LEABHARLANN CHOLÁISTE NA TRÍONÓIDE, BAILE ÁTHA CLIATH
Ollscoil Átha Cliath
TRINITY COLLEGE LIBRARY DUBLIN
The University of Dublin

Terms and Conditions of Use of Digitised Theses from Trinity College Library Dublin

Copyright statement

All material supplied by Trinity College Library is protected by copyright (under the Copyright and Related Rights Act, 2000 as amended) and other relevant Intellectual Property Rights. By accessing and using a Digitised Thesis from Trinity College Library you acknowledge that all Intellectual Property Rights in any Works supplied are the sole and exclusive property of the copyright and/or other IPR holder. Specific copyright holders may not be explicitly identified. Use of materials from other sources within a thesis should not be construed as a claim over them.

A non-exclusive, non-transferable licence is hereby granted to those using or reproducing, in whole or in part, the material for valid purposes, providing the copyright owners are acknowledged using the normal conventions. Where specific permission to use material is required, this is identified and such permission must be sought from the copyright holder or agency cited.

Liability statement

By using a Digitised Thesis, I accept that Trinity College Dublin bears no legal responsibility for the accuracy, legality or comprehensiveness of materials contained within the thesis, and that Trinity College Dublin accepts no liability for indirect, consequential, or incidental, damages or losses arising from use of the thesis for whatever reason. Information located in a thesis may be subject to specific use constraints, details of which may not be explicitly described. It is the responsibility of potential and actual users to be aware of such constraints and to abide by them. By making use of material from a digitised thesis, you accept these copyright and disclaimer provisions. Where it is brought to the attention of Trinity College Library that there may be a breach of copyright or other restraint, it is the policy to withdraw or take down access to a thesis while the issue is being resolved.

Access Agreement

By using a Digitised Thesis from Trinity College Library you are bound by the following Terms & Conditions. Please read them carefully.

I have read and I understand the following statement: All material supplied via a Digitised Thesis from Trinity College Library is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, and duplication or sale of all or part of any of a thesis is not permitted, except that material may be duplicated by you for your research use or for educational purposes in electronic or print form providing the copyright owners are acknowledged using the normal conventions. You must obtain permission for any other use. Electronic or print copies may not be offered, whether for sale or otherwise to anyone. This copy has been supplied on the understanding that it is copyright material and that no quotation from the thesis may be published without proper acknowledgement.

The language of *ordo* in the early histories of the First Crusade

Trinity College Library
Dublin

University of Dublin
THIS THESIS MAY BE READ ONLY IN THE
LIBRARY

The language of *ordo* in the early histories of the First Crusade.

A Dissertation for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

2005

Conor Kostick
Trinity College Dublin

TRINITY COLLEGE
12 MAY 2006
LIBRARY DUBLIN
THESIS
7868

Declaration

I declare this dissertation has not been submitted as an exercise for a degree at this or any other University.

I declare that it is entirely my own work.

I agree that the Library may lend or copy the thesis upon request. This permission covers only single copies made for study purposes, subject to normal conditions of acknowledgement.

Conor Kostick

5-12-05

Summary

Part One of this dissertation is a close examination of the social vocabulary of early crusading histories, namely those of the anonymous author of the *Gesta Francorum* c.1099 (pp. 8 – 9), Raymond of Aguilers c.1099, (p. 32), Fulcher of Chartres, begun 1101, (p. 54), Albert of Aachen, first redaction 1102, (p. 76), Baldric of Dol, c. 1107 – 1111, (p. 109), Robert the Monk, c. 1106 (pp. 128 – 9), Guibert of Nogent, 1109, (p.148). This study also includes the *Chronicon* of William of Tyre, begun 1167, redrafted 1184, (p. 174), which although a much later work, allows us to see how a sophisticated intellectual of the second half of the twelfth century understood his predecessors and therefore sheds light on the intended meaning of the earlier works.

The major findings of Part One are the new insights that this study gives to the work of particular authors. In particular, it reveals for the first time the social schema of those writers who enriched the eyewitness accounts of the First Crusade with their clarifications, changing the relatively sparse vocabulary of the *Gesta Francorum* and the histories of Raymond of Aguilers and Fulcher of Chartres for more sophisticated formulations. Baldric of Dol is shown to have been overwhelmingly concerned to emphasise the *concordia* that existed between rich and poor among the Christian forces (p. 118). By contrast Albert of Aachen, now understood as being a closer witness to events than hitherto has been appreciated, was well aware of the tensions that existed between the rich and poor, suggesting that among his informants were those who had been present on the People's Crusade and those who were in a position to provide information about the perspective of the *pauperes* on events such as the abandonment of the expedition by those *proceres* who fled from Antioch (p. 347). Albert is shown to have been acutely aware of social differentiation and used the terms *ordo*, *gradus*, *manus* and *status* to express his sense of social hierarchy (p. 79). Guibert of Nogent had much less interest in the point of view of the poor, but his familiarity with classical literature gave him a rich vocabulary with which to elaborate on the incidents depicted in his *fons formalis* the *Gesta Francorum*. This dissertation reveals Guibert as an author who advanced the social concepts of his day, particularly in his differentiation of the class of *principes* to draw attention to the existence of a large layer of *mediocres principes* (p. 169). By a careful treatment of the exact social language through which the early crusading sources were explaining events, a rich texture of the layers of social classes within the First Crusade has been discerned. Several of these authors for example, but most especially Robert the Monk, wrote about the actions of the hitherto unnoticed band of bachelor knights, the *iuvenes* (pp. 141 – 2). Finally Part One uses the later work of William of Tyre as a control on the material presented in the other sources, helping to confirm an understanding of how the

terms for social classes were being applied by the earlier sources. This dissertation also shows William of Tyre to have recovered the sociological concept of *classis* meaning 'class' from the works of Livy and advanced it by using it in his own history (pp. 175 – 7).

The material and understanding gathered from Part One allows for a reassessment of the narrative of events of the First Crusade. Part Two of this dissertation offers four studies that synthesise the understanding and material gained in Part One in four significant areas. Women are shown to have been present in hitherto unsuspected numbers on the First Crusade and it is shown here for the first time that the evidence of the sources points to their being present not as camp followers but as participants, pilgrims (Chapter II.4). There exists an important debate on the nature of knighthood in the early twelfth century. Were the terms *milites* and *equites* used simply for those functioning as mounted soldiers or did they convey a sense of social status, of nobility? This dissertation enters into the debate by showing that in main the early crusading sources did treat *milites* and *equites* as nobles, but that this status was a precarious one, subject to change (Chapter II.2). There have been several previous attempts to understand the role of the *pauperes* in the First Crusade, but as none of them are based on a clear understanding of how the terms *inferiores, ignobiles, parvi, minores, egeni, vulgus, rustici,* and *pauperes* were used by the sources, they are somewhat unsatisfactory. This dissertation offers the first complete study of the role of the lower social orders in the First Crusade (Chapter II.1). It offers original insights into the political perspective of the poor and how that was given expression through the emergence of popular visionaries, especially in the emergence of Peter Bartholomew as their most influential spokesperson (pp. 211 – 22). This study shows that the poor were decisive in forcing the expedition on to Jerusalem and demonstrates that the poor had asserted themselves on the question of captured property to such an extent that by the fall of Jerusalem (15 July 1099) they had established an *ius*, a law, that guaranteed them possession of the property that they seized (pp. 234 – 5). Perhaps the most original contribution of this dissertation to an understanding of the First Crusade is the discovery that the sources depict the existence of a distinct body of bachelor knights, the *iuvenes*. *Iuvenes* can easily be overlooked as the term was very often simply a reference to age, but the *iuventus* are revealed by the methodology employed in Part One, namely a detailed and precise dissection of the language of these sources, to be a distinct category of knights. The important role played by these knights in the events of the First Crusade is described here for the first time (Chapter II.3).

Contents

Abbreviations 1
Introduction 5

Part I.

I.1 The *Gesta Francorum* and Peter Tudebode 6
I.2 Raymond of Aguilers 31
I.3 Fulcher of Chartres 53
I.4 Albert of Aachen 75
I.5 Baldric of Dol 109
I.6 Robert the Monk 128
I.7 Guibert of Nogent 147
I.8 William of Tyre 174

Part II.

II.1 *Pauperes* in the First Crusade 190
II.2 The terms *milites*, *equites* and *equestres* in the early crusading histories 238
II.3 *Iuvenes* in the First Crusade 257
II.4 Women and the First Crusade 277

Conclusion 289

Bibliography 292

Abbreviations

AA	Albert of Aachen, *Historia Iherosolimitana,* ed. S. B. Edgington (unpublished PhD. thesis: University of London, 1991).
AC	Anna Comnena, *The Alexiad*, trans. E. R. A. Sewter (Middlesex, 1979).
BD	Baldric of Dol, *Historia Hierosolymitana, RHC Oc.* 4, 1 – 111.
CA	*La Chanson d'Antioche*, ed. S. Duparc-Quioc, 2 (Paris, 1977).
CC	*Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis.*
EA	Ekkehard of Aura, 'Chronica', *Frutolfs und Ekkehards Chroniken und die Anonyme Kaiserchronik*, ed. F-J Schmale and I. Schmale-Ott (Darmstadt, 1972).
FC	Fulcher of Chartres, *Historia Hierosolymitana (1095 – 1127)*, ed. H. Hagenmeyer (Heidelberg, 1913).
GF	*Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitan*orum, ed. R. Hill (London, 1962).
GN	Guibert of Nogent, *Gesta Dei per Francos*, ed. R. B. C. Huygens, *CC* LXXVIIa, (Turnhout, 1996).
GP	Gilo of Paris and a second, anonymous author, *Historia Vie Hierosolimitane*, ed. C. W. Grocock and J. E. Siberry (Oxford, 1997).
MGH SS	*Monumenta Germaniae Historica Scriptores*, *Scriptores* in Folio, 32 (1826 – 1934).
OV	Orderic Vitalis, *The Ecclesiastical History*, ed. and trans. M. Chibnall, 6 (Oxford, 1969 - 79).
PL	J. P. Migne ed., *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Latina* (1844 – 66).
PT	Peter Tudebode, *Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere*, ed. J. H. Hill and L. L. Hill (Paris, 1977).
RA	Raymond of Aguilers, *Historia Francorum qui ceperunt Iherusalem*, ed. John France (unpublished PhD. thesis: University of Nottingham, 1967).
RC	Ralf of Caen, *Gesta Tancredi*, *RHC Oc.* 3, 587 – 716.
RHC Oc.	*Recueil des historiens des croisades*, *Historiens occidentaux* 1 – 5 (Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres: Paris 1841 – 95).
RM	Robert the Monk, *Historia Iherosolimitana*, *RHC Oc.* 3, 717 – 882.
WT	William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, ed. R. B. C. Huygens, *CC* 63 (Turnhout, 1986).

Introduction

This dissertation is a study of the internal social structure of the First Crusade (1096 – 1099), from prince to pauper. It is the kind of study that is a 'lost cause' according to Marcus Bull, since the 'poor' are seldom more than a shadowy presence in the dynamics of a crusade.[1] In the case of the First Crusade, however, the internal social dynamics are discernible to a surprising degree. This is both because the tension between the senior princes and the lower social orders became so great that open mutiny took place and also because the sources for the First Crusade are sufficiently rich as to allow an insight into the interaction of the various social orders within the Christian forces.

One immediate stumbling block to such an investigation is the fact that in the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries the language of social structure was neither sophisticated nor uniform. One of the most important sources for the First Crusade, the anonymous *Gesta Francorum*, for example, very rarely indicated internal differentiation within the Christian forces, preferring simply to write in the first person plural, with 'we' standing for the entire expedition. The other early crusading authors employed a variety of social schemas and adopted terms to suit their purposes, such that the same term could have a very different social content depending not only on regional differences but on whether they were consciously emulating the classics or the Bible. Raymond of Aguilers was raised to the priesthood during the course of the First Crusade and his language and social schema was very strongly shaped by the Bible. For him the term *pauperes* could shift in meaning from a social category, 'the poor,' into a theological term for the entire expedition, portraying the Christian forces as underdogs, casting down mighty pagan princes through divine assistance.[2] Guibert, abbot of Nogent, by contrast, had a relatively sophisticated education and a familiarity with the works of Ovid, Virgil and Cicero. He enjoyed writing texts that engaged with the educated reader, inviting them to recognise subtle references and implied meanings. In Guibert's hands the *Gesta Francorum* was reworked into a history full of rich social texture, with a complex, classically influenced social vocabulary, as well as a strong aristocratic sense of social *ordo*.

