

УДК 930.23

**EARLY LATIN REPORTS ABOUT THE MONGOLS (1221):
REASONS FOR DISTORTION OF REALITY**

Roman Hautala

*(Sh.Marjani Institute of History,
Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Tatarstan
University of Oulu, Finland)*

The first mention of the Mongols appears in Latin sources in 1221. According to these sources, the Mongol army, which accomplished a number of conquests in Central Asia, Persia, and Transcaucasia, consisted of baptized nomads. Latin authors asserted that at the head of this army stood a certain David, “king of the Indies”, which sought to help the Middle Eastern Christians and “liberate” Jerusalem from Muslim rule. Undoubtedly, the Latin sources meant by the “deeds of king David” the first western campaign of the Mongols led by Genghis Khan, which began in 1219 and was directed against the Central Asian sultanate of Khwarezm. These Latin sources were written at the time, when the troops of Genghis Khan had already conquered Khwarezmian territory in Central Asia and began military actions in Khorasan, while the separate divisions of the Mongols led by Jebe and Subedei invaded Transcaucasia and inflicted the first serious defeat to the Christian kingdom of Georgia.

Even though the later Oriental sources indicate the presence of certain baptized nomads in the Mongol army, at the moment it is known for certain that the bulk of the nomadic army of Genghis Khan did not adhere to the Christian religion and the Mongol divisions led by Jebe and Subedei were sent by Genghis Khan in the west in pursuit of the former Khwarezmian Sultan Muhammad rather than for the “liberation” of Jerusalem or provision of any tangible support to the Middle Eastern Christians.

Thus, the early Latin information about the Mongols contains relatively accurate description of the western conquests of Genghis Khan, but represent a specific explanation for the Mongol expansion, which does not correspond to historical reality.

This article represents an attempt to explain this distortion of reality.

In the first part of the article, the author gives a brief description of the Latin sources containing information about the “king David’s” advance to the west. In the second part, the author attempts to find an explanation for the distortion of historical reality in Latin sources by considering the information of these sources in the ideological context of the Fifth Crusade.

Keywords: Crusade ideology, Fifth Crusade, Khwarezmian campaign of Genghis Khan, Nestorian documents, Latin sources.

The Fifth Crusade (1217–1221) coincided with an increased optimism of Christianity in relation to the approaching triumph over Islam. Already in his encyclical *Quia maior* of 1213 addressed to potential participants in the crusade, Pope Innocent III identified the apocalyptic head of the beast with the Muslim religion and interpreted its number 666 as the number of years destined for its existence. After had ascertained the completion of the 600-year period since the advent of Islam, Innocent III presented the approaching destruction of the Muslim religion as an additional incentive to participate in the crusade [31, p. 13; 51, p. 306; 44, p. 18; 14, p. 1391; 59, p. 42, nota 10].

The content of the prophecies provided by the Eastern Christians in Egypt strengthened the Crusaders' expectations. So, at the beginning of 1220, in an atmosphere of gloom in the Christian camp in connection with the return of a large part of the Crusaders to their homeland [44, p. 179], the papal legate Pelagius¹ received from the Eastern Christians the "Saracen" prophecy with an encouraging content. In this instance, it was a prophecy attributed to Hannan, son of Agap or, more precisely, of Ishaq, by which it was meant Hunayn ibn Ishaq, the Nestorian physician and famous translator of Greek texts into Syriac, who died in Samarra in 873 [15, p. 61; 41, p.117–123; 51, p. 314; 26, p.243–244; 34, p.136–137; 44, p. 161; 6, p.13–14]. Actually, the prophecy of Hannan was forged by the Eastern Christians with the possible complicity of the legate, if we take seriously the suspicions of Igor de Rachewiltz [46, p. 40]. However it was, Pelagius did not fail to inform the Crusaders on the contents of the prophecy and, in particular, on that part that foreshadowed the inevitable defeat of the Muslims in connection with the victorious advance of a powerful ruler of Christians and the parallel attack on Mecca by a ruler of the Abyssinian Christians [65, p.154–155; 26, p. 243; 51, p. 314; 6, p.13–14].

Reliability of the prophecy was soon confirmed with the identification of the first Christian ruler mentioned in the prophecy by matching him to the Georgian ruler Giorgi IV Lasha who promised the legate in the beginning of 1220 to immediately launch military action

¹ Pope Honorius III commissioned the Benedictine Pelagius Galvani the spiritual leadership of the Fifth Crusade in the summer 1217 appointing him his legate in the Middle East. In September 1218, Pelagius arrived in Acre accompanied by the Italian contingent and hastened to join the Crusade army in Egypt besieging Damietta [15, p. 46, 53; 37, p. 246–247]. Starting from February 1219, the Papal legate began to openly claim the supreme leadership of military operations, often provoking dissent within the Crusade army. Despite the general negative assessment of the role of Pelagius by modern researchers considering his strategic solutions as the main reason for the failure of the military campaign of Egypt, it should be noted undeniable spiritual influence of Pelagius on the Crusaders, capable of maintaining the morale of the Christian army in the most difficult periods of the campaign [44, p. 160–161; 62, p. 421].

against the Sultan of Damascus [72; 65, p.154–155; 53, p.53–54; 26, p. 244; 6, p. 18; 71, III, p. 31].

At the beginning of 1221 and under similar circumstances, it was disclosed a new prophecy that Jacques de Vitry called “Revelations of St. Peter the Apostle collected in one volume by his disciple Clement” [33, p. 200–201; 28, p. 152], and Oliver of Paderborn named it in short as the “Book of Clement” [27, p. 258; 19, II, coll. 1428]. In contrast to the first prophecy of Hannan, this text was not intended to the Latin audience, but it represented a version of the new edition of the Apocalypse circulated in the 13th century among the Christian circles of the Middle East [15, p. 61; 41, p.130–131, 135; 26, p. 246; 34, p.136–137; 6, p. 14, 18–20]. As in the previous case, the “Book of Clement” presaged the arrival of the armies of powerful Christian rulers. One of these rulers had to come to the Middle East from the West and the other from the East. In early 1221, the legate Pelagius equated the western ruler from this prophecy with the same Georgian king whom he strongly demanded to outbreak hostilities against the Muslims [67, p. 612]. However, starting from March of the same year, the western ruler of the “Book of Clement” became identified with the newly elected Holy Roman Emperor in connection with the arrival of the encouraging news about the intention of Frederick II of Hohenstaufen personally take part in military actions in Egypt [15, p. 74; 37, p. 93; 44, p. 184; 63, p. 132–133, 135].

