attention to in his book *'Castles in Medieval Society'* (2003), but is especially significant for the Near East, is to explore which role religion played in fortresses. Because it is so intertwined with everyday life in the medieval world, such an important aspect of peoples' lives, I will pose this as a separate question. Until today, religion and warfare have a tense relationship. For the Frankish East this relationship can be seen in the crusade as an enterprise, the crusader as pilgrim-knight, and in the establishment of the military orders. How did the people in a castle deal with this tension when it came to spatial arrangement? While faith in the middle ages was interwoven with every aspect of life, how was it displayed and used within structures that are believed to be devoted to fighting? With respect to this question, it is important to take into account the contemporary sources on these matters, and the way in which people dealt with religion in medieval society. Wheatley explains that while ecclesiastical architecture has long been understood as meaningful, operating at an ideological as well as a practical level, still the ideological exploration of castle architecture has

only recently received attention.³⁶ By looking at the religious functions we will also try to look at what the castle wished to communicate in an ideological sense. Therefore practical capabilities and ideological functions must be separated, which is one thing our methodology can provide.

What is important to understand in the context of both research questions is that we try to investigate different functions and functioning of a castle, not *the function* of a castle. It is not right either to presuppose the main function of a castle or that we are able to obtain *the* meaning of this. As we already noted in the first part of the introduction, castles represent too complex a structure to make any suggestions of the sort. What we will do is try to explore the social space and look at the relationships between different functions of a castle, to analyse its structure and see how important one of these functions might have been. The third research question relates to social behaviour and will be directed in particular to two groups of owners that inhabited crusader castles. Is there a difference between the castles of military orders and those of the individual aristocrats of the Near East? This seems a rather unusual question. Looking at the fortresses built by the Franks in the Levant, we get the impression that by form they all differ and by function they are all the same. In the first instance, it seems the answer to the third question is no, there is no difference visible. One can also reason that when castles are denoted as residential and as places of military defence, they will all have the same sort of internal and external appearance. This would lead us to think more in the direction of all castles being similar. However, some suggestions point to another line of thought, which lies more in the social sphere. Military orders have very different lifestyles than the aristocracy that dwelled in the Frankish East, and the issue that relates to our third research question is whether this is reflected in the internal division and movement within space in the castle. Hence, it is very important to study the use of space between two social categories in the Latin Near East. The two questions on the functioning of a castle have to be treated in the context of these two

different social groups and therefore the last research question will be the setting for the first questions. For instance, the appearance of a chapel does not say anything about the way religion played a part in everyday life. In almost every castle in the Frankish East we find a chapel, there is no difference between castles owned by military orders and aristocratic castles. It is the spatial positioning of that chapel which teaches us more about the importance for its users.³⁷

In relation to our adopted method and hypothesis, there are some meta-questions involved, that also need some attention in the introduction, which are directed to the working of the methodology. Space syntax, although widely accepted, requires a different focus when it is employed in past situations. Spatial analysis in general has been a significant aspect of the archaeological endeavour and has already provided many insights into the behaviour, social organisation and cognitive structures of past cultures. But the diverse methods and approaches that emerged from the many disciplines that occupied themselves with space made the concept somewhat elusive and indefinable. It is necessary to reflect on the whole concept of space and how it is defined and will be used in the coming research. We will also need to find an angle in which the method of space syntax fits an archaeological case study, and subsequently we will have to evaluate in this thesis if the theory of Hillier and Hanson developed in 1984 works for the study of medieval castles.

What will be done effectively is that by applying space syntax as a research tool, invariants in spatial patterning of crusader castles will be explored. Following this, we will return to the historical context to see whether these invariants can be translated into

37. This indicates a research drawing on the emic-etic discussion. We want to know the 'emic' view, or what was inside the head of the medieval inhabitant in the crusader castle. How did he use and perceive the space around him? Of course obtaining an emic description is insofar an unrealistic aim in that we can never directly discover this, however, we must realise that pure etic descriptions are also non-existent because science does not speak a universal language. In scientific research it is important to give room to both these principles in order to receive a 'thick description' (the emic description should be the aim and the etic description should be epistemologically explained).

36. Wheatley 2004, 2

patterns of human interaction to get more lucidity on the social behaviour within a castle. In general, we can say that this thesis will have an interdisciplinary approach, using and employing ideas and methods from ethnography and cultural anthropology, environmental and ecological psychology, philosophy, neurological science, architecture and sociology to make the archaeological research as rich in angles as possible. The principle aims of this research study are to propose a new way of investigating crusader castles, to analyse the spatial qualities of castles, to examine the social organisation within crusader castles, and to reflect in a general sense on the method of space syntax within archaeology and investigate the use of space syntax on crusader castles in particular.

1.5 STRUCTURE OF THESIS

We will set out this research in six different chapters that will deal successively with the methodology, data analysis and the interpretation of the data in order to answer the questions posed in this introduction. In the following chapters I will first provide a literary review of the preceding research on the crusades and a discussion of the current studies of crusader castles. Because that research consists of such an extensive body of works that cannot be discussed in one chapter, we will limit ourselves to the most important works and those with a special significance

for this specific study. After the review, we will explain in chapter two the adopted theoretical framework in which this research is conceived, the way we will approach our main object of study, the theory and method of space syntax and how all of these topics have been practically applied to the data analysis in the methodology chapter. The data analysis that follows will consist of three chapters that analyse the data as described in the methodology chapter. The first chapter will deal with castles owned by Military Orders, and the second with castles of the aristocracy. The division of these two chapters is in accordance with the third research question, which is to see whether there is a difference in the use of space between castles of military orders and castles of the aristocracy in the Frankish Near East. We will analyse these as two separate categories and compare them in these chapters. The last chapter on data analysis will deal with other types of buildings, both in the Frankish Near East and on the Western European mainland, which carried a special importance in relation to our previous categories, either in a related configuration or in social or architectural structure. The last chapter will be a synthesis of all the analyses of the previous chapters to finally compare the different buildings and see how these relate to our main objective and whether we can receive any clarity on the research questions posed in this introduction.