The existence of a wide variety of nuance of meaning among the early crusading sources has led even the most distinguished of modern historians astray. Jonathan Riley-Smith, for example, has argued that the Christian forces of the First Crusade 'can be divided into three classes, the *principes* or *maiores*, the *minores* or *mediocres* and the *plebs* or

---

[1] M. Bull and N. Housley ed., *The Experience of Crusading 1: Western Approaches* (Cambridge, 2003), p. 18.
[2] See below p. 36 - 8.

populus.'[3] He defined *minores* as the 'great lords, castellans and petty knights' beneath the ranks of the senior princes.[4] But there is no evidence for the use of *minores* in this sense; in fact all the early crusading sources used the term for the lower social order, often, as in the *Gesta Francorum*, by coupling the term with *maiores* to indicate the entirety of society.[5] Nor do the other terms used to dissect the social structure of the First Crusade by Riley-Smith fit his purpose. *Mediocres* has a limited and specialised use in the sources, not for those knights below the rank of the senior princes but for footsoldiers or for the lowest social orders.[6] Furthermore *plebs* and *populus* were used to indicate the entire body of Christian forces, not a subgroup unless qualified by an appropriate adjective.[7] If Riley-Smith's intention was to indicate the lower social orders by these terms, then more appropriate would have been *vulgus*, *pauperes, egeni,* or *minores*, to mention only the more frequently used contemporary terms.

A certain methodology is forced upon the historian who wishes to examine the social dynamics of the First Crusade. A preliminary investigation has to be made to understand the language of the sources. In what manner are the key terms being used? How fixed are they? Do they echo classical or biblical language? To what extent can they be trusted as labels for specific social classes? This dissertation is therefore divided into two parts: the first, an examination of the social vocabulary of the early crusading historians; the second, four essays integrating the information provided in Part One into discussions of the role of the poor, the *milites*, *iuvenes* and women.

This methodology also determines the sources to be examined. Shorter chronicles, letters and charters are unsuited to an analysis of their philosophical and theological standpoint. Verse sources present the problem that their vocabulary is constantly subordinated to metre. Therefore the more substantial early narrative histories of the First Crusade form the subject matter of this dissertation. Naturally this includes the eyewitness accounts of the *Gesta Francorum*, Raymond of Aguilers's *Historia Francorum* and Fulcher of Chartres's *Historia Hierosolymitana*. Albert of Aachen's extremely well informed *Historia Iherosolimitana* is another work that must come under analysis. The three reworkings of the *Gesta Francorum* by northern French monks around the year 1108 are also significant for a study of this kind. Modern historians have tended to neglect the *Historia Hierosolymitana* of Baldric of Dol, the *Historia Iherosolimitana* of Robert the Monk, and (to a lesser extent) the *Gesta Dei per Francos* of Guibert of Nogent. This is because the eyewitness has to be preferred over the later works, especially given that the rewriting sometimes distorted

---

[3] J. Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading* (London, 1986), p. 74.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 76.
[5] See below pp. 11 - 2.
[6] See below pp. 148 – 9, 158 – 9, 175.
[7] See below pp. 42 – 2, 60 – 1, 86 – 8, 114 – 17, 134 – 5, 157 – 8, 180 -1.

historical information as the authors strove to provide edifying examples for their readers. But for the social historian such reworkings are something of a treasure trove, for, at the very least, they indicate how a French monk of the time understood the *Gesta Francorum*. So, for example, the crusading army at Antioch won a victory against a sortie from the city (6 March 1098), soon after which the *Gesta Francorum* reported that 'we' went to where the citizens had buried their dead, dug them up and cut their heads off.[8] Robert the Monk's version of this incident, instead of using the vague term *nostri*, indicated it was the *iuvenes* of the Christian army who did this.[9]

The discovery of a distinct group of knights, the *iuvenes*, playing a role as the 'shock-troops' of the First Crusade, is the most striking proof of the value of this methodology. As the raw material of the social language of the early crusading sources has been sifted, hitherto unnoticed social groupings have come to light. Since the term *iuvenes* so often simply stands for 'youths' in twelfth century material it has not come to the attention of historians of the First Crusade. But around 1100 in France the term was also beginning to be used in a technical sense, for those knights, probably, but not necessarily, young, who had yet to establish their own households and did not have children.[10] These knights played a particular role in the First Crusade, being to the fore in all the major military actions and being a body who were insistent that the expedition make for Jerusalem.[11] It is primarily through the three monastic elaborations on the terse account of the *Gesta Francorum* that these *iuvenes* have become visible, although Raymond of Aguilers and Albert of Aachen provide important corroborative evidence for their presence.

Another theme that emerged during the research and analysis for Part One concerns the question of how the sources understood the term *milites*. A key question, not only for this study, but for medieval historians of this period generally, is whether the sources mean by a *miles* a 'knight' or simply a 'mounted soldier.' Again the northern French historians who used the *Gesta Francorum* as their *fons formalis* are extremely valuable here, for them the *milites* of the *Gesta Francorum* were 'knights'. A related theme, that of the loss of status of the *miles* due to the loss of his horse, shows that at the same time as they considered the position of a *miles* to be one with a certain social status, they also believed it possible for such a status to be lost and, indeed, regained.[12]

The final work to be treated in Part One of this dissertation is the *Chronicon* of William of Tyre. The *Chronicon* was commissioned by King Amalric of Jerusalem in 1167 and took its final form after redrafting by William in 1184, shortly before his death. His

---

[8] GF 42.
[9] RM 788.
[10] See below p. 257.
[11] See below Chapter II.3.
[12] See below Chapter II.2.

account of the First Crusade was written, therefore, considerably after the events it was describing. Modern historians are cautious about invoking William as an authority for the First Crusade, although it is accepted that the *Chronicon* does contain information from written sources that have since been lost.[13] William was a careful and highly educated scholar; born in Jerusalem, he spent twenty years among the leading intellectuals of France and Italy and, after pursuing an avid interest in the liberal arts, devoted himself to civil law and the teachings of the masters at Bologna.[14] As someone with a sophisticated schema of social hierarchy, it is often very illuminating to see how he understood the social terminology of his sources. In this respect he provides a very interesting control over the material of the earlier historians. For that reason the *Chronicon* is one of the works examined in this study.

The analysis of each of these eight early crusading histories takes up more than half the dissertation. This is because not only is such an analysis necessary in order to obtain the data from which to reconstruct an account of the social dynamics of the First Crusade, but also because such an analysis is an end in itself. These histories are key texts in the study of the crusades and it is hoped that a study that offers as precise an understanding as possible of the various social terms that they employed will be of some enduring value to historians in the field.

---

[13] See below pp. 77 - 9.
[14] WT 19.2 (879 – 80).

I.1. The *Gesta Francorum*

The text

The *Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum* is the most studied and influential account of the First Crusade. It was the version of events that had the greatest impact in its day and it formed the basis of most of the subsequent twelfth century histories of the First Crusade. The first published edition was in 1611, by Jacques Bongars; Phillipe La Bas prepared the edition that in 1866 was used in the great French collection of crusading sources, the *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades*; Heinrich Hagenmeyer prepared an edition in 1890 with a significant apparatus; a popular edition was published in 1924 edited by B. A. Lees and based upon the edition by Bongars; also in 1924 Louis Bréhier brought out an edition with a new apparatus of notes. The most recent modern edition is that of Rosalind Hill (1962), which was issued with an accompanying English translation. It is Hill's edition that is used for this discussion.[1]

The author of the *Gesta Francorum* is unknown, leading to considerable discussion over the centuries as to his background. There is no doubting that the emphasis of the author was slanted towards the activities of Bohemond I of Taranto and a strong consensus has been reached that the author travelled from Italy as far as Antioch in the contingent of Bohemond.[2] There is far more colour in the description of how Bohemond's contingent was formed and its subsequent journey than for the equivalent, cursory, accounts of the armies of the expedition led by Hugh the Great, count of Vermandois, Count Raymond IV of Toulouse or Duke Godfrey IV of Bouillon.[3] As Rosalind Hill has pointed out, the author knew the names of many of the individual knights of Bohemond's following, but not even the correct titles of the other senior princes, let alone their followers.[4] The exact status of the anonymous author, however, is difficult to determine. Bréhier initially proposed seeing the author as a cleric

---

[1] J. Bongars, *Gesta Dei per Francos* (Hanover, 1611); *RHC Oc.* 3, 121 – 63; *Anonymi Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum*, ed. H. Hagenmeyer (Heidelberg, 1890); *Anonymi Gesta Francorum*, ed. B. A. Lees (Oxford, 1924); *Histoire Anonyme de la première Croisade* ed. L. Bréhier (Paris, 1924); *Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum* ed. R. Hill (Oxford, 1962), hereafter GF.

[2] For Bohemond I of Taranto see R. B. Yewdale, *Bohemond I, Prince of Antioch* (New York, 1924).

[3] For these princes see M. Bull, 'The Capetian monarchy and the early crusade movement: Hugh of Vermandois and Louis VII', *Nottingham Medieval Studies* 50 (1996), pp. 25-46; J. Hill and L. Hill, *Raymond IV, Count of Toulouse* (Syracuse, 1962); J. C. Andressohn, *The Ancestry and Life of Godfrey of Bouillon* (Bloomington, 1947).

[4] GF xi-xii. Although titles at this time had considerable fluidity, see I. S. Robinson, 'Eine unbekannte Streitschrift über die Salevamento von Exkommuniziesten im Münchener Kodex lat. 618', *Studi Gregoriani* 11 (1978), p. 311 n. 30.

taking down the story from a knight. Hagenmeyer argued in favour of seeing the author as a literate knight, which is a view that has found favour with subsequent historians, including Hill. But Colin Morris has sounded a note of caution in regard to the characterisation of the author as a simple knight, with an analysis that went further than that of Bréhier in drawing attention to the clerical elements of the work.[5] In resolving this issue there are inevitably great difficulties. What would be the difference in language between a knight dictating to a cleric who helped shape the material[6] and a literate knight with a 'half-conscious' memory of the phrases he had heard in church?[7] Do the rare moments when the author reveals a sophisticated grammar definitely indicate he was a cleric,[8] or someone who had once trained for the clergy but subsequently become a knight?

Insofar as this thesis sheds any light on the identity of the author of the *Gesta Francorum*, it is inclined not to see him as a cleric. Although knights were generally not literate around 1100, it was not particularly rare for a younger son of a knightly family to begin clerical training, only to be brought back into secular life due to a change in circumstance for the family, such as the death of an older son. From Guibert of Nogent's *Gesta Dei Per Francos* comes an example of an otherwise unknown crusader, Alberic of Normandy, nobly born, who was sent to school early, became a cleric but out of a love for warfare defected from the clergy.[9] Guibert himself declined the offer from his mother of arms and equipment to change profession to that of a knight.[10] In his discussion of the authorship of the *Gesta Francorum*, Bernard Hamilton drew attention to the example of a very prominent crusading knight who had in his youth been clerically trained, Baldwin of Boulogne, later King Baldwin I of Jerusalem.[11] According to William of Tyre, Baldwin, the youngest of the three sons of Eustace II, count of Boulogne and Ida of Bouillon, trained for the priesthood but left the clergy to become a *miles*.[12] Albert of Aachen described him as a *vir litteris eruditus*.[13] Further evidence that the ability to write a history of contemporary events was not confined to the clergy comes from the author of the *Gesta Francorum* himself; at one point he observed that so much had happened that no *clericus* or *laicus* could possibly hope to write it all

---

[5] First in a footnote, C. Morris, 'Policy and Visions – The case of the Holy Lance at Antioch', *War and Government in the Middle Ages*, ed. J. Gillingham and J. C. Holt (Woodbridge, 1984), pp. 33-45, here p. 36 n. 12, then expanded in C. Morris, 'The *Gesta Francorum* as narrative history', *Reading Medieval Studies*, 19 (1993), pp. 55 – 71.
[6] *Histoire Anonyme de la première Croisade*, ed. L. Bréhier, v-viii.
[7] GF xiv.
[8] C. Morris, 'The *Gesta Francorum*', p. 66, referring to GF 59-60.
[9] GN 5.xv: *Et postmodum a clero apostatice ac turpiter, militiae amore, desciverat.*
[10] Guibert of Nogent, *Monodiae*, I.6.
[11] B. Hamilton, *Religion in the Medieval West* (London, 1986), p. 108.
[12] WT 10.1 (453).
[13] AA 591. For the early career of Baldwin of Boulogne see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem* (Oxford, 2000), pp. 30 – 36.

down.[14] Given there were members of the laity at the time, and specifically knights, who were capable of writing a work such as the *Gesta Francorum*, the most likely solution to the question of authorship does seem to be to attribute it to a literate knight. Certainly the social vocabulary and concerns of the author are quite different from those of all the other early crusading historians, including those who were heavily dependent on the *Gesta Francorum*, all of whom were clerics. The attention of the author of the *Gesta* Francorum is almost entirely fixed on the activities of the *seniores* and *milites*. While the lower social groupings get a handful of mentions each, the *milites* have over a hundred. The social concerns of the author are not particularly for the poor, although he is aware of the hardships they face, but insofar as the author refers to an internal differentiation among the Christian forces (which is uncommon) much more attention is given to the *milites*, for example, in noting the loss of status of a *miles* through the death of his mount.[15]

There is a consensus among scholars that the *Gesta Francorum* was completed shortly after the last event that it described, the victory of the Christian forces near Ascalon against al-Afdal, vizier of Egypt (12 August 1099). Bréhier thought that two passages in the work indicated that the expedition was not complete at the time that they were written, indicating that the text as we have it is the result of more than one redaction.[16] Hill further suggests that the first nine of its ten books were composed before the author left Antioch in November 1099.[17] There is no explicit evidence in the work to support this insight, which Hill leaves unsupported in her introduction, but the structure of the work makes it plausible. The first nine books have roughly even amounts of material and finish coherently with the surrender of the citadel of Antioch, following the victory over Kerbogha that makes for the highpoint of the work. The tenth book is considerably longer and can be seen as a large addendum, written at a later date, that brings the story up to the battle of Ascalon. Morris has noted that the way the *Gesta Francorum* deals with the matter of the discovery of the Holy Lance becomes more comprehensible if it is considered to be a work of two sections. Otherwise the passages of unqualified praise and acceptance of the legitimacy of the lance do not fit well with the relic's later loss of favour.[18] Another pertinent observation of Morris with regard to the bipartite structure of the work is that the epithet *dominus* is applied regularly to Bohemond in the first nine books but not at all in the tenth.[19]

---

[14] GF 44.
[15] See below pp. 14, 17.
[16] *Histoire Anonyme de la première Croisade*, ed. L. Bréhier, p. ix, referring to GF 21 and 35.
[17] GF ix.
[18] C. Morris, 'Policy and Visions', p. 37, n. 14, referring to GF 59 – 60. For a full discussion of the Holy Lance see below pp. 211 - 15.
[19] C. Morris, 'The *Gesta Francorum*', p. 66.