The identity of the second, eastern ruler was revealed a few weeks after the appearance of the “Book of Clement” with the arrival of rumors about westward advance of the invincible army of “king David” [67, p. 612]. These rumors were confirmed later by three reports, which were received by the Prince of Antioch, Bohemond IV.

Despite the apparent discrepancies in these reports, they were undoubtedly based on a single original text: authors of the reports added or omitted some details at their discretion, but kept the structure of the primary text in its original form [54, p. 31; 52, p. 140; 49, p. 233, nota 6]. A number of details contained in these reports indicate that the author of original text was a Nestorian, apparently residing in Baghdad. So, an anonymous Christian author of the text argues that the Nestorian patriarch resided in Baghdad was the main initiator of the western military expedition of “king David” [28, p. 144–145]. At the same time, the author points to a relatively friendly relations between the Caliph and patriarch (this detail shows that the original text was not written for the Latin audience]. In addition, in some of the surviving Latin manuscripts, the author presents an obviously Nestorian justification of the conflict between “king David” and the Georgians, calling them heretics, that is, those Eastern Christians who accepted Chalcedonian creed [66, p. 54; 31, p. 48; 52, p. 143, 146; 6, p. 16; 46, p. 40].

Currently the following Latin translations of the “king David’s” reports or their mentions are known:

1. Report of the legate Pelagius sent to the Papal Curia in January–February 1221. The text of report has not been preserved and it is known by the circular letter of Pope Honorius III, dated by 13th March, 1221. In turn, the text of this circular letter of the pontiff is known from the copies contained in the so-called “Romersdorfer Manuscript”, in the “Dunstable Annals”, and in the “Chronicle” of Alberic de Trois-Fontaines [67, p. 612–613; 3, p. 66–67; 16, p. 911]. This Papal letter contains the first ever mention of the Khwarezmian campaign of Genghis Khan, where the Mongol attack on the Georgian kingdom has not yet been mentioned.

2. Parallel message of the Middle Eastern Templars known only by the mention in the “Chronicle” of Alberic de Trois-Fontaines [16, p. 911].

3. Latin translation of the first Nestorian report contained in the seventh letter of the Catholic Archbishop of Acre, Jacques de Vitry, and referred to as the “History of the Deeds of David, King of the Indies” [54, p.41–51; 33, p. 177–191; 28, p.141–148; 66, p.45–56; 23, p.48–55]. According to Jacques de Vitry, this report was delivered to the Prince of Antioch, Bohemond IV, by his spies in Muslim countries and translated from Arabic into Latin [28, p. 149]. Jacques de Vitry dates his letter by 18th April, 1221. However, the report could reach Antioch a little earlier, but not earlier than February 1221 [33, p. 12; 34, p.136–137; 28, p. 54–55].

4. The same report was included in the second message of the legate Pelagius, which he sent to Europe between February and April 1221 [34, p. 136–137; 28, p.60–62; 3, p. xvii, 69–74].

5. Latin translation of the second Nestorian report contained in the seventh letter of Jacques de Vitry and following the first report [54, p. 52–54; 33, p. 192–195; 28, p. 148–149; 66, p. 57–58; 23, p. 55–57]. According to Jacques de Vitry, this report was delivered by the Eastern merchants simultaneously with the first report [28, p. 149]. The second report lists the same conquests, which are mentioned in the “History of the Deeds of David”, but contains a number of references to commercial products supplied from the East [54, p. 31; 52, p. 140; 49, p. 233, nota 6]. These details are missing in the “History of the Deeds of David”.

6. Latin translation of the third Nestorian report. This translation was contained in a letter by two canons regular of the cathedral of Münster participated in the Fifth Crusade. In turn, a copy of canons’ letter has been preserved in two manuscripts containing the differences in the initial part of the letter [54, p. 54–56; 67, p. 613–614; 66, p. 58–59]. Unfortunately, the canons of Münster do not report, how they became owners of this report’s translation, and we can only assume that the third Nestorian report came to Antioch together with the two previous. The third Nestorian report has obvious similarities with the second report included by Jacques de Vitry in his letter, but it contains some additional details: a reference to the family ties between “king David” and the Prester John [66, p. 58] and an indication of the presence of non-Christians in his army [67, p. 614; 66, p. 58–59].

7. Mention of the Nestorian reports in the Oliver of Paderborn's "Historia Damiatina" [27, p. 258–259; 19, II, coll. 1427–1428].

The first Nestorian report contained in a letter by Jacques de Vitry represents the most complete version [28, p. 141–148]. Therefore, the content of this report should be considered in detail. Therefore, we take a closer look at this particular report.

At the beginning of his "History of the Deeds of David", the Nestorian author presents the king Israel, the father of the protagonist of the story, as a tributary of certain *Chancana*, the ruler of lands between Kashgar and Balasaghun. It is obvious that under the name of *Chancana* the author has in mind Yelü Zhilugu, the last Gurkhan of Karakitais [28, p. 141; 54, p. 32; 52, p. 140–141]. After describing the miraculous rescue of David from the insidious intrigues of *Chancana* [28, p. 141–143], the author of the "History" announces the election of David as the ruler of his land, which the third Nestorian report calls the land of *Silo* [28, p. 143; 66, p. 58]. After that, the Nestorian author proceeds to describe the victorious campaign of David against *Chancana* and lists the lands of defeated Gurkhan, conquered by the protagonist of the story [28, p. 143–144]. Enumeration of these conquests indicates that the author of the "History" means by "king David" the Naiman khan Kuchlug, who became the actual ruler of the Karakitai Empire after the capture of Gurkhan in 1211. The Nestorian author attributes Kuchlug's victory to the might of his army. However, he neglects to mention that in fact Kuchlug was able to carry out a coup d'état in the Karakitai Empire due to a significant weakening of the military potential of Gurkhan after serious defeat of the latter's troops in the battle against Khwarezmshah Ala ad-Din Muhammad II in September 1210 [45, p. 72; 54, p. 33, 44, nota 5; 31, p. 38; 47, p. 699; 7, p. 46; 70, p. 50–51; 40, p. 160; 57, p. 262; 9, p. 193–194].

Next, the "History" tells of the David's conquest of the territories belonging to the Ghurid Sultanate [28, p. 144], which actually was carried out by Khwarezmshah Muhammad up to 1215 [54, p. 27, 36, 44, nota 7; 9, p. 166]. However, it is possible that the Nestorian author deliberately attributes this conquest to David, matching it with the victory of the former Karakitai Gurkhan over the troops of the Ghurid Sultan Mu'izz al-Din Muhammad, which occurred in 1204 [70, p. 45; 29, p. 429–430; 40, p. 160; 9, p. 165; 68, I, p. 413–415].

Then, suddenly leaving aside the protagonist of the narrative, the "History" provides details of the victorious raid of Khwarezmshah Muhammad through Iran and Iraq in 1217 and announces his intention to capture Baghdad [28, p. 144], in order to proceed thereafter to describe the secret negotiations between the Abbasid Caliph and the Nestorian patriarch. According to the author, the Nestorian patriarch urged by the Caliph, sent his words to David contained a requirement to launch military actions in the rear of Khwarezmshah in order to save the Abbasid capital from imminent ruin [28, p. 144–145]. This reference to the central role of

the Nestorian patriarch in the outbreak of future conflict between the Mongols and Khwarezm serves as the major evidence for suggestion that the author of report was a Nestorian, apparently resided in Baghdad [31, p. 48; 52, p. 143].

Without a doubt, the approval of the direct impact of the Catholicos on unleashing the conflict between Genghis Khan and Khwarezmshah should be recognized as a deliberate distortion of reality. However, it is quite probable that the description of the dialogue between the Caliph of Baghdad and Catholicos reflects the diplomatic activity of the caliph al-Nasir, which was not a highly moral by nature. Being an implacable enemy of Muhammad, al-Nasir was able to successfully provoke a conflict between Khwarezmshah and Ghurid Sultan. Muhammad could personally verify this by accessing the Ghurid diplomatic correspondence after the capture of Ghazna in 1215. Moreover, in addition to plotting against him, Khwarezmshah found in the al-Nasir's letters the evidence that the Caliph was planning to create a military alliance between the Ghurids and "pagans" Karakitais [70, p. 55; 52, p. 143; 9, p. 165, 168, 184; 68, I, p. 416].

This desire of the Caliph to destroy his political opponent at any cost provided the basis for claims of Ibn al-Athir and other Arab chroniclers that al-Nasir was secretly corresponded with Genghis Khan and was the initiator of the Khwarezmian campaign of the Mongols [70, p. 85–86; 52, p. 143; 24, p. 112; 69, p. 67–68; 9, p. 168].

Further, the author reports about the defeat of Khwarezmshah in the battle against the forces of David and tells about further conquests of the Eastern Christian army. However, he does not realize that by the beginning of the conflict between Genghis Khan and Khwarezmshah, Kuchlug khan was no longer alive [54, p. 33–34; 31, p. 38; 47, p. 699; 70, p. 82; 57, p. 262; 55, p. 177–178]. Therefore, further conquests carried out in reality by the Mongols, are presented as fulfillment of the same "king David" for the sake of Christian religion [28, p. 146–147].

Among the real and imaginary conquests of "David", the author mentions the Mongol attack on the lands of Georgians. This reference was missing in the first report of Pelagius [67, p. 612–613], since the Papal legate, obviously, had not yet received information about the first serious defeat of the Georgians by Mongols. The first major clash between Georgian forces and Mongols occurred between December 1220 and February 1221. The battle took place either in the Cotman river valley or at the river Gardman, the right tributary of the river Shamkhor-chai, which flows into the Kura [18, p. 54–56; 43, p. 171; 35, p. 124–126; 45, p. 125; 24, p. 112; 1, p. 11; 5, p. 94–95, 98; 69, p. 64–65; 6, p. 18; 10, p. 310–311; 11, I, p. 294]. The Nestorian author explains the attack of "king David" against Georgia by the fact that the Georgians concluded a military alliance with the Saracens [28, p. 147]. Apparently, the author condemned in such a way the Georgian king Giorgi IV Lasha for the fact

that he signed a military alliance with atabek of Tabriz, Uzbek, and the Sultan of Khilat and al-Jazira, al-Malik al-Ashraf, before entering into battle with the Mongols.

At the end of the translation of “History”, Jacques de Vitry adds fresh news from the east. Apparently this news was received from the Catholic prisoners who arrived in Antioch after they had been liberated by the Caliph of Baghdad to please “king David” [28, p. 147–150; 54, p. 51; 27, p. 259; 66, p. 56]. According to these report, the Mongols devastated Qazvin after its inhabitants had rebelled and killed a representative of the Mongol power. But in this case, the author is wrong and confuses Qazvin with Hamadan.

The Mongols approached Hamadan in the autumn 1220 and accepted a voluntary capitulation of its ruler, Sayyid Majd al-Din Ala 'al-Dawla, leaving in the city *shahna*, that is representative of the Mongol power. Next, the Mongols marched on Qazvin, where, in contrast to Hamadan, they met fierce resistance and took the city by storm. Thereafter the tümens of Subedei and Jebe withdrew to Azerbaijan [35, p. 124–126; 39, p. 121; 10, p. 310–311; 11, I, p. 294, II, p. 111].

Therefore, it is obvious that the author of this report confuses Qazvin with Hamadan [54, p. 38], since it were the residents of Hamadan, not affected by the first appearance of the Mongols, who revolted after their withdrawal and killed the Mongol *shahna*. Repression of the Mongols did not take long to come: tümens of Subedei and Jebe went back to the south after the destruction of the Georgian troops and stormed Hamadan shortly before the Vitry’s letter was written, that is, before 18th April, 1221 [35, p. 124–126; 45, p. 125; 1, p. 11; 52, p. 145; 5, p. 98; 69, p. 65; 10, p. 310–311; 11, I, p. 294].

Despite the error in the city name, this report is important to clarify the date of the Hamadan’s conquest, refuting the assertion be found in modern studies that the assault of Hamadan took place in August or September 1221 [18, p. 56; 60, p. 258–259, 272].

To summarize, we can say that the Nestorian reports are a valuable source for Khwarezmian campaign of the Mongols, taking into account the earlier date of their writing. In turn, the appearance of translations of these reports in the Crusader camp in Damietta had a direct impact on the course of the Fifth Crusade. According to Jacques de Vitry, the Crusaders in Damietta considerably heartened after learning of the “king David’s” advance in the Middle East along with encouraging news about the impending arrival in Egypt of Emperor Frederick II [28, p. 147]. Under the influence of these reports and after the arrival of reinforcements of the Bavarian Duke Ludwig I, the Papal legate Pelagius made the fateful decision to march on Cairo, which led both to the complete defeat of the Crusaders in August 1221 and the end of the Fifth Crusade [44, p. 185; 66, p. 9; 21, p. 467–468; 22, p. 300–301].