One common argument for a *terminus ad quem* by which the existence of the *Gesta Francorum* had to have existed has arisen from the testimony of the chronicler, Ekkehard, later abbot of Aura, who in 1101 made the pilgrimage to Jerusalem where he came across a *libellus*.[20] This has often been taken as a reference to the *Gesta Francorum* and thus as giving a date by which the work must have been completed.[21] But this is not an entirely safe assumption; Raymond of Aguilers's *Historia Francorum* was available at around the same time[22] and Peter Knoch's detective work has raised the possibility that at least one other earlier crusading history was available in the region.[23] There is no reason to doubt that the version of the *Gesta Francorum* as we have it today had been written by 1101 but hard evidence is lacking. The earliest manuscript is Vaticanus Reginensis latinus 572, written and punctuated 'in a bold round hand of the early twelfth century.'[24] Two historical events can be used to suggest a very early date for the completion of the *Gesta Francorum*, albeit with the risk that always attends an argument based on an absence of material rather than on more positive evidence. On 18 July 1100, Duke Godfrey of Lotharingia, Advocate of the Holy Sepulchre, died, yet nowhere does the author of the *Gesta Francorum* show any awareness of his death. In particular, the description of the election of Godfrey as ruler of Jerusalem (23 July 1099) was written towards the very end of the text at which point it would have been conventional to have written an epitaph on his praiseworthy character or offer a blessing, should the writer have possessed knowledge of his death less than a year later.[25] Similarly, as Morris has observed, the author wrote of the election of Arnulf of Chocques, chaplain to Duke Robert of Normandy, to the Patriarchate of Jerusalem (1 August 1099) without any indication that this election would be considered uncanonical and Arnulf deposed in favour of Daimbert of Pisa shortly after Christmas 1099.[26]

A. C. Krey has drawn attention to the propaganda use of the *Gesta Francorum* by Bohemond while in France 1105-6 in his efforts to garner support for an expedition against Alexius I Comnenus, the Byzantine emperor, which was defeated in 1108. From this perspective Krey has argued that the text as we have it might include interpolations from

---

[20] EA 148.

[21] For example, *Histoire Anonyme de la première Croisade*, ed. L. Bréhier, viii; GF ix and xvi; *RHC Oc.* 5 (Paris, 1895), p. 21 n. b and ix; S. Runciman, *A History of the Crusades* p. 329; Fulcher of Chartres, *A History of the Expedition to Jerusalem 1095 – 1127*, F. R. Ryan trans. (Knoxville, 1969), p. 19.

[22] RA ccxxvi. See below p. 32.

[23] P. Knoch, *Studien zu Albert von Aachen* (Stuttgart, 1966), pp. 36 – 59. See also below p. 77 - 8.

[24] GF xxxviii.

[25] GF 92 – 3.

[26] C. Morris, 'The *Gesta Francorum*', p. 66, referring to GF 93. For Arnulf of Chocques, chaplain to Robert I, duke of Normandy before becoming patriarch of Jerusalem in 1099 and again from 1112 until 1115 see R. Foreville, 'Un chef de la première croisade: Arnulf Malecouronne,' *Bulletin philologique et historique du comité des travaux historiques et scientifiques* (1953 –4), pp. 377 – 90. See also B. Hamilton, *The Latin Church in the Crusader States* (London, 1980), pp. 12 – 13. For Duke Robert of Normandy see C. W. David, *Robert Curthose Duke of Normandy* (Cambridge, Mass., 1920).

around 1105 that exaggerate the importance and positive qualities of Bohemond, as well as blur the actual relationship of the expedition with Alexius.[27]

It should be recognised too, that although the narrative is written tersely, it is not designed as a piecemeal 'diary' of events but as a more complete work setting out the deeds of the expedition.[28] Rosalind Hill has observed that the *Gesta Francorum* is reminiscent of a *chanson de geste* in its formulaic refrains on the capture of plunder after battles and in the doxology introduced at the end of each section of the work.[29] Colin Morris has elaborated this idea and goes so far as to argue that, 'in a real, if limited sense, the *Gesta Francorum* is a *chanson de geste*.'[30] The clearest departure from a chronicle style is the section in which the author describes the encounter between Kerbogha, emir of Mosul, and his prophetic, pro-Christian, mother. This strange and fictional conversation would be eccentric in a chronicle style of history, but the author of the *Gesta Francorum* uses it in a very purposeful manner. That particular scene is a device to indicate the extent of Kerbogha's pride and his confidence in the size of his army, to make all the more extraordinary the victory of the Christians in battle against him.[31] The author was familiar with such poetic devices, probably from an awareness of the structure of songs in general, but possibly he was helped in the composition of these scenes by familiarity with the particular creations of the versemakers who we know were present on the expedition.[32]

As a social historian the author of the *Gesta Francorum* was extremely limited. He was generally content to describe the expedition as a whole and not comment on the internal differentiation within it. The standard point of view he adopted is that given by the first person plural, typically he wrote of how *nos* viewed a certain event, meaning the whole movement. When the author went beyond this simple designation he still tended to use terms that embraced the entirety of the Christian forces: *populus*, *peregrini*, or *milites Christi*. In large part this is because the events that were of greatest interest to the author were the major military conflicts between the Christian army and their Muslim opponents. He seems to have been reluctant to dwell on internal dissension within the movement, so, for example, his own

---

[27] A. C. Krey, 'A neglected passage in the Gesta', *The Crusades and Other Historical Essays Presented to Dana C. Munro*, ed. L. J. Paetow (New York, 1928), pp. 57 – 76; see also K. B. Wolf, 'Crusade and narrative: Bohemond and the *Gesta Francorum*', *Journal of Medieval History* 6, II (1991), pp. 207 – 216.

[28] 'Diary': S. Runciman, *A history of the Crusades* (London, 1991), p. 329; K. Leyser, 'Money and Supplies on the First Crusade,' *Communications and Power in Medieval Europe: the Gregorian Revolution and beyond*, ed. and trans. T. Reuter (London, 1994), pp. 77 – 96, here p. 81.

[29] GF xv.

[30] C. Morris, 'The *Gesta Francorum*', p. 61.

[31] See also N. Hodgson, 'The Role of Kerbogha's Mother in the *Gesta Francorum* and Selected Chronicles of the First Crusade', *Gendering the Crusades*, eds. S. B. Edgington and S. Lambert (Cardiff, 2001), pp. 163 – 176.

[32] RA 358.

move from the contingent of Bohemond to that journeying on to Jerusalem is made without any justification, or any criticism of Bohemond for not fulfilling his oath. In this regard the *Gesta Francorum* again appears to parallel a *chanson*, with its focus being on a simplified conflict between two undifferentiated blocks, Christians and pagans. Only in a few instances did the author comment on events that draw attention to the diverse social makeup of the First Crusade. Interestingly, although his vocabulary had very few terms that carried a social connotation, those he did adopt were rare ones and invariably altered by the later authors who used the *Gesta Francorum* as their *fons formalis*.

Terms denoting social orders in the Gesta Francorum

Gens minuta, minores, egeni, pauperes

The author of the *Gesta Francorum* had very little at all to say about the lower social orders. When wishing to comment on their plight he seems to have been at a loss for an appropriate term and coined a phrase, *gens minuta*, which, other than its occurrences in Peter Tudebode's direct borrowings, does not occur in any other early crusading history, nor indeed, in the entire collection of writings in the *Patrologia Latina*. He wrote that because of the hardship of the siege of Antioch, around February 1098, the *gens minuta et pauperrima* fled to Cyprus, Rum and the mountains.[33] When Raymond Pilet attempted prematurely to lead an expedition against Ma'arat-an-Numan an-Nu'man in July 1098, Ridwan of Aleppo threw him back, in large part because Raymond's forces had a great number of poor and local Christians unused to combat. Of this incident, the author of the *Gesta Francorum* wrote that the *gens minuta* were seized by extreme terror.[34] The phrase *gens minuta* is a vague one. From the example of those who accompanied Raymond Pilet out of Antioch in July 1098 it seems to be used to describe footsoldiers, probably of the less well equipped sort, unattached to any following. But the *gens minuta et pauperrima* who abandoned the hardship of the siege of Antioch is more likely to be a reference to the entire lower social orders, fighters and non-combatants.

The author of the *Gesta Francorum* had recourse to *minores*, another vague term for the lower social orders, on three occasions. In each case *minores* was used in juxtaposition to *maiores* to form a couplet indicating a totality of people. In this regard there is a possible biblical reminiscence, although the phrase *maiores et minores* was something of a commonplace.[35] In reporting a speech of Bohemond to the other princes, during the siege of Antioch, shortly before the city fell (3 June 1099), the Norman prince was described as

---

[33] GF 35.
[34] GF 74.
[35] I Chronicles 24:31: *tam maiores quam minores*. See below pp. 25 – 6, 59, 82, 116, 177.

drawing attention to the great poverty of all, *maiores siue minores*.[36] The anonymous author had Kerbogha, atabeg of Mosul, boast that he had more emirs in his army than there were Christians, *sive maiores sive minores*.[37] Thirdly, all non-Christian inhabitants of al-Bara, *maiores et minores*, were slaughtered when the town fell to Count Raymond of Toulouse in October 1098.[38] The phrase *maiores et minores* acted as an indicator of the presence of a basic bipartite division between rich and poor, but sheds no light on their distinct qualities.

The issue of supplying the crusading army as it gathered, first at Constantinople and then at the siege of Nicea (April 1097 to its surrender 19 June 1097), prompted the author of the *Gesta Francorum* to write more observantly about the poor. He recorded the promise of Alexius I Comnenus, the Byzantine emperor, to give alms to the *pauperes* in the contingent of Duke Godfrey to keep them alive after they had departed Constantinople (4 April 1097).[39] In summing up the siege of Nicea and the sense of frustration that the sacrifices of the expedition had not been properly rewarded, the anonymous author pointed out that many of the *pauperrima gens* had in fact starved to death.[40] Immediately afterwards he nevertheless acknowledged that, exceedingly pleased with the fall of the city, Alexius ordered alms to be distributed bountifully to *nostri pauperes*.[41]

After this cluster of usages in writing about the siege of Nicea and its aftermath, the term *pauper* appeared only three times more in the entire work. Two of these instances were cases where the term *pauperes* was used as an adjective that seems to have been used to describe poor combatants rather than 'the poor'. The author described a scene where Kerbogha's complacency grew from having been brought a rusty sword, a bad bow and a useless spear, recently stolen from the *pauperes peregrini*.[42] This incident was not intended to identify a social group but to show Kerbogha, gloating hubristically and prematurely over the superiority of his forces to those of the Christians. When the castellan Achard of Montmerle left the siege of Jerusalem to contact six Christian vessels that had arrived at Jaffa on 17 June 1099, he was intercepted by some Arab soldiers and killed. According to the report of the *Gesta Francorum* Achard died along with the *pauperes homines pedites*.[43] In this case, the only such formulation, the most likely meaning is that these were footsoldiers who were distinguished, perhaps, by poverty relative to the condition of better off footsoldiers in the

---

[36] GF 44.
[37] GF 53.
[38] GF 75.
[39] GF 7.
[40] GF 17.
[41] GF 18. For a discussion of Karl Leyser's interpretation of the meaning of this passage see below pp. 203 - 4.
[42] GF 51.
[43] GF 89. For Achard of Montmerle see J. Riley – Smith, *The First Crusaders, 1095 – 1131* (Cambridge, 1997), p. 197.

main body of the Christian forces for whom the author consistently used the term *pedites* without qualification.[44]

The final use of *pauperes* by the author of the *Gesta Francorum* is the most critical and important one. This was the epitaph to Bishop Adhémar of Le Puy on the death of the legate at Antioch (1 August 1098). 'Because [Adhémar] was the helper of the *pauperes*, the counsel of the rich and he ordered the clergy; he preached to and summoned the *milites*, saying this: None of you can be saved unless he does honour to the *pauperes* and assists them; you cannot be saved without them, and they cannot live without you.'[45] Karl Leyser has noted that Adhémar's speech reflected the contemporary orthodoxy of the tripartite division of society.[46] This is a valuable observation, but it applies with even greater force to the preceding description of the legate as: *sustentamentum pauperum, consilium divitum, ipseque ordinabat clericos*. The division of rich and poor here is of course hierarchical rather than functional (working, fighting, praying) but nevertheless this passage provides evidence that the author of the *Gesta Francorum* did indeed see the expedition in tripartite terms and, by loose analogy with the orthodox understanding of the three orders, it seems that *pauperes* is being used for non-combatants. For Colin Morris this passage is a key one in indicating that the author was a cleric, since it shows an outlook that would be unlikely for a knight, particularly in its concern for the poor.[47] But the concern for the poor reported here is Adhémar's and in fact the reportage is given from the perspective of a *miles* who was remembering the bishop as someone who recalled them to their duties to the poor, which they might otherwise have neglected.