It should be noted that the illusion of Latin authors about the Mongols' adherence to the Christian religion was also shared by Eastern Christians. In their letters to Pope Honorius III in 1223, the Georgian Queen Rusudan and atabeg Iwane Zak'arian emphasized that they were not prepared for the attack of the Mongols, since they thought that the Mongols were Christians [20, no. 251–252, p. 178–180; 2, XX, a. 1224 xvii–xx, p. 483–484; 34, p. 158–159]. Both letters contained exaggerated claims about the subsequent victory over the Mongols, despite the fact that in reality the Georgian troops had suffered two major defeats [18, p. 48, 50, 54–56; 43, p. 171; 35, p. 124–126; 45, p. 125; 24, p. 112; 1, p. 11; 5, p. 94–95, 98; 69, p. 64–65; 6, p. 18; 10, p. 310–311; 11, I, p. 294]. But thanks to these messages, the Roman Curia received convincing evidence refuting the previous reports about “king David”. Doubts about the veracity of these reports appear in the “Chronicle of Tours” [21, p. 467–468; 22, p. 300–301], and they are most clearly expressed in the later report on the Battle of the Kalka River in the “Chronicle” of Alberic de Trois-Fontaines containing the assumption that the Mongols could be the pagans [16, p. 911; 52, p. 148].

Probably, these doubts appear exactly after receiving of the letters from Georgia, since parallel reports of the Battle of the Kalka River written in the same year as the letters of Georgian rulers [56, p. 110–111; 17, p. 623–624], still continue to represent the Mongols in accordance with their description in the reports on “king David”, including references to the custom attributed to the Mongols to place image of the Cross on the banners of their military units [cfr. 28, p. 146].

Thus, the early Latin information about the Mongols contain relatively accurate description of the western conquests of Genghis Khan, but represent a specific explanation for the Mongol expansion, that does not correspond to historical reality. This distortion of reality requires a short explanation.

The most obvious explanation for this phenomenon are the following considerations. Firstly, the Latin authors assumed the existence of a strong Christian State in the East starting from the 12th century in connection with the spread in Europe of rumors about the realm of Prester John who defeated the “kings of Persia and Media” in the name of the Christian religion [54, p. 21–22; 36, p. 10; 42, p. 60; 71, II, p. 441, 449]. Therefore, any news of the victory of non-Muslim ruler from the East over the Islamic states was automatically matched to Prester John and consistently represented him as a Christian ruler and a potential ally of the Catholic world.

Secondly, Latin authors learned initial information about the Mongols from Nestorian sources. This remark leads to the assumption that the Nestorian authors of reports on the eastern events intentionally provided their Latin counterparts with falsified information about the Mongols, guided by the same special and unknown motives that prompted them to bring to the attention of the spiritual leaders of the Fifth Crusade the

content of “ancient” prophecies foretelling the final victory of the Christians over Muslims.

However, it should be noted that Latin authors treated with a certain criticism Nestorian information from the East. So, Jacques de Vitry treated with a certain doubt the claim of “king David’s” affinity with Prester John, despite the fact that he took for granted the prophecies that appeared before the reports on the Mongol conquests [28, p. 141, 150–152; 52, p. 147]. Latin authors might well be aware of the fact that information provided by the Nestorians did not necessarily correspond to reality. However, they took for granted that part of information that met their expectations and, therefore, was never in doubt. In particular, Jacques de Vitry, not only did not question the assertion that “king David” was a Christian ruler, but also claimed that his army consisted wholly and entirely of Christians, despite the fact that he did not insist on the affinity between David and Prester John [28, p. 141, 146]. Probably the primary Nestorian source assumed the presence of pagan warriors in the David’s army [cfr. 66, p. 58–59; 6, p. 18].

Therefore, it seems somewhat simplistic the assumption that Latin authors perceived the Mongols as the Christian army of Prester John automatically and only on the grounds that the Mongols waged war against the Muslim rulers. So, Jacques de Vitry’s letter does not contain a hint of condemnation of the Mongols for the attack on the Christian Georgians [28, p. 147]. And more importantly, Jacques de Vitry represents the Mongol conquests in the East as logical consequence of the Crusaders’ military actions in Egypt. According to Jacques de Vitry, the Mongols moved westward after they had learned about the beginning of the Western crusade. Essentially, Jacques de Vitry perceived the Mongol expansion as part of the Fifth Crusade.

Thus, Latin authors took for granted information about the “deeds of king David” precisely because the Mongol conquests coincided with the Fifth Crusade. The advance of “Eastern Christians” meet the expectations of their Western co-religionists since it corresponded to the Crusade ideology. And we should seek an explanation for the early Latin perception of Mongol expansion exactly in the ideology of the Fifth Crusade.

The Fifth Crusade was generated by the tireless work of Pope Innocent III, who, however, sought to present the organization of the military campaign in the Middle East as a reflection of religious expectations of the whole Catholic world. Therefore, a formal decision about the beginning of the crusade was made at the IV Lateran Council, held in Rome between 11th and 30th November 1215 in the presence of the main part of the European prelates. The Council was attended by around 400 archbishops and bishops, 800 abbots, and a variety of theologians, heads of the cathedral chapter, and the religious orders, as well as representatives of the principal secular rulers of Europe. The IV Lateran Council can rightly be called the first truly universal council of the

Catholic world. Thus, the decision to begin a crusade taken unanimously at the Council, may be regarded as a reflection of the religious aspirations of the entire Latin world [13, p. 537; 48, p. 421; 44, p. 41–42].

In contrast to previous councils, Innocent III's innovation was an absolute identification of moral reform of the Catholic community with the implementation of the crusade. In his inaugural speech on the opening of the Council, the Pope emphasized that the main purpose of its convocation was a collective celebration of three kinds of Easter that is of biblical exoduses. According to the Pope, the bulk of the Western prelates assembled at the Council to celebrate the Easter of eternity in anticipation of the inclusive entry of Christianity in the era of the eternal salvation predicted in the Holy Scriptures. Next, Innocent III indicated the need of the preliminary secular Exodus symbolizing the future military campaign in the Middle East. However, this Exodus should be preceded by Spiritual Easter embodied in the Church reform [65, p. 129, 133, 146; 44, p. 16, 41–42].

Already in his encyclical *Vineam Domini* sent in 1213 to the future participants of the Council, the Pope emphasized the need for the Church reform for more effective implementation of the crusade. However, more important in this encyclical was the Papal consideration of the crusade as the most effective tool to implement the moral reform of Christian society. Innocent III emphasized that participation in the proposed Middle Eastern campaign represented the most effective way to achieve eternal salvation to any member of the Catholic community. It was for this reason that in his parallel encyclical *Quia maior* the Pope addressed appeal for an immediate change in their moral lifestyle to all potential participants of the crusade [65, p. 129, 133, 146; 38, p. 136–137; 61, p. 133; 64, p. 120; 48, p. 443; 44, p. 19].

Crusade no longer was perceived as an exclusively military campaign, but as one of the most important functions and responsibilities of the Catholic Church for the salvation of the Christian community. In parallel with mobilization of material resources for the organization of Middle Eastern campaign, the Council made a decision to total moral mobilization of the entire Christian community [48, p. 443; 50, p. 255; 44, p. 63].

In turn, the total moral mobilization of the Catholic community presupposed the immediate termination of military conflicts in Europe. This issue was discussed in a separate canon of the Lateran Council both containing the order to comply with universal peace in Europe for 4 years since the proclamation of the crusade's beginning and reinforced by the threat of excommunication and the use of military force against all violators of this regulation [38, p. 143; 48, p. 445; 44, p. 47, 68].

Despite the fact that this order of the Council did not have a decisive influence on the political situation in Europe, its consequence was the mass assumption of the Cross among the middle layer of European nobility. The pacification program pursued by Apostolic See proposed to medieval nobility an alternative model of behavior that allowed them to

apply their military capabilities in the Middle East in the service of a higher ideal of Christianity. It is important to note that most of the Crusader troops participating in the subsequent military operations in Egypt, went on a crusade from Europe after the conclusion of truce with their Christian political opponents. In many cases both the warring parties went to the Middle East at the same time, literally moving from the European battlefield in the Egyptian. The elevated number of priests participating in the Fifth Crusade served the purpose of deterring armed conflict within the Crusader camp. However, in their descriptions of the Middle Eastern campaign, religious leaders represented European army as forces of the penitent Christians, who for the first time came to an agreement for the sake of a higher purpose [15, p. 52; 44, p. 74–75, 77, 115, 128; 63, p. 110–111].

There is no reason to question this perception of Latin chroniclers of the Fifth Crusade, as the western army, which launched the Middle Eastern campaign after the death of Innocent III, had a really international structure. Since the military operations in Palestine conducted both by the Hungarian crusaders headed by King Andrew II and additional Austrian contingents of Duke Leopold VI, brought no special results by the end of 1217, the leadership of the Christian army decided to move the war into Egypt after the arrival in the Middle East of significant reinforcements from Germany and the Netherlands in the Spring 1218 [37, p. 92, 168; 44, p. 117, 123, 137; 62, p. 388, 390–393]. In May of the same year, the Crusaders laid siege to Damietta with significant success thanks to the additional reinforcements from Burgundy arrived in the summer 1218. In the Autumn 1218, the army of the Crusaders replenished due to the arrival to Egypt of new troops from England, France, and Italy [15, p. 52; 37, p. 92–93, 168; 44, p. 117, 137, 144–145]. In parallel with the capture of Damietta on 5th November, 1219, the fresh Italian troops replaced a number of German and French crusaders returned home [37, p. 92–93; 44, p. 117, 175; 62, p. 411]. In the Summer 1220, significant reinforcements arrived in Damietta from Northern Italy, headed by the Archbishop of Milan, Matthew, and in the Autumn of the same year, the Italian contingents were significantly augmented by Crusaders from Puglia [44, p. 76–77, 117, 169, 177]. Since May 1221, the Crusaders became more active thanks to arrival in Egypt of the Bavarian Duke Ludwig I accompanied by 500 German knights. And in the Autumn of the same year, the Italian and German reinforcements arrived in Egypt, which, however, were no longer able to take part in military operations in connection with the signing of a 10-year truce with the sultan of Egypt [15, p. 62, 74; 4, p. 125, nota 2; 37, p. 93–94; 44, p. 76–77, 117, 184–185, 190]. Summarizing, we can say that the Fifth Crusade was attended by contingents from almost all regions of the Latin world.

It should be noted that the Roman Curia made several attempts to involve in the crusade the Eastern Christians as well. If negotiations in 1214

between the papal legate Pelagius and the Nicene emperor Theodore I Lascaris did not yield tangible results in connection with the Pelagius' requirement of recognizing the Church Union with Rome [15, p. 13; 44, p. 26, 115], then negotiations with the Georgian king Giorgi IV Lasha led to the conclusion of a military alliance in 1220 and the emergence of a hope among the Crusaders in the coming Georgian campaign against the Sultanate of Damascus [72; 65, p. 154–155; 53, p. 53–54; 26, p. 244; 6, p. 18; 71, III, p. 31]. Not less optimistic were the reports of Jacques de Vitry and Oliver of Paderborn about their preaching of Church Union and Crusade among the Middle Eastern Christians [4, p. 108; 32, p. 38–39; 8, p. 26; 33, p. 72–73; 53, p. 36; 25, p. 348–349; 12, p. 294]. The success of both preachers among the local Monophysites was reflected in the appearance of confidence on numerical superiority of the Asian Christians over Muslims and their desire to contribute by military means to the Crusade. In particular, Jacques de Vitry conjectured the existence of a strong Christian army in the former territory of Prester John, which was ready to come to the aid of their Western co-religionists [54, p. 29; 31, p. 21; 30, p. 95; 53, p. 8; 6, p. 21; 12, p. 109–110; 58, p. 14].

This confidence in the intention of the Eastern Christians to participate in the universal military enterprise was a natural consequence of the V Crusade's ideology that assumed the unity of all the adherents of the Christian religion for the implementation of the most effective military campaign against Muslims. In turn, having received information of the approach of the Christian army of "king David", the Latin authors did not express doubts about its authenticity, since this information was entirely consistent with their expectations.