For one final consideration of the poor by the author of the *Gesta Francorum* he used the term *egeni*. *Egeni* in classical Latin is an adjective for 'needy', but it can function as a noun, 'the poor', in medieval Latin.[48] In a very interesting passage, describing an offer by the princes after the victory over Kerbogha (28 June 1098), the author of the *Gesta Francorum* wrote that the *principes* had it announced throughout Antioch that if someone *egens* wished it, the princes would make a compact (*conventio*) with them and retain them (*remanere*) with pleasure.[49] To whom was the offer being made? Clearly it was addressed to persons experiencing poverty, but did the princes, after their stunning victory, want to consolidate a

---

[44] See below pp. 14 -5.
[45] GF 74: *Quia ille erat sustentamentum pauperum, consilium divitum, ipseque ordinabat clericos, predicabat et summonebat milites, dicens quia: 'Nemo ex vobis saluari potest nisi honorificet pauperes et reficiat, vosque non potestis saluari sine illis, ipsique vivere nequent sine vobis.'* For Bishop Adhémar of Le Puy see J. A. Brundage, 'Adhémar of Puy: The Bishop and his Critics,' *Speculum* 34 (1959), pp. 201 – 212.
[46] K. Leyser, 'Money and Supplies', p. 82 n. 25. For the tripartite division of society the best discussion still remains, G. Duby, *The three orders, feudal society imagined* (Chicago, 1978).
[47] C. Morris, 'The *Gesta Francorum*', p. 66.
[48] J. F. Niermeyer, *Medival Latin Dictionary* (Leiden, 2002), I, 482.
[49] GF 72-3.

labour force or a military following? Were they appealing to non-combatants, footsoldiers, or knights? The question is discussed below in part II, where the offer can be seen in its proper context and where the reworking of this passage by Baldric of Dol suggests that it was, in fact, made to the poor, despite the language of vassalage.[50]

Pedites

The term *pedites*, the footsoldiers, generally appeared in the *Gesta Francorum* to denote a military, rather than a social, category. Several times *pedites* was coupled directly with *milites* to depict those fighting as 'knights and footsoldiers' in a bipartite division of the entire army.[51] In one of these instances, when Tancred, the Norman prince and nephew of Bohemond, and Count Eustace of Boulogne set out to receive the surrender of Nablus, at the beginning of August 1099, the variant *milites et pedones* was used.[52] This may well be a regional variation from Italy as Caffaro used *pedones* in his *Annals of Genoa* for an entry dated 1148.[53] There are very many other appearances of *pedites* indicating footsoldiers in a purely military capacity.[54] There are, however, three instances where a social content is indicated for the *pedites*. One has already been mentioned above, the *pauperes homines pedites* who were killed along with Achard of Montmerle during the siege of Jerusalem.[55] The other two are related to each other and very significant. During the march of the army through the Anatolian desert, in July 1097, the expedition experienced severe hardship, a great number of horses died, so that *multi ex nostris militibus remanserunt pedites.*[56] The author of the *Gesta Francorum* was more sensitive to the issue of a knight's demotion in status to a footsoldier than the deaths of the poor, which we know took place at this point, particularly from the account of Albert of Aachen.[57] The question of whether this passage in the *Gesta Francorum* testifies to the fact that it was possible for a 'knight' to lose social status by falling to the state of a footsoldier or whether it was simply a description of a formerly mounted soldier now marching on foot is discussed further in the light of the full range of early crusading histories in Part II.[58] Here it can be noted that the second significant passage concerning *pedites* suggests that the author of the *Gesta Francorum* was reporting the issue

---

[50] See below pp. 118, 217.
[51] GF 18-19, 21, 30, 32, 35, 40, 73, 79.
[52] GF 93. For Tancred see R. L. Nicholson, *Tancred: a study of his career and work in their relation to the First Crusade and the Establishment of the Latin States in Syria and Palestine*, (Chicago, 1940). For Eustace III, count of Boulogne see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem, A Dynastic History 1099-1125* (Oxford, 2000), p. 93.
[53] Caffaro, 'Annales Ianuenses', ed. L.T. Belgrano, *Annali Genovesi di Caffaro e de' suoi continuatori*, (Rome, 1890) I, 87.
[54] GF 19, 21, 30, 32, 35, 40, 46, 73, 79, 95.
[55] See above 12 - 3.
[56] GF 23.
[57] AA 199.
[58] See below Chapter II.2.

from the social rather than functional point of view. This passage was an account of the reply by Kerbogha to Peter the Hermit and Herluin, the ambassadors of the crusading army (27 June 1098). Kerbogha offered that if the Christians became Turks they would be given land, cities and castles so that none should remain (*remanere*) a *pedes* but all would be *milites*.[59] That Kerbogha was being portrayed as addressing the issue that first arose in the march through the desert, that of knights becoming footsoldiers, is suggested by the use of the same verb, *remanere*, in both instances. In the latter example, however, to be a *miles* was to be an owner of land, cities and castles. There is no mention of horses. Here the *miles* was a lord, not a rider or simple soldier. Together, the two passages seem to yield the highly interesting insight that a knight could lose social status by losing his mount. That this was an issue of some significance to the author of the *Gesta Francorum* is shown by the fact that he placed it at the heart of Kerbogha's offer to the Christians.

Servientes, domestici

The author of the *Gesta Francorum* has an interesting term, *servientes*, which on investigation proves to be used for those performing the same duties as a knight, but with a status that was not quite their equal. There are three usages of the term in the work. On the 5 April 1098, during the siege of Antioch, a fort was built opposite the Gate of St George and for the sum of four hundred marks Tancred took charge of it with his best *milites* and *servientes*.[60] The other two usages of the term both appear in the account of the capture of Antioch (3 June 1098). In his description of the fall of the city the anonymous author wrote that Bohemond sent for one of his *servientes*, a soldier with the nick-name of 'bad-crown', and told him to go out as a herald to summon a large force to make a diversion.[61] Once the first soldiers were on the walls of the city, they were anxious that others quickly follow. Hence, reported the *Gesta Francorum*, a certain *serviens* went back down the ladder.[62] There were several meanings for the term *serviens* at the time,[63] although historians have tended to assume that here the natural seeming 'servant' was the intended one.[64] Reports in other early crusading sources of the same two incidents for which the author of the *Gesta Francorum* used *servientes* suggest that a different meaning may have been intended. Gilo of Paris, later cardinal-bishop of Tusculum,

---

[59] GF 67. For Peter the Hermit, see J. Flori, *Pierre l'Ermite et la Première Croisade* (Paris, 1999), see also below 198 - 200.
[60] GF 43.
[61] GF 45-6. *Mala-Corona* is unknown outside of the *Gesta Francorum* and those works directly derived from it.
[62] GF 46.
[63] See J. F. Niermeyer, *Medieval Latin Dictionary*, II, 1255.
[64] For example, R. Hill, GF 46; J. Riley-Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 215; alternatively 'infantryman' in S. Runciman, *A History of the First Crusade*, p.233; 'follower' T. Asbridge, *The First Crusade* (London, 2004), p. 207.

wrote a metrical version of the *Gesta Francorum*.[65] In this work Gilo described Tancred as occupying the fort opposite the gate of St George in the company of a particular social grouping, the *iuvenes*, that is, knights in the early part of their career who had yet to establish themselves as heads of households.[66] Similarly, in the eyes of later French writers the first group of soldiers onto the walls of Antioch and therefore the *serviens* who went back down the ladder were *iuvenes*. In Robert the Monk's description of these events he wrote that the first group to ascend the city wall were sixty armed *iuvenes*.[67] Gilo, whose version of events was very close to Robert's, also described those first on to the walls as *iuvenes*.[68] Ralph of Caen, a follower of Bohemond in 1107 and of Tancred from 1108 to 1113, wrote the poetic *Gesta Tancredi in expeditione Jerosolymitana* shortly after 1113. Ralph also made the same observation independently of the tradition of the two northern French authors: that it was *iuvenes* who first climbed the walls of Antioch.[69] The fact that the *servientes* of the *Gesta Francorum* are described as performing the same actions as the *iuvenes* of these three authors raises the possibility that, around the year 1100, in the Italian contingents on the First Crusade, the term for an unestablished knight was *serviens*, which was changed by the later, French, writers to one that they were more familiar with, *iuvenis*.

By the eleventh century *domesticus* was also a term covering a wide range of social positions, from a senior member of staff of a royal household to a house servant.[70] It occurred once in the *Gesta Francorum*. When the Byzantine general, Tatikios, left the siege of Antioch, early in February 1098, the author of the *Gesta Francorum* described him as making a speech in which he promised to return, pointing out that he was leaving behind his tent and his *domestici*.[71] Here the context indicates that the term *domestici* was probably intended to be understood as referring to personal servants.

Milites

With nearly a hundred usages, *milites* was by far and away the most common term for a group of persons in the *Gesta Francorum*. This should provide sufficient material to yield a precise interpretation of the social grouping referred to by the term. Yet *milites* was such a ubiquitous a term for the anonymous author that it was used to cover a broad variation of person, ranging from unnamed soldiers fighting in their thousands to the senior princes.

---

[65] For the career of Gilo see GP xix-xxii and R. Hüls, *Kardinäle, Klerus and Kirchen Roms* (Tübingen, 1977), p. 142 - 3
[66] GP 123. For a full discussion of *iuvenes* in the First Crusade see below Chapter II.3.
[67] RM 800. See also below pp. 141 - 2 for Robert the Monk's use of *iuvenes*.
[68] GP 164-6.
[69] RC 654-5.
[70] J. Niermeyer, *Medieval Latin Dictionary*, I, 457.
[71] GF 35.

There occur in the *Gesta Francorum* very many instances of the terms *milites* and *pedites* being coupled to indicate a bipartite view of an entire fighting force, usually with the *milites* entering battle on horse.[72] One slight variation in the formula *milites et pedites* took place when the author was describing the formation of the Christian forces before the battle of Ascalon (12 August 1099), there the leaders were reported as forming up *pedites* and *sagittarii* who preceded the *milites*.[73]

Having a mount was typically part of the definition of being a *miles*. In January 1098 hardship at the siege of Antioch led, reported the *Gesta*, to a situation where it was not possible to find a thousand *milites* who had managed to keep their horses in really good condition.[74] The fact that at sieges such as Ma'arat-an-Numan the *milites* were distinguished from the *pedites*, even though they were fighting from foot, shows, however, that the term *miles* was not being used simply in the sense of a 'soldier on horseback', but did include a sense of status.[75] This is consistent with those passages discussed under *pedites* above where the loss of a horse not only changed the military function of the *miles* but altered his social status.[76]

All the specific individuals termed *miles* by the author of the *Gesta Francorum* were clearly nobles and often senior ones. The complete list is: Godfrey IV of Bouillon, duke of Lotharingia, Baldwin of Boulogne and Baldwin II of Mons, count of Hainault, together termed *potentissimi milites*;[77] Count Raymond of Toulouse, *fortissimus miles*;[78] Count Robert II of Flanders, *acerrimus miles*;[79] Godfrey of Montescaglioso and William son of the Marquis, brother of Tancred, *milites honorabiles*;[80] Peter of Alifa;[81] Kerbogha, *miles inuictus*;[82] Guy of Hauteville, brother of Tancred, *miles honestissimus*;[83] Raymond Pilet;[84] Letold of Tournai;[85] Stephen of Blois, *imprudens miles*[86] and Hugh the Great, *nobilissimus*

---

[72] GF 18-19, 21, 30, 32, 35, 40, 73, 79.
[73] GF 95.
[74] GF 34.
[75] GF 79.
[76] See above p. 14.
[77] GF 2. For Baldwin of Boulogne see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom*, Chs. 1, 2, 4; for Baldwin II of Mons, count of Hainault see *ibid.*, pp. 186 – 7.
[78] GF 20.
[79] GF 20. For Robert II Flanders see M. M. Knappen, 'Robert II of Flanders in the First Crusade,' *The Crusades and Other Historical Essays Presented to Dana C. Munro*, ed. L. J. Paetow (New York, 1928), pp. 79 – 100.
[80] GF 21. For these knights see J. Riley – Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 207 (Geoffrey of Montescaglioso); p. 225 (William Marchius).
[81] GF 25. For Peter of Alifa see J. Riley – Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 217.
[82] GF 53.
[83] GF 64. For Guy of Hauteville see J. Riley – Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 210.
[84] GF 73. For Raymond Pilet see J. Riley – Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 220.
[85] GF 91. For Letold of Tournai see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom*, p. 216.
[86] GF 65. For Stephen of Blois see J. A. Brundage, 'An Errant Crusader: Stephen of Blois', *Traditio* 16 (1960), pp. 380 – 95.

miles.[87] Although the author of the *Gesta Francorum* clearly had no difficulty in referring to the senior princes as *milites*, he invariably assigned an epithet to them, which was not always the case with the less senior knights. This observation is strengthened by the cases of *oratio recta* attributed to Bohemond, who was portrayed as addressing the council of princes as *Seniores et prudentissimi milites*;[88] *Seniores et inuictissimi milites*[89] and *Viri prudentissimi milites*.[90] Not just knights, but 'judicious' and 'invincible' knights. A similar distinction between the deaths of the two most senior casualties and the deaths from among the general body of *milites* seems to be present in the report of the Christian losses at the battle of Dorylaeum (1 July 1097). In that battle, wrote the anonymous author, there died two *milites honorabiles*, namely Godfrey of Montescaglioso and William son of the Marquis, brother of Tancred, along with some *milites* and *pedites* whose names he did not know.[91]

A common phrase in the *Gesta Francorum* is *milites Christi*.[92] Although the frequency with which the term appears tells us something about the theological framework through which the author viewed the expedition, it sheds little light on social status. For example, Bishop Adhémar was included in a grouping with Count Raymond, Godfrey of Lotharingia, and Hugh the Great that together were termed *milites Christi*.[93] It was not, therefore, a term specifically reserved for combatants of the First Crusade. The phrase *miles Christi* derives from a letter of the apostle Paul, a passage much exploited by Pope Gregory VII and by the authors of investiture polemics.[94] Other examples of the appearance of *miles Christi* in the *Gesta Francorum* include it being adopted for Tancred[95] and collectively for Bohemond, Godfrey of Lotharingina and Count Raymond of Toulouse, who together are termed *Christi milites*.[96] One of Bohemond's speeches to his colleagues began: *Seniores et fortissimi milites Christi*.[97] These examples indicate that the author of the *Gesta Francorum* considered the leadership of the First Crusade to be devoted to the idea of a Holy War, at least as they are depicted in the first nine books. For the battle with Kerbogha the entire army are described as *milites Christi*. Thereafter the term is never applied to individual knights but only for the general army of the expedition, suggesting both a certain disillusionment with the leaders and also that the work might well have been written at two distinct stages.[98] One

---

[87] GF 72.
[88] GF 34 and again 35. For *seniores* see below p. 21 - 2.
[89] GF 37.
[90] GF 44.
[91] GF 21. For Geoffrey of Montescaglioso and William Marchius see above n. 80.
[92] GF 6, 11, 18, 19, 23, 24, 70, 73, 88, 89, 96.
[93] GF 19.
[94] Paul, to Tim 2:3. For Gregory VII and *miles Christi* see C. Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, trans. M. W. Baldwin and W. Goffart (Princeton, 1977), pp. 202 – 3, 340 – 2.
[95] GF 24.
[96] GF 11.
[97] GF 18.
[98] GF 70 (against Kerbogha), 88, 89, 96. 'Two stages', see above p. 8.

interesting variation was the phrase, *Christi milites peregrini*, for Raymond Pilet's expedition of July 1098.[99] As this contingent of the Christian army was made up from previously unattached footsoldiers and knights, including the *gens minuta* discussed above, it might well be the case that the author of the *Gesta Francorum* adapted his conventional phrase to match the less princely nature of that force.[100] The other variation on *milites Christi* that appeared in the *Gesta Francorum* was the phrase, '*milites veri Dei*.'[101] This was used to describe a Christian force in battle with the garrison of Antioch (6 March 1098). The Christians suffered heavy losses due to an ambush on an expedition returning from Simeon's Port. When they had regrouped, together with reinforcements from the camp, they turned the battle around and won a major victory. The phrase, 'knights of the true God,' appeared here, not as any kind of point concerning knighthood, but to underscore the comforting thought that the author of the *Gesta Francorum* had just made, which was that those killed must surely have earned the reward of Heaven.

Two passages concerning *milites* deserve more detailed attention as they give some further information about the knightly class as described in the *Gesta Francorum*. When news of the crusade reached Bohemond, in the summer of 1096, he was engaged in the siege of Amalfi alongside his uncle, Count Roger I of Sicily.[102] The *Gesta Francorum* reported that when Bohemond declared he was joining the crusade, so many *milites* joined him that Count Roger remained behind almost alone, lamenting the loss of his forces.[103] The interesting aspect of this passage is that *milites* who were once evidently vassals of Count Roger are described as transferring their allegiance to Bohemond. The same movement of *milites* from prince to prince can be seen during the course of the First Crusade.[104] In the view of the *Gesta Francorum* it was not inappropriate for a vassal to transfer his allegiance. The author of the *Gesta Francorum* himself, if it is accepted that he was a *miles*, might be an example of this, as, having travelled to Antioch in the contingent of Bohemond, he then joined that part of the expedition that pushed on to Jerusalem. Furthermore the author of the *Gesta Francorum* seems to describe Raymond Pilet, a *miles* and vassal of Count Raymond of Toulouse, as having made a bid for a more senior status by retaining (*retinere*) many *milites* and *pedites* from those who did not want to wait five months after the fall of Antioch for the expedition to

---

[99] GF 73. For Raymond Pilet see above n. 84.
[100] GF 73. For a discussion of the term *peregrini* for in early crusading sources see C. Tyerman, *The Invention of the Crusades* (London, 1998), pp. 20 – 22.
[101] GF 40.
[102] For Count Roger I Sicily (d. 1101) see G. A. Loud, *The Age of Robert Guiscard* (Harlow, 2000) chs. 4 and 5.
[103] GF 7.
[104] See K. Leyser, 'Money and Supplies', pp. 89 – 92; see also W. G. Zajac, 'Captured property on the First Crusade', *The First* Crusade, ed. J. Phillips (Manchester 1997), pp. 153 – 180, p. 169.

continue.[105] Raymond Pilet then set out with this army. With the failure of his expedition the next appearance of Raymond Pilet in the *Gesta Francorum* showed him to be once again a member of the contingent of Count Raymond.[106] The association of the verb *retinere* with the enlistment of *milites* appeared again in the *Gesta Francorum* in al-Afdal's lament that having been defeated by a poor Christian force (the battle of Ascalon, 12 August 1099) he would never again retain (*retinere*) *milites* by compact (*conventione*).[107] Even though the statement was made by the vizier of Egypt concerning his own forces, it allows us to see the type of terminology that the author of the *Gesta* thought suitable for the recruitment of *milites* by a lord.

One final passage worth noting with regard to *milites* occurs during the course of a discussion of the fighting qualities of the Turkish knights who, wrote the anonymous author, were of Frankish extraction (*generatio Francorum*) and only they and the Franks were naturally *milites*.[108] Contained in this comment was a view that to be a *miles* was a condition that is related to birth. The content of the passage does not stretch to the implication that all *miles* were of high birth as clearly not all Franks were nobles.[109] Nevertheless the connection between *generatio* and *miles* was in the author's mind and this is of interest as a tentative step in the direction of seeing the status of a *miles* as one that is inherited.

Domini, maiores, seniores, divites, principes

In the *Gesta Francorum* the term *dominus* is overwhelmingly a term attached to Bohemond.[110] So much is this the case that Rosalind Hill chose to translate *dominus Boamundus* as 'my lord Bohemond.'[111] Certainly in all its other appearances in the *Gesta Francorum* the term does have overtones of allegiance, being used to indicate the lord *of* some group, city or person, rather than as an adjective. In the dispute between Tancred and Baldwin over the ownership of Tarsus, Tancred is reported as saying to Baldwin that the men of this city had chosen him as *dominus* over them.[112] Rainald, leader of the German fragment of the People's Crusade that was besieged in Xerigordo and eventually surrendered to the Turkish forces of the Seldjuk Sultan of Asia Minor, Kilij Arslan ibn-Suleiman (7 October 1096), was described as their *dominus*.[113] An unnamed Christian leader of the garrison of the Orontes bridge was captured by Kerbogha (5 June 1098). He was termed the *dominus* of those

---

[105] GF 73. For Raymond Pilet see n. 84.
[106] GF 83.
[107] GF 96.
[108] GF 21.
[109] See below Chapter II. 2.
[110] GF 7, 8, 9, 11, 29, 32, 33, 35, 62, 64, 71.
[111] GF xviii.
[112] GF 25.
[113] GF 4. For Rainald see J. Riley-Smith, *The First Crusaders*, p. 218.

killed there.[114] The leader of the Arab town of Masyaf, who made an agreement with count Raymond of Toulouse, 22 January 1099, was its *dominus*.[115]

There are several terms for the senior nobility in the *Gesta Francorum*, the most common of which was *nostri maiores*.[116] Other than in instances of the phrase being used for the decision making body of leaders of the First Crusade, the appearance of *maiores* mainly occurred in the couplet *maiores et minores* to refer to an entire people, as noted above.[117] The leading citizens of Tarsus who surrendered the city to Baldwin and Tancred in September 1097 were described as *maiores*.[118] One other passage contained the term *maiores* both for the crusading princes and the great nobles of Constantinople, where all the Byzantine *maiores natu* who were in Constantinople were described as meeting and agreeing that the *maiores* of the arriving armies ought to swear an oath faithfully to the emperor.[119] The phrase *maiores natu* for 'those of great birth' has a long tradition[120] and does seem well placed here to indicate the difference between the ancient inherited nobility of the Byzantine court and the senior figures of the First Crusade, among whom was Bohemond, son of the *novus homo* Robert Guiscard.[121]

In marked contrast to the other crusading sources, especially those northern French writers basing their work on the *Gesta Francorum*, the author used the term *seniores* a great deal to indicate the leading figures of the First Crusade.[122] An important example that shows *seniores* could be applied to a lord who was not one of the very greatest princes was that of the above-mentioned Rainald, leader of a German section of the People's Crusade.[123] At the other end of the social spectrum, Duke Godfrey was described as a *senior* on his arrival at Constantinople.[124] The fact that the author of the *Gesta Francorum* sometimes used the term for a social group rather than simply for military leaders is evident from a description of some notable clerical figures the day before the first battle of Ascalon (11 August 1099). Gathered together with the patriarch (Arnulf of Chocques) were bishops and other *seniores*.[125] Other than in these examples the term *seniores* appeared repeatedly as a formal mode of address, either in speech or letter, to leading nobles. Bohemond was given several speeches in the course of the *Gesta Francorum* and they usually began with the word *seniores*. So, speaking to all the *milites* before the battle of Dorylaeum (1 July 1097), he was reported as beginning:

---

[114] GF 50.
[115] GF 81.
[116] GF 12, 16, 30, 39, 40, 45, 57, 59, 63, 65, 66, 72, 75, 87.
[117] See above pp. 11 - 12.
[118] GF 24.
[119] GF 11.
[120] Niermeyer, *Medival Latin Dictionary*, II, 822.
[121] GN 137: *novus homo*. For Robert Guiscard as a *novus homo* see below pp. 162, 254.
[122] GF 25, 29, 30, 33, 37, 44, 67, 72, 75, 76, 78, 80, 81, 84, 85, 86, 88, 89, 90.
[123] GF 3 - 4. For Rainald see above n. 113.
[124] GF 18.
[125] GF 94. For Arnulf of Chocques see n. 26.