REFERENCES

1. Allsen T.T. Mongols and North Caucasia. *Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi*. Vol. 7. Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz Verlag, 1987–1991, pp. 5–40.
2. *Annales ecclesiastici Caesaris Baronii*. 37 Vols. Raynaldus O., Laderchii J., Theiner A. (eds.). Barri-Ducis: L. Guerin, 1864–1883.
3. *Annales monastici*. Vol. III. *Annales de Prioratus Dunstaplia (1–1297)*; *Annales monasterii de Bermundseia (1042–1432)*. Luard H.R. (ed.). London, Longman, Roberts, and Green, 1866. 492 p.
4. Barber M., Bate K. *Letters from the East. Crusaders, Pilgrims and Settlers in the 12th–13th centuries*. Farnham, UK; Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publ., 2010. 188 p.
5. Bedrosian R. *The Turco-Mongol Invasions and the Lords of Armenia in the 13th–14th centuries*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Columbia University, New York, 1979. 312 p.
6. Bezzola G.A. *Die Mongolen in abendländischer Sicht (1220–1270): ein Beitrag zur Frage der Völkerbegegnungen*. Bern, Francke Verlag, 1974. 251 p.

7. Biran M. "Like a Mighty Wall": The Armies of the Qara Khitai. *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam*. Vol. 25. Jerusalem: Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Institute of Asian and African Studies, 2001, pp. 44–91.

8. Bird J.L. Crusade and Conversion after the Fourth Lateran Council (1215): Oliver of Paderborn and James of Vitry's Missions to Muslims Reconsidered. *Essays in Medieval Studies*. Vol. 21/1. Chicago: Illinois Medieval Association; Morgantown, WV: West Virginia University Publ., 2005, pp. 23–47.

9. Bosworth C.E. The Political and Dynastic History of the Iranian World (A.D. 1000–1217). *The Cambridge History of Iran*. Vol. 5. *The Saljuq and Mongol Periods*. Boyle J.A. (ed.). Cambridge, Cambridge University Publ., 1968, pp. 1–202.

10. Boyle J.A. Dynastic and Political History of the Il-Khans. *The Cambridge History of Iran*. Vol. 5. *The Saljuq and Mongol Periods*. Boyle J.A. (ed.). Cambridge, Cambridge University Publ., 1968, pp. 303–421.

11. Bretschneider E. *Mediaeval Researches from Eastern Asiatic Sources: Fragments towards the Knowledge of the Geography and History of Central and Western Asia from the 13th to the 17th century*. 2 Vols. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1967.

12. Brincken A.-D. von den. *Die "Nationes Christianorum orientaliū" im Verständnis der lateinischen Historiographie von der Mitte des 12. bis in die zweite Hälfte des 14. Jahrhunderts*. Köln, Wien: Böhlau Verlag, 1973. 551 p.

13. Burns J. Fullness of Power? Popes, Bishops and the Polity of the Church, 1215–1517. *The Medieval World*. Linehan P., Nelson J.L. (eds.). London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 2001, pp. 534–556.

14. Burns R.I. Christian-Islamic Confrontation in the West: The Thirteenth-Century Dream of Conversion. *The American Historical Review*. Vol. 76/5. Washington, American Historical Association; Chicago, University of Chicago Press; London, Oxford University Publ., 1971, pp. 1386–1434.

15. Claverie P.-V. *Honorius III et l'Orient (1216–1227). Étude et publication de sources inédites des Archives vaticanes (ASV)*. Leiden, the Netherlands; Boston, MA: Brill Academic Publishers, 2013. 502 p.

16. *Chronica Albrici monachi Trium Fontium, a monaco Novi Monasterii Hoiensis interpolata*. Scheffer-Boichorst P. (ed.). *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores*. Vol. XXIII. Hannover: Bey den Brüdern Hahn, 1874, pp. 631–950.

17. *Continuatio Claustroneoburgensis secunda*. Wattenbach W. (ed.) *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores*. Vol. IX. Hannover: Bey den Brüdern Hahn, 1851, pp. 613–624.

18. Dashdondog B. The Mongol Conquerors in Armenia. *Caucasus during the Mongol Period – Der Kaukasus in der Mongolenzeit*. Tübach J., Vashalomidze S.G., Zimmer M. (eds.). Wiesbaden, Reichert Verlag, 2012, pp. 53–82.

19. Eckhart J.G. von. *Corpus historicum Medii Aevi, sive scriptores res in orbe universo, praecipue in Germania, a temporibus Maxime Caroli M. Imperatoris usque ad finem seculi post C.N. XV. gestas enarrantes aut illustrantes*. 2 Vols. Lipsiae: apud Johann Gottlieb Gleditsch, 1723.

20. *Epistolae saeculi XIII e regestis pontificum romanorum selectae*. Bd. I. Pertz G.H., Rodenberg K. (eds.). Berolini, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, 1883. 786 p.

21. Ex Chronico S. Martini Turonensi. Holder-Egger O. (ed.). *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores*. Vol. XXVI. Hannover, Bey den Brüdern Hahn, 1882, pp. 458–476.

22. Ex Chronico Turonensi, auctore anonymo, S. Martini Turon. Canonico. *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France*. Tome XVIII. *Contenant la seconde livraison des monumens des règnes de Philippe-Auguste et de Louis VIII, depuis l'an MCLXXX jusqu'en MCCXXVII*. Brial M.-J.-J., Baquoy P.-Ch., Monsiau N.-A., Arthus-Bertrand C. (eds.). Paris: de l'Imprimerie royale, 1822, pp. 290–320.

23. Giles J.A. *Incerti scriptoris narratio de rebus in bello sancto gestis a.D. 1217–1218*. Londini, D. Nutt, 1846. 79 p.

24. Göckenjan H. Frühe Nachrichten über Zentralasien und die Seidenstrassen in der "Relatio de Davide rege". *Ural-Altäische Jahrbucher. Internationale Zeitschrift für uralische und altaische Forschung. Neue Folge*. Band 8. Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz, 1988, pp. 99–124.

25. Hamilton B. *The Latin Church in the Crusader States. The Secular Church*. London, Variorum Publications LTD, 1980. 409 p.

26. Hamilton B. Continental Drift: Prester John's Progress through the Indies. *Prester John, the Mongols and the Ten Lost Tribes*. Beckingham Ch.F., Hamilton B. (eds.). Aldershot, UK; Burlington, VT: Ashgate/Variorum, 1996, pp. 237–269.

27. Hoogeweg H. *Die Schriften des Kölner Domscholasters, späteren Bischofs von Paderborn und Kardinal-Bischofs von S. Sabina, Oliverus*. Tübingen, Litterarischer Verein in Stuttgart, 1894. 352 p.