Seniores et fortissimi milites Christi.[126] Telling a council of *seniores* that he was willing to go on a foraging expedition around Christmas 1097, while the expedition was besieging Antioch, Bohemond began: *Seniores et prudentissimi milites*.[127] Bohemond again spoke to the *seniores et prudentissimi milites* at a council of leaders, (8 February 1098).[128] Before the 'Lake Battle' the next day, Bohemond addressing the other leaders began: *Seniores et invictissimi milites*.[129] Similarly when Peter the Hermit addressed Kerbogha on his embassy of 27 June 1098 he spoke of *nostri maiores et seniores*; Kerbogha replied in the same terms.[130] Stephen of Valence, the visionary priest, addressed the leaders of the expedition as *seniores*[131] and the nobles of Tarsus addressed Baldwin and Tancred as *seniores*.[132]

Divites was used only once in the *Gesta Francorum* in the eulogy to Adhémar, as part of a tri-partite division of society between clergy, rich and poor in a passage discussed above.[133]

In other works *principes* was the main term by far for the leading nobles of the First Crusade, but in the *Gesta Francorum* it is a relatively rare term, appearing only six times. The author preferred to use *seniores* and *nostri maiores*, displaying what is probably an Italian bias that contrasts with the vocabulary of the French sources. The term *principes* seems to have been used in the *Gesta Francorum* only to indicate the very uppermost figures of the expedition. When the leaders of the various crusading contingents gathered in Constantinople and argued with Count Raymond that he should take the oath to Alexius, which he did on 26 April 1097, the author described how Duke Godfrey, Robert of Flanders and other *principes* spoke to Raymond.[134] Near Antioch, shortly before battle with the relieving forces of Ridwan, emir of Aleppo, and Suqman ibn Ortuq (9 February 1098), Bohemond was described as ordering that each of the *principes* should form up their battle lines, one after the other.[135] This battle, as John France has observed, is significant in that the Christian forces for the first time agreed to have a sole commander for deployment of all the forces, Bohemond.[136] Can the other 'princes' to whom Bohemond issued his orders be determined? Stephen of Blois wrote a letter which indicated he was present at this battle[137] and Ralph of Caen, who claimed to have

---

[126] GF 18.
[127] GF 30.
[128] GF 35.
[129] GF 36.
[130] GF 66 and 67. For Peter the Hermit, see n. 59 above.
[131] GF 57 and 58. For Stephen of Valence see J. Riley – Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 223; see also below p. 20.
[132] GF 24.
[133] GF 74, see above n. 45.
[134] GF 13.
[135] GF 36.
[136] J. France, *Victory in the East. A military history of the First Crusade*. (Cambridge, 1984), p. 245.
[137] H. Hagenmeyer, *Die Kreuzzugsbriefe aus den Jahren 1088 – 1100* (Innsbruck, 1901), p. 150.

visited the site, mentioned Conan of Brittany and Duke Godfrey of Lotharingia,[138] but the sources are inconsistent as to which other senior figures were present at this battle. John France reasonably suggests that Tancred would have been present in company with Bohemond and Hugh the Great with Stephen. According to the author of the *Gesta Francorum* there were five battle lines and a reserve led by Bohemond, meaning at least one other of the senior figures was present. Given that Bishop Adhémar of Le Puy, Duke Robert of Normandy and Count Raymond of Toulouse were probably not present, the most likely suggestion would be that it was Count Robert of Flanders who was the sixth *princeps* who formed a battle line.[139] Duke Godfrey was described as *princeps* of Jerusalem on his election as ruler of the city (23 July 1099).[140] Soon afterwards, Tancred was described as sending a message to Duke Godfrey, the patriarch, and all the *principes* at Jerusalem.[141] The term *principes* was used to describe Count Raymond and Robert of Normandy on the 10 August 1099, two days before the battle at Ascalon.[142] The one other appearance of the term *principes* was for those leaders who, as discussed above, after the victory over Kerbogha (28 June 1098) and the decision to halt the expedition for five months, offered to provide gold and silver in return for the services of the active poor.[143] The fact that the term *principes* was used at this point suggests that the offer was being made by those very few senior leaders to whom the author of the *Gesta Francorum* was willing to attach the term.

The author of the *Gesta Francorum* clearly had a much more limited social vocabulary than any of the other early crusading historians. His attention to the condition of the *milites* does, however, provide particularly valuable material for a discussion of the meaning of that term as it was applied to participants of the *First Crusade*.[144]

The *Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere* of Peter Tudebode

---

[138] RC 647. For Conan of Brittany see J. Riley – Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 203.
[139] For a full discussion of this battle see J. France, *Victory in the East*, pp. 245 – 51.
[140] GF 92.
[141] GF 93.
[142] GF 94.
[143] See above pp. 13 - 14.
[144] See below chapter II.2.

The text

There has been a centuries long controversy over the status of the *Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere* of Peter Tudebode. The work is very similar indeed to the anonymous *Gesta Francorum* and the debate has been conducted about the relationship between the two. In 1641 Jean Besly produced an edition of the *Historia De Hierosolymitano Itinere* that challenged the version of the *Gesta Francorum* in Jacques Bongars's famous 1611 collection of crusading sources.[145] From the internal evidence presented in the manuscript from which he was working (now Paris, B. N. MS latin 4892), Besly argued for the primacy of the version in which the author gave his name as *Petrus Tudebodus* a *sacerdos* of Civray, approximately 50 km from Poitiers.[146] Henri Wallon and Adolphe Régnier adopted this perspective for the *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades* version edited in 1866.[147] With the appearance of Heinrich Hagenmeyer's scholarly edition of the *Gesta Francorum* in 1880 the argument was made that the relationship of the two works should be reversed and that the *Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere* should be considered the derivative work.[148]

The consensus of historians since 1880 has been to follow Hagenmeyer, with the important exception of John and Laurita Hill, the most recent editors of Peter Tudebode's text. The Hills performed valuable work in examining the key manuscripts and, largely on stylistic grounds, separating the two traditions. This allowed them to publish a modern edition of *Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere*, which is used here. However on the issue of the relationship between the *Gesta Francorum* and the *Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere* they muddied again waters that had been relatively clear by arguing in the introduction both to the Latin edition and the separately published English translation, that the *Gesta Francorum*, *Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere* and the *Historia Francorum* of Raymond of Aguilers shared a now lost common source.[149] The difficulty with this position is that the *Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere* seems indisputably to be adopting passages wholesale from the *Gesta Francorum*, unconsciously importing the perspective of the anonymous author in many instances. As John France has pointed out, the main problem with the 'missing source' theory is that it does not explain how a French priest came to adopt the term *nos* for events that are

---

[145] Peter Tudebode, *Historia de Hierosolymitano itinere*, ed. J. Besly *Historiae Francorum Scriptores*, IV, ed. A. Duchesne (Paris, 1841); J. Bongars, *Gesta Dei per Francos* (Hanover, 1611); see *Peter Tudebode, Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere* trans. J. H. Hill and L. L. Hill (Philadelphia, 1974), p. 1 – 2.

[146] *Petrus Tudebodus, Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere*, eds. J. H. Hill and L. L. Hill (Paris, 1977), hereafter PT, p. 138 n. b; see *Peter Tudebode* trans. J. H. Hill and L. L. Hill, p. 1 – 2.

[147] *RHC Oc.* 3, 3 - 117.

[148] *Anonymi Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum,* ed. H. Hagenmeyer (Heidelberg, 1890).

[149] PT 21- 24; *Peter Tudebode,* trans. J. H. Hill and L. L. Hill (Philadelphia, 1974), pp. 10 – 13.

describing the viewpoint of the Italian contingent.[150] Nor are the differences between the *Gesta Francorum* and the *Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere* of the nature that point to a missing source. They are much more simply explained as revisions by an eyewitness who also was familiar with the work of Raymond of Aguilers.

This is not to dispute the importance of Peter Tudebode as a source for the First Crusade in those matters where he does offer new material. It is clear that he was present on the First Crusade. He wrote several passages that offer new information, or slight revisions of the version of events that are described in the *Gesta Francorum*, consistent with his putting forward his own name as a participant. Indeed he listed several other individuals who were not mentioned in other sources, including two knights also with the name Tudebode.[151] This study agrees with the modern consensus as put by Susan Edgington, that 'Peter Tudebode, though a participant in the First Crusade used the *Gesta* extensively, and his work is therefore chiefly of ancillary value, adding convincing and circumstantial detail particularly about the sieges of Antioch and Jerusalem.'[152]

It is hard to distinguish Peter Tudebode as a social observer from the anonymous author of the *Gesta Francorum*. Since they both had a great amount of material in common they necessarily have the same social language. Peter Tudebode's work did, however, have some small variations worth noting and he put a different perspective on some of the passages discussed with regard to the *Gesta Francorum*. Furthermore he used two terms that are not to be found in the Gesta, *clientes* and *familiares*. His revisions and additions show a slightly greater awareness of social division within the First Crusade than does the *Gesta Francorum* itself.

Terms denoting social order in the Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere

Gens minuta, minores, pauperes

Peter Tudebode retained the two usages of the expression *gens minuta* from the *Gesta Francorum*, a term so unusual that it is not found anywhere else in the *Patrologia Latina*. This is further evidence that the *Historia De Hierosolymitano Itinere* was drawing directly on

---

[150] J. France, 'The Use of the Anonymous *Gesta Francorum* in the Early Twelfth – Century Sources for the First Crusade', *From Clermont to Jerusalem. The Crusades and Crusader Societies 1095 – 1500*, ed. A. V. Murray (Turnhout,1998), pp. 29 – 42.
[151] PT 97 and 116.
[152] S. B. Edgington, 'The First Crusade: Reviewing the Evidence', *The First Crusade, origins and impact*, ed. J. Phillips (Manchester, 1997), pp. 55 – 77, p. 56.

the *Gesta Francorum*, unless the assumption is made that the supposed missing source coined this clumsy and near unique expression for the poor.

The author of the *Gesta Francorum* used *minores* as a loose term for the lower social order on three occasions. Peter Tudebode added two more examples. When the author of the *Gesta Francorum* described the fictional incident of the boasting of Kerbogha, atabeg of Mosul, to his mother, he had the Turkish leader say that he had more emirs than the entire Christian army, *sive maiores sive minores*.[153] Peter Tudebode had Peter the Hermit use the same phrase in his embassy to Kerbogha. Where the *Gesta Francorum* reported Peter as saying: 'Our *maiores* say that you should quickly withdraw'[154] Peter Tudebode's version read: '*Nostri maiores sive minores* say that you should quickly withdraw.'[155] Then in Kerbogha's reply Peter Tudebode replaced the *Gesta Francorum*'s phrase *seniores et maiores* with *seniores et maiores sive minores*.[156] These additions, although relatively unimportant, begin to demonstrate a greater awareness of the presence of the lower social orders in Peter Tudebode's work than in the *Gesta Francorum*. This distinction between the two texts is more clearly evident in their respective use of the term *pauperes*.

In Stephen of Valence's vision of Christ at Antioch (10 June 1098), Peter Tudebode added an extra line of *oratio recta*, reporting that Christ ordered everyone to make penance, undertake a procession with bare feet through the churches and 'give alms to the *pauperes*.'[157] This is useful additional information that the visions of Stephen were giving expression to the needs of the poor.[158] Peter Tudebode made it clear that this advice was acted upon, when he altered the *Gesta Francorum*'s report that just before battle with Kerbogha (28 June 1098) 'and they gave alms' to read 'and they gave alms to the *pauperes*.'[159] In the month after the fall of Ma'arat-an-Numan (11 December 1098) the *pauperes* engaged in a form of behaviour that, in the version of events reported by Peter Tudebode, brought forth a response from the *seniores*. The *pauperes peregrini* cut open the bodies of the dead to look for coins hidden in the stomachs. They then cooked and ate scraps of flesh from the bodies. As a result, reported Peter, the *seniores* dragged the bodies outside the gates of the city, where they formed large piles that were burnt.[160] The version in the *Gesta Franorum* was blander, not distinguishing the *pauperes* as those responsible for cannibalism nor reporting the response of the *seniores*.[161]

---

[153] GF 53.
[154] GF 66: *Nostri maiores ... velociter recedatis.*
[155] PT 108: *Nostri maiores sive minores ... velociter exeatis.*
[156] PT 109 referring to GF 67.
[157] PT 100: *... pauperibus dent eleemosinas.*
[158] See below p. 211.
[159] PT 110: *Et dederunt eleemosynam pauperibus.* Referring to GF 67-8.
[160] PT 124 – 5.
[161] GF 80.

There is a slight but interesting change to the critical passage in the *Gesta Francorum* on the death of Bishop Adhémar of Le Puy at Antioch (1 August 1098). The version of the *Gesta Francorum* runs, 'because [Adhémar] was the helper of the *pauperes*, the counsel of the rich and he ordered the clergy; he preached to and summoned the *milites*, saying this: None of you can be saved unless he does honour to the *pauperes* and assists them; you cannot be saved without them, and they cannot live without you.'[162] The version in the *Historia De Hierosolymitano Itinere* has the notable difference that Adhémar was reported as saying 'none of you can be saved unless he honours and assists the *pauperes clerici*.'[163] This significantly changes the meaning of the passage. The theological message from Adhémar is not now that by the meritorious deeds of the knights towards the *pauperes* they save their own souls, but by the prayers of the clergy the souls of the knights are saved. It is a change that shifts the psychological standpoint of salvation from that of a knight to that of a cleric and it is completely in keeping with the view that the author of the *Gesta Francorum* was a knight, while Peter Tudebode was a priest. It should also be noted that the addition is clumsy and not convincing, as the new sentence no longer follows consistently with the start of the eulogy in which Adhémar is described as the helper of the *pauperes*.

Peter Tudebode wrote a description of an appearance of St Andrew to the lowly Provençal visionary Peter Bartholomew that is not in the *Gesta Francorum*. The phrasing was drawn from the account of Raymond of Aguilers although Peter Tudebode placed it in his account of the storming of Ma'arat-an-Numan (11 December 1098), while Raymond was referring to the events of March 1099. It is clear, however, from his other comments concerning the siege of Ma'arat-an-Numan, that Peter Tudebode was an eyewitness to events there, nor does the manner of his borrowing from Raymond contradict the basic message reported by both historians.[164] According to Peter Tudebode, St Andrew announced to Peter Bartholomew that the city would fall soon to the Christians if they repented of their having been evil and followed the Lord's instructions to *love your brothers as yourself* [Lev 19:34]. They were to take a tithe, which was to be divided into four parts: 'One should be given to the bishop, another to the priests, another to the churches and the other to the *pauperes*.'[165] From this and the other passages that mention the lower social order it is evident that Peter Tudebode had a greater awareness of the activities and needs of the *pauperes* than did the author of the *Gesta Francorum*.

---

[162] GF 74: *Quia ille erat sustentamentum pauperum, consilium divitum, ipseque ordinabat clericos, predicabat et summonebat milites, dicens quia: 'Nemo ex vobis saluari potest nisi honorificet pauperes et reficiat, vosque non potestis saluari sine illis, ipsique vivere nequent sine vobis.'* See above p. 13.
[163] PT 117: *Quoniam nemo ex vobis salvus fieri potest, nisi honorificet et reficiat pauperes clericos.*
[164] For the same passage in Raymond of Aguilers see RA 214 – 5.
[165] PT 122: *... una quarum detur episcopo, alia sacerdotibus, alia ecclesiis, alia pauperibus.* For Peter of Narbonne, Bishop of Albara, see J. Riley-Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 217; see below p. 223 for a discussion of this vision.

Clientes

Peter Tudebode used the term *clientes*, which was not a part of the vocabulary of the author of the *Gesta Francorum*. Elsewhere the term was used for vassals, *ministeriales* and footsoldiers.[166] Peter Tudebode seems to have used it in the latter sense. This is most clearly seen in the way in which the *Gesta Francorum* and Peter Tudebode reported Raymond Pilet's recruitment of followers at Antioch (July 1098). In the *Gesta Francorum* the description was of Raymond Pilet retaining very many men, *milites* and *pedites*.[167] The version in the *Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere* had Raymond Pilet retaining many *milites* and *clientes*.[168] Both authors used the verb *retinere* for the relationship of the lord to his new forces. In his account of the storming of Ma'arat-an-Numan Peter Tudebode added a line that is not in the *Gesta Francorum*, reporting that *milites et clientes* thus fought.[169] This is probably a reworking of the standard couplet *milites et pedites* for the fighting forces of an army. The same idea seems to be the case for the report, not in the *Gesta Francorum*, that a barefoot procession of the clergy took place around Jerusalem (8 July 1098) while the armed *milites et clientes* went ahead.[170] Similarly, when Peter Tudebode reported that a herd of animals clung to the *milites et clientes* of the Christian army at the battle of Ascalon (12 August 1099),[171] the natural reading would be to see the *clientes* as a substitute for *pedites*. The final example of *clientes* in the *Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere* arose in the description of Count Raymond of Toulouse, during the spring of 1098, retaining through an agreement *milites vel clientes* for the purpose of protecting the castle, 'Mahomeries tower', used to press the siege of Antioch.[172]

Familiares

The author of the *Gesta Francorum* did not use the term *familiares*, which in other early crusading sources was a relatively common one for the following or household of a senior prince.[173] In the one instance that Peter Tudebode used the term he gave an interesting comment concerning the following of Count Raymond of Toulouse. The Christian forces at Antioch constructed the 'Mahomeries Tower' in the spring of 1098. Peter reported that this was entrusted to Count Raymond because he had more *milites* in his *familia* than others.[174] Among those listed as guarding the *castrum* were Gaston of Béarn with his men; Viscount

---

[166] J. F. Niermeyer, *Medieval Latin Dictionary*, 1, 251. See also below pp. 63 – 5, 136, 160 - 1.
[167] GF 73. For Raymond Pilet see J. Riley – Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 220.
[168] PT 115.
[169] PT 123.
[170] PT 137.
[171] PT 145.
[172] PT 79.
[173] See below pp. 43 – 5, 65, 89 – 90, 120 –1, 136, 160, 182.
[174] PT 78.

Peter of Castillon; Viscount Raymond of Turenne; William of Montpellier; Gouffier of Lastours; Peter Raymond of Hautpoul and William of Sabran.[175] As discussed below, the information that Count Raymond's following was already substantial, even before its accretion from the followers of Bishop Adhémar of Le Puy after his death (1 August 1098), is important in understanding the later split between the Count and his *familia*.[176]

Milites

There are a few variations between the *Gesta* and the *Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere* with regard to the use of the term *milites*. Most of them are additional epithets given by Peter Tudebode. Tancred was described in the *Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere* as *prudentissimus miles*[177] and *vir prudens atque honorabilis Christi miles*.[178] Pons Raynouard was a *miles egregius*.[179] An additional epithet was given to Count Raymond of Toulouse by Peter Tudebode, that of *fortissimus miles*.[180] Robert of Anzi also gained an epithet, *honestissimus miles*.[181] Rainald Porchet was described by Peter Tudebode as a *miles nobilis*.[182] Tatikios, the leader of the Byzantine forces on the First Crusade as far as Antioch, was termed *dives nobilis miles*.[183] Arvedus Tudebode was a *probatissimus miles* and Arnald Tudebode an *optimus miles*.[184] Gouffier of Lastours gained the epithet *honestissimus miles*.[185]

Seniores, maiores, nobiles

Peter Tudebode described an incident, not in the *Gesta Francorum*, in which the knight Rainald Porchet was displayed to the Christians on the walls of Antioch by the besiegers before being executed. He was described as calling out to the Christian *seniores*, to let them know that they had killed all the *maiores* and the bolder men of the city, namely twelve emirs and 1,500 *nobiles*.[186] The new passage contains additional uses of *seniores*, *maiores* and *nobiles*, all consistent with the vocabulary of the *Gesta*. One other passage in Peter Tudebode concerning *maiores* is of interest. He reported that when trapped in Antioch

---

[175] For these knights see J. Riley – Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 206 (Gaston of Béarn); p. 217 (Peter of Castillon); p. 219 - 20 (Raymond of Turenne); p. 226 (William of Montpellier); p. 209 (Gouffier of Lastours); p. 217 (Peter Raymond of Hautpoul); p. 225 (William of Sabran).
[176] See below pp. 230 - 1.
[177] PT 41.
[178] PT 58.
[179] PT 44. For Pons Raynouard see J. Riley – Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 218.
[180] PT 53.
[181] PT 53. For Robert of Anzi see J. Riley – Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 221.
[182] PT 79. For Rainald Porchet see J. Riley – Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 219.
[183] PT 69.
[184] PT 97, 116. There are no references to Arnald Tudebode other than in the *Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere*.
[185] PT 123. For Gouffier of Lastours see J. Riley – Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 209.
[186] PT 79.

by the arrival of Kerbogha's army (7 June 1098) many of the *maiores* wished to flee from the city by night.[187]

Several times Peter Tudebode added the term *seniores* where the Gesta might have a more vague term like *alii*. None of these examples introduce new information or clarify the role of the *seniores*, other than the example under *pauperes* above, of the *seniores* being spurred to action to prevent acts of cannibalism by the poor. The fact that the French priest was comfortable in using the term means that the *Gesta*'s frequent recourse to *seniores* cannot be considered decisive proof of its uniquely Italian provenance.

Since the *Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere* of Peter Tudebode was so heavily dependent on the *Gesta Francorum* it added only a few new passages containing extra information that distinguishes between the various social orders of the First Crusade. Although the quantity is limited, the additional material is in fact relatively rich in social information and there is sufficient to discern a difference in outlook between the two authors, in particular through Peter Tudebode having shown a greater interest in the presence of the poor.

---

[187] PT 98: For a discussion of this incident see below p. 209 - 210.

I.2. Raymond of Aguilers's *Historia Francorum qui ceperunt Iherusalem*

The text

Although the *Historia Francorum* of Raymond of Aguilers is a critical text for the history of the First Crusade, it is a relatively neglected work in comparison to the other sources. Its limited popularity in the medieval period is indicated by the fact that only ten manuscripts of the history have survived. It was first published by Jacques Bongars in the collection *Gesta Dei per Francos* (1611) and edited by various authors for the version that was published in the *Recueil* series (1866). A very important modern edition with considerable critical apparatus was prepared by John France for his PhD. thesis (1967); surprisingly this thesis has not been published, perhaps because of the publication of an edition in 1969 by J. H. Hill and L. L. Hill. Nevertheless France's is used here as easily the most reliable edition.[1] The edition of 1969 is based on one manuscript, Paris, B. N. MS latin 14378. The editors seem to have been unaware of France's work, which has established that among the surviving manuscripts, MS 14378 is relatively far removed from the archetype.[2] France's edition used all ten manuscripts in a sophisticated reconstruction of the archetype.

The biographical information available concerning Raymond of Aguilers derives entirely from the text. The author was a canon of the cathedral church of St. Mary of Le Puy, in the Auvergne region of France.[3] He participated on the expedition with the Provençal contingent, probably that of Bishop Adhémar of Le Puy, the papal legate, to judge by the bias of his detail.[4] After Adhémar's death (1 August 1098), like most of the southern French participants, Raymond of Aguilers joined with Count Raymond of Toulouse. Having earlier been raised to the priesthood during the course of the expedition,[5] Raymond of Aguilers subsequently joined the chaplaincy of the count. In referring to the events of 10 June 1098,

---

[1] J. Bongars, *Gesta Dei per Francos* (Hanover, 1611); *RHC Oc.* 3, 235 –309; J. France, *A Critical Edition of the* Historia Francorum *of Raymond of Aguilers* (unpublished PhD. thesis: University of Nottingham, 1967), hereafter RA; *Le 'Liber' de Raymond d'Aguilers*, eds. J. H. Hill and L. L. Hill (Paris, 1969).
[2] RA clxiv – ccv.
[3] RA 5.
[4] RA 11 – 12, 17.
[5] RA 202.

when the visionary Peter Bartholomew first came forward, Raymond of Aguilers mentioned that he was already chaplain to Count Raymond at that time and presumably thereafter.[6]

The *Historia Francorum* was written very soon after the end of the First Crusade, some time after the battle of Ascalon (12 August 1099). As John France has pointed out, it must have been written before the end of 1101, when Count Raymond of Toulouse's participation in the Lombard and French expedition in Anatolia that summer would have contradicted a statement by the historian that the count intended to return to France.[7] The earliest writer to make use of the *Historia Francorum* was Fulcher of Chartres, which shows the work was available in Jerusalem between 1101 and 1105.[8] Through an analysis of the cross-references in the work, France has made a strong case for seeing the finished work as being based on notes or longer extracts that Raymond wrote during the course of the expedition.[9]

As a writer Raymond of Aguilers had an above average command of Latin for a priest, but no familiarity with the classics, quoting only the Bible.[10] Shaped by the traditions of pilgrimage that were the dominant feature of religious life in the Le Puy region,[11] as we shall see, Raymond's *Historia Francorum* was framed by the author's perspective that the First Crusade was an *iter Dei* and that God was working miracles through the participants of the journey.[12]

The miracles and visions that fill the account have led later historians to treat Raymond as an excessively credulous and therefore unreliable source. Paulin Paris has described Raymond of Aguilers as a sinister fanatic.[13] L. L. and J. H. Hill in their biography of Count Raymond of Toulouse and in their English translation of the *Historia Francorum* considered the historian to be extremely disingenuous, describing him as inaccurate, 'superstitious, and prejudiced.'[14] In particular they argued that the entire account of the discovery and use of the Holy Lance found at Antioch was fanciful on Raymond's part.[15] In fact they considered Raymond of Aguilers to have fabricated most of the material concerning the Lance as he 'weaves in events along with miracles to give the semblance of truth. We

---

[6] RA 100. For Peter Bartholomew see below pp. 37 – 8, 211 - 2.
[7] RA 354. See also RA cxxxviii-cxxxix.
[8] RA cxxxix.
[9] RA cxxxix – cxliii.
[10] RA xvii.
[11] RA xvi.
[12] *Itinere Dei* see RA 202; 'miracles' see RA 59.
[13] Anon., *La Chanson d'Antioche*, ed. P. Paris (Geneva, 1969) 1, xxi.
[14] Raymond d'Aguilers, *Historia Francorum Qui Ceperunt Iherusalem*, trans. J.H. Hill and L. L. Hill (Philadelphia, 1968).
[15] Raymond d'Aguilers, *Historia Francorum,* trans. J.H. Hill and L. L. Hill, p. 12.

think that he is the creator of most of the account rather than a naive reporter.'[16] This is an unbalanced viewpoint. Steven Runciman's statement that 'within his limits he was obviously sincere and well informed,'[17] is a much more accurate assessment, as the evidence of the text shows Raymond of Aguilers to be a reliable reporter of events. The historian seems to have taken to heart his avowed belief that, having been made a priest, he should speak the truth before God.[18] This honesty is shown in particular with regard to the very issue of the peasant visionary Peter Bartholomew and the Holy Lance. Raymond clearly did wish to believe in Peter Bartholomew as an authentic conduit for the messages of Christ and the apostles, but this does not seem to have led him to falsify his account of events. Raymond reported the doubts of Bishop Adhémar on the subject of the Lance;[19] he described an interview with Peter Bartholomew in which the visionary was caught out lying about his knowledge of scripture[20] and, in a convincingly candid passage, Raymond admitted that he held doubts about Peter Bartholomew and secretly desired to see the visionary take the ordeal of fire to have them resolved.[21] Raymond of Aguilers therefore was not given to invention in order to justify his view. Nor, in his own terms, would he need to, as the fall of Jerusalem to the Christians fully satisfied the historian that the participants had performed God's work so worthily that the event would be remembered in all the world to come as the day when paganism was reduced to nothing.[22]

From the point of view of an investigation of social class the theological perspective of Raymond of Aguilers is more helpful than harmful. It encouraged the historian to be attentive to the lower social orders, whom he understood to be especially meritorious in the eyes of God, precisely because of the hardship that they had to endure during the expedition.[23] The fact that the goals, desires and sentiments of the poor were seen as important by Raymond means that historians have an insight into the social tensions that existed during the expedition that would be almost indiscernible from the other sources.