28. Huygens R.B.C. *Lettres de Jacques de Vitry (1160/1170 – 1240) évêque de Saint-Jean-d'Acre*. Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill Academic Publishers, 1960. 166 p.

29. Jackson P. Prester John Redivivus: A Review Article. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*. Vol. 3. Cambridge, UK, Cambridge University Press, 1997, pp. 425–432.

30. Jackson P. Christians, Barbarians and Monsters: The European Discovery of the World beyond Islam. *The Medieval World*. Linehan P., Nelson J.L. (eds.). London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 2001, pp. 93–110.

31. Jackson P. *The Mongols and the West, 1221–1410*. Harlow, UK, Pearson Longman Publishing, 2005. 414 p.

32. Jacques de Vitry. *Histoire orientale = Historia Orientalis*. Donnadiou J. (ed.). Turnhout, Belgium, Brepols Publishers, 2008. 547 p.

33. Jacques de Vitry. *Lettres de la Cinquième Croisade, texte latin établi par R.B.C. Huygens*. Duchet-Suchaux G. (ed.). Turnhout, Belgium, Brepols Publishers, 1998. 229 p.

34. Klopprogge A. *Ursprung und Ausprägung des abendländischen Mongolenbildes im 13. Jahrhundert: ein Versuch zur Ideengeschichte des Mittelalters*. Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz Verlag, 1993. 277 p.

35. Lane G. *Daily Life in the Mongol Empire*. Indianapolis, Ind., Hackett, 2009. 312 p.

36. Larner J. *Marco Polo and the Discovery of the World*. New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 1999. 250 p.

37. Lock P. *The Routledge Companion to the Crusades*. London, Routledge, 2006. 527 p.

38. Mastnak T. *Crusading Peace: Christendom, the Muslim World, and Western Political Order*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002. 406 p.
39. May T. *The Mongol Art of War. Chinggis Khan and the Mongol Military System*. Yardley, Westholm, 2007. 214 p.
40. Morgan D.O. Prester John and the Mongols. *Prester John, the Mongols and the Ten Lost Tribes*. Beckingham Ch.F., Hamilton B. (eds.). Aldershot, UK; Burlington, VT: Ashgate/Variorum, 1996, pp. 159–170.
41. Pelliot P. Deux passages de Le prophétie de Hannan, fils d'Isaac. *Prester John, the Mongols and the Ten Lost Tribes*. Beckingham Ch.F., Hamilton B. (eds.). Aldershot, UK; Burlington, VT: Ashgate/Variorum, 1996, pp. 113–137.
42. Phillips J.R.S. *The Medieval Expansion of Europe*. Oxford, New York, Oxford University Press, 1988. 303 p.
43. Pogossian Z. Armenians, Mongols and the End of Times: An Overview of 13th Century Sources. *Caucasus during the Mongol Period – Der Kaukasus in der Mongolenzeit*. Tübach J., Vashalomidze S.G., Zimmer M. (eds.). Wiesbaden, Reichert Verlag, 2012, pp. 169–198.
44. Powell J.A. *Anatomy of a Crusade, 1213–1221*. Philadelphia, PA, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986. 287 p.
45. Pubblici L. *Dal Caucaso al Mar d'Azov. L'impatto dell'invasione mongola in Caucasia fra nomadismo e società sedentaria (1204–1295)*. Firenze, Firenze University Publ., 2007. 254 p.
46. Rachewiltz I. de. *Papal Envoys to the Great Khan*. London, Faber & Faber, 1971. 230 p.
47. Rachewiltz I. de. *The Secret History of the Mongols. A Mongolian Epic Chronicle of the Thirteenth Century*. 2 Vols. Leiden, the Netherlands, Brill Academic Publ., 2004.
48. *Readings in Medieval History*. Geary P.J. (ed.). Peterborough, Ont.: Broadview Press, 1997. 801 p.
49. Richard J. L'Extrême Orient légendaire au Moyen Âge: Roi David et Prêtre Jean. *Annales d'Éthiopie*. Vol. 2. Paris, Centre Français d'Études Éthiopiennes, 1957, pp. 225–244.
50. Richard J. 1187, point de départ pour une nouvelle forme de la croisade. *The Horns of Hattin. Proceedings of the Second Conference of the Society for the Study of the Crusades, Jerusalem-Haifa, 2–6 July 1987*. Kedar B.Z. (ed.). Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, Israel Exploration Society, 1992, pp. 250–260.
51. Richard J. *Histoire des croisades*. Paris, Librairie Arthème Fayard, 1996. 544 p.
52. Richard J. The Relatio de Davide as a Source for Mongol History and the Legend of Prester John. *Prester John, the Mongols, and the Ten Lost Tribes*. Beckingham Ch.F., Hamilton B. (eds.). Aldershot, UK; Burlington, VT: Ashgate/Variorum, 1996, pp. 139–158.
53. Richard J. *La Papauté et les missions d'Orient au Moyen Age (XIII^e–XV^e siècles)*. Rome, École Française de Rome, 1998. 331 p.
54. Richard J. *Au-delà de la Perse et de l'Arménie. L'Orient latin et la découverte de l'Asie intérieure. Quelques textes inégalement connus aux origines de l'alliance entre Francs et Mongols, 1145–1262*. Turnhout, Belgium, Brepols Publishers, 2005. 218 p.
55. Roux J.-P. *Histoire de l'empire Mongol*. Paris, Librairie Arthème Fayard, 1993. 597 p.

56. *Ryccardi se Sancto Germano notarii Chronica*. Garufi C.A. (ed.). *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*. Vol. VII/2. Bologna, Nicola Zanichelli, 1938. 312 p.
57. Sinor D. Western Information on the Kitans and Some Related Questions. *Journal of the American Oriental Society*. Vol. 115/2. New Haven, American Oriental Society, 1995, pp. 262–269.
58. Soranzo G. *Il Papato, l'Europa cristiana e i Tartari*. Milano: Vita e pensiero, Pubblicazioni Dell'Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, 1930. 624 p.
59. Southern R.W. *Western Views of Islam in the Middle Ages*. Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Publ., 1962. 114 p.
60. Tvaradze A. Der Westfeldzug von 1219–1221: Die “Mongolenerwartung” im Kreuzfahrerlager von Damiette und im christlichen Kaukasus. *Caucasus during the Mongol Period – Der Kaukasus in der Mongolenzeit*. Tübach J., Vashalomidze S.G., Zimmer M. (eds.). Wiesbaden, Reichert Verlag, 2012, pp. 251–307.
61. Tyerman C. What the Crusades meant to Europe. *The Medieval World*. Linehan P., Nelson J.L. (eds.). London, New York, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 2001, pp. 131–145.
62. Van Cleve T.C. The Fifth Crusade. *A History of the Crusades*. Vol. II. *The Later Crusades, 1189–1311*. Setton K.M., Wolff R.L., Hazard H.W. (eds.). Madison, Wisc., University of Wisconsin Press, 1969, pp. 376–428.
63. Van Cleve T.C. *The Emperor Frederick II of Hohenstaufen: immutator mundi*. Oxford, Oxford University Publ., 1972. 607 p.
64. Watt J.A. The Papacy. *The New Cambridge Medieval History*. Vol. V. *c.1198–c.1300*. Abulafia D. (ed.). Cambridge, England, Cambridge University Publ., 1999, pp. 107–163.
65. Whalen B.E. *Dominion of God: Christendom and Apocalypse in the Middle Ages*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Publ., 2009. 328 p.
66. Zarncke F. Der Priester Johannes. *Abhandlungen der Philologisch-Historischen Classe der Königlich Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*. Bd. 8/1. Leipzig, S. Hirzel, 1876.
67. Zarncke F. Zur Sage vom Priester Johannes. *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für Ältere Deutsche Geschichtekunde zur Beförderung einer Gesamtausgabe der Quellenschriften deutscher Geschichten des Mittelalters*. Bd. 2. Berlin, Weidmann, 1877, pp. 611–615.
68. Bartol'd V.V. *Sochineniya v 9 tomakh* [Selected Works in 9 volumes]. Moscow, Nauka Publ., 1963–1977.
69. Bunyatov Z.M. *Gosudarstvo Atabekov Azerbaydzhana: 1136–1225 gody* [The State of Atabegs of Azerbaijan: 1136–1225]. Baku, Elm Publ., 1978. 136 p.
70. Bunyatov Z.M. *Izbrannye sochineniya v 3-kh tomakh*. Tom 3. *Gosudarstvo khorezmshakhov-anushteginidov: 1097–1231 gg.* [Selected Works in 3 volumes. Vol. 3. The State of Khwarezmshahs-Anushteginids: 1097–1231] Agaeva E.R. et al. (ed.). Baku, Elm Publ., 1999. 376 p.
71. Hennig R. *Nevedomye zemli* [Terrae Incognitae]. Vol 1–4. Krasnokutskaya E.K., Raykhshteyn A.D. (ed.). Moscow, Vostochnaya literatura Publ., 1961.
72. Kazaryan O. *Krestonostsy i Gruzija (XII–XIII vv.)* [The Crusaders and Georgia (12th–13th centuries)]. *Deusvult.ru*. 2011. Available at: <http://deusvult.ru/66-krestonostsy-i-gruziya.html>

About the author: Roman Hautala – Senior Research Fellow, Usmanov Center for Research on the Golden Horde and Tatar Khanates, Sh.Marjani Institute of History Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Tatarstan; Postdoctoral researcher, Historical branch at the Faculty of Humanities, University of Oulu, Ph.D. (History) (420014, Kremlin, entrance 5, Kazan, Russian Federation; 90014, Pentti Kaiteran st., 1, Oulu, Finland); virisequisque@hotmail.com

ПЕРВЫЕ ЛАТИНСКИЕ ИЗВЕСТИЯ О МОНГОЛАХ 1221 ГОДА: ПРИЧИНЫ ИСКАЖЕНИЯ РЕАЛЬНОСТИ

Роман Хаутала

*(Институт истории им. Ш. Марджани
Академии наук Республики Татарстан)*

(Университет Оулу, Финляндия)

Первые упоминания монголов в латинских источниках появляются в 1221 году. В представлении авторов этих источников, армия монголов, осуществившая ряд завоеваний в Средней Азии, Персии и Закавказье, состояла из крещенных кочевников и возглавлялась неким Давидом, «царем Индий», главным стремлением которого было прийти на помощь христианам Ближнего Востока и «освободить» Иерусалим от мусульманского правления. Несомненно, под свершениями «царя Давида» латинские источники понимали первую западную кампанию монголов во главе с Чингиз-ханом, которая началась в 1219 году и была направлена против среднеазиатского султаната Хорезма. К моменту написания упомянутых латинских источников, войска Чингиз-хана завоевали хорезмийские территории в Средней Азии и приступили к военным действиям в Хорасане; тогда как отдельные подразделения монголов во главе с Джебе и Субедеем вторглись в Закавказье и нанесли первое серьезное поражение христианской Грузии.

Несмотря на то, что более поздние ориентальные источники указывают на определенное присутствие крещенных кочевников в армии монголов; на данный момент доподлинно известно, что основная часть кочевников армии Чингиз-хана не придерживалась христианской религии, а подразделения монголов во главе с Джебе и Субедеем были направлены Чингиз-ханом на запад в погоню за бывшим хорезмийским султаном Мухаммадом, а не для «освобождения» Иерусалима или предоставления какой-либо ощутимой поддержки ближневосточным христианам.

Таким образом, ранние латинские сведения о монголах содержат сравнительно точное описание западных завоеваний Чингиз-хана, но представляют специфичное объяснение причин монгольской экспансии, которое не соответствует исторической действительности.

Настоящая статья представляет собой попытку объяснения этого искажения действительности. В первой части статьи автор приводит короткое описание латинских источников, содержащих сведения о наступлении на запад «царя Давида». Во второй части автор пытается найти объяснение

искажению исторической действительности в латинских источниках, рассматривая сведения этих источников в идеологическом контексте V Крестового похода.

Ключевые слова: идеология крестовых походов, V Крестовый поход, хорезмийская кампания Чингиз-хана, несторианские документы, латинские источники.

Сведения об авторе: Роман Хаутала – старший научный сотрудник Центра исследований Золотой Орды и татарских ханств им. М.А. Усманова Института истории им. Ш. Марджани АН РТ; исследователь на историческом отделении гуманитарного факультета Университета Оулу, Ph.D. (история) (420014, Кремль, подъезд 5, Казань, Российская Федерация; 90014, ул. Пентти Кайтера, д. 1, Оулу, Финляндия); virisequisque@hotmail.com