Terms denoting social orders in the Historia Francorum

Servi

Slaves, the very lowest of the social hierarchy, do not seem to have accompanied their owners on the expedition in any great numbers, almost certainly because of Church

---

[16] J. H. Hill and L. L Hill, *Raymond IV Count of Toulouse*, (Syracuse, 1962), p. 109.
[17] S. Runciman, *A History of the Crusades* (third edition: London, 1991), 1, 328-9.
[18] RA 202.
[19] RA 100.
[20] RA 113 – 4.
[21] RA 256 – 7. See below p. 229.
[22] RA 348.
[23] See below p. 37.

opposition to the use of Christians as slaves and the importance of papal direction to the movement. The Christian princes on the expedition, however, had no qualms about selling pagan prisoners as slaves[24] and were not averse to making use of them, as Raymond of Aguilers indicated in one clear cut example. The compulsory labour of prisoners was used in order to bring timber to the craftsmen making siege equipment outside of Jerusalem, shortly before the storming of the city (15 July 1099).[25]

Rustici, vulgus, pauperes

Although the lower social orders on the expedition were no longer living and working on farms, their former status was reflected in the vocabulary of Raymond of Aguilers. He reported that in the winter of 1097 sorties from the city of Antioch against their besiegers killed squires and *rustici* who were pasturing horses and oxen beyond the river.[26] Writing about a foraging expedition (31 December 1097), Raymond described how Bohemond was alerted to the presence of an enemy force when he heard certain *rustici* from his men cry out.[27] John France assumes this was a passing reference to Christian infantry, although, given the purpose of the expedition, it could be that non-combatants in search of foodstuffs accompanied the fighting forces.[28] The visionary Peter Bartholomew, who came on the expedition as the servant of a knight, was described as a *pauper rusticus*.[29] This shows the historian's use of *rusticus* as a general social term for someone of a lowly background. According to Raymond, those who disbelieved Peter drew attention to this low social state, refusing to accept that God would desert *principes* and bishops to reveal Himself to a *rusticus homo*.[30] The other two examples of *rustici* in the *Historia Francorum* are for people other than the Christian forces and convey no significant social information.[31]

There are only three instances in the *Historia Francorum* in which Raymond of Aguilers used the term *vulgus*, in each case with the sense of the 'crowd of commoners'. At Antioch, shortly after the discovery of the Holy Lance (15 June 1098), the *vulgus* recovered from famine and demoralisation to accuse the *principes* of delaying battle against the forces of Kerbogha, emir of Mosul, that were besieging them.[32] Shortly before the battle of Ascalon (12 August 1099), Raymond reported that the Egyptians were being told by those who had fled from the fall of Jerusalem how few were the Christian forces and of the infirmity of the

---

[24] RA 156 – 7.
[25] RA 333.
[26] RA 36.
[27] RA 42.
[28] J. France. *Victory in the East. A military history of the First Crusade* (Cambridge, 1984), p. 237.
[29] RA 88 – 9.
[30] RA 229 – 30.
[31] RA 81, 194 – 5.
[32] RA 120.

vulgus and the horses.[33] In the latter case the term was deliberately chosen so as to emphasise just how lowly was the state of the Christian army in the eyes of the Egyptians; it cannot be therefore concluded that Raymond himself saw the term *vulgus* as appropriate for combatants. The one other appearance of the term *vulgus* in the history occurs with respect to non-Christian forces. When Raymond referred to the Muslims killed outside Tripoli early in March 1099, he noted the great numbers of bodies both of the nobles and the *vulgus*.[34]

Raymond of Aguilers's preferred term for the lower social orders on the First Crusade was *pauperes*; there are over thirty examples of his use of the term. Raymond's early usages of the term help establish the social group he was referring to. In the winter of 1096 the stragglers of the Provençal contingent became the targets of the inhabitants of Dalmatia who slaughtered the feeble old women, the *pauperes* and the sick straggling behind the army because of their infirmity.[35] Raymond reported that the Byzantine emperor, Alexius I Comnenus, promised that when Nicea was captured he would found there a Latin monastery and hospice for *pauperes Francorum*.[36] In these examples Raymond's use of *pauperes* is for people in a state of weakness, not necessarily 'the poor'. As Karl Leyser has written in an important footnote, 'discussions of the *pauperes* on the First Crusade generally assume the translation *pauper* = poor, though western European usage even at this period probably still had overtones of the sense *pauper* = defenceless.'[37] Similarly, later (January 1099), on the march through the Buqaia, the plain that connects inner Syria to the sea, Raymond wrote that certain *pauperes*, who were experiencing weakness and were lingering a long way behind the army, were killed and despoiled by Turks and Arabs.[38] Raymond also reported that the Christian army before Jerusalem had no more than twelve thousand fighters, as well as many who were infirm and *pauperes*.[39]

The term *pauperes* could, however, be used by Raymond to indicate a class of people, not simply the weak and defenceless. In his description of the famine experienced by the Christian forces as they besieged Antioch in the early days of 1098 he wrote that the *pauperes* began to leave 'and also many *divites* fearing *paupertas*.'[40] In this case the juxtaposition of *pauperes* with the *divites* makes it clear they are being considered the lower part of a basic bipartite division of the Christian forces into 'rich' and 'poor'. In another example arising from the same period of the expedition the *pauperes* were described as fearing to cross the

---

[33] RA 369.
[34] RA 262.
[35] RA 6 – 7.
[36] RA 22.
[37] K. Leyser, *Communications and Power in Medieval Europe: the Gregorian Revolution and beyond*, trans. T. Reuter, (London, 1994), p. 82 n. 26.
[38] RA 191.
[39] RA 338.
[40] RA 46*: ... et multi divites paupertatem verentes.*

Orontes to find fodder, giving a small insight into at least one of their activities.[41] Raymond singled out the *pauperes* as being most affected by the expedition being stalled at Antioch due to the discord of the princes at the end of October 1098.[42]

Raymond's next example was the first that gives an indication that the term *pauper* could carry a positive meaning in the *Historia Francorum*. Having described the victory of the Christians over the relieving forces of Ridwan, emir of Aleppo and Suqman ibn Ortuq (9 February 1098) and the similarly successful defence of the camp from a sortie by the garrison of Antioch on the same day, Raymond wrote that the ambassadors of al-Afdal, vizier of Egypt, were in the camp at the time and seeing the miracles that God performed through His servants, praised Jesus, son of the Virgin Mary 'who through His *pauperes* trampled under foot the most powerful tyrants.'[43] The use of *pauperes* here is schematic (there is an obvious echo of the Magnificat, Luke 1:52 – 3); clearly it was the fighting force of the expedition which was responsible for the miraculous victories, but Raymond was working in a framework that saw the mighty pagan powers being confronted by a Christian force which, although in appearance lowly and weak, was powerful through the assistance of God. From this theological point of view the entire movement could be considered to be one of *pauperes*.

On 6 March 1098 a sortie from Antioch that began well ended disastrously for the Turkish forces; they were thrown back and their retreat blocked by the narrowness of the bridge between them and the city. This was the occasion for Raymond of Aguilers to enjoy the sight of certain *pauperes* returning after victory. He described these *pauperes* as dashing in among the tents on Arab horses, displaying their new found wealth to their comrades, dressing themselves in robes of silk, and being strengthened with two or three new shields. He went on to say that the *pauperes*, provoked by these scenes broke into a Saracen graveyard in search of more booty.[44] These *pauperes* returning from battle, on horseback, delighted that their hardship was over and carrying shields cannot therefore have been *pauperes* as traditionally understood. The incident has to be placed in the context of the loss of mounts and status by *milites* during the hard march through the desert of Anatolia and on the narrow mountain paths south of Coxon, a development mentioned in all the sources.[45] The people depicted by Raymond must have been those *milites* who had fallen to a status that Raymond clearly understood as being that of *pauperes* through the loss of their mounts and equipment. This conclusion is strengthened by his description of those breaking into the Saracen graves as *pauperes*, since according Robert the Monk, elaborating on the *Gesta Francorum*'s brief

---

[41] RA 50.
[42] RA 163.
[43] RA 59: .. *qui, per pauperes suos, potentissimos tyrannos conculcabat.* The embassy was sent by al-Afdal, vizier of Egypt in the name of the boy Caliph, al-Mustali.
[44] RA 68-69.
[45] For a discussion of this theme see below pp. 251 - 6.

version of the same incident, those who dug up bodies in search of booty were identified as *iuvenes*, that is, knights yet to become independent heads of households.[46] In a certain context, Raymond was willing to apply the term *pauperes* even to combatants. The status of *pauperes* in this sense was a transitive one. The appearance of two such examples of this unusual use of the term shows that the choice of vocabulary was not accidental; in this sense Raymond of Aguiler's use of *pauperes* anticipates a similar use of the term by the scholar and civil servant, Peter of Blois (c. 1180), and Innocent III.[47]

For Raymond of Aguilers, *pauperes* as an adjective and *paupertas*, the state of poverty, could also, depending on the context, carry connotations of membership of the social grouping of *pauperes*. This seems to be the case in Raymond's writings about Peter Bartholomew, the lowly servant of William Peyre of Cunhlat, from the Provençal region of France.[48] As noted above, Raymond introduced Peter as, 'a certain *pauper rusticus*.'[49] He reported that when Peter explained his reason for being hesitant in approaching the princes, the visionary said that his reluctance had come about from 'recognising ... *paupertas mea*'[50] and from 'standing in fear from *paupertas mea*.'[51] Peter emphasised his own *paupertas* twice more, the second time saying to the princes that reflecting on '*paupertas mea*' led him not to want to come forward in case they believed he had made up the visions in order to obtain food.[52] In these statements are possible reminiscences from the Vulgate, where there are many references to *pauperes* and *paupertas* such as Tobias 5:25, 'for our *paupertas* was sufficient for us.'[53] Or the prophet speaking in Lamentations 3:1, 'I am the man seeing *paupertas mea* ...'[54] Ecclesiasticus 10:33 reads, 'the *pauper* is glorified by his discipline and fear,'[55] which has echoes in Peter Bartholomew's careful and avowedly fearful initial approach to the princes. In Ecclesiasticus 11:12-13, the point is made that no matter the degree to which a person is experiencing *paupertas*, they can be raised up by the eye of God, a view that is very similar to Raymond's with respect to Peter Bartholomew. Evidence that Raymond had in mind a treatment of the condition of *paupertas* that indicated it to be a state which was conducive to gaining the support of God was displayed in his report of Peter Bartholomew's vision which took place on or about 1 December 1098. Here SS. Peter and Andrew appeared, but they were not initially recognised as they were wearing misshapen clothing and were

---

[46] RM 788. See also below Chapter II.3.
[47] I. S. Robinson, *The Papacy 1073-1198 Continuity and Innovation* (Cambridge, 1990), pp. 365 - 6.
[48] For Peter Bartholomew see J. Riley-Smith, *The First Crusaders* (Cambridge, 1997) p. 216. See also below p. 211 - 2.
[49] RA 88 - 9: ... *pauperem quemdam rusticum.*
[50] RA 95: *recogitans ... paupertatis meae habitum.*
[51] RA 96: *Metuens paupertati meae.*
[52] RA 97.
[53] Tob 5:25, *Sufficiebat enim nobis paupertas nostra.*
[54] Lam 3:1, *Ego vir videns paupertatem mea.*
[55] Eccus 10:33, *Pauper gloriatur per disciplinam et timorem suam.*

dressed most sordidly, so that Peter Bartholomew thought them to simply members of the *pauperes*.[56] St Peter explained to the visionary that they appeared in this condition to make him aware that anyone who serves God devotedly obtains His assistance.[57] This vision gave an answer to the critics of Peter Bartholomew who could not believe that God would reveal himself to one so lowly.[58] Another example of Raymond seeing the *pauperes* as especially important to God arose from the deaths of six or seven people following a Saracen raid in January 1099. The corpses were found to have crosses on their right shoulders. Those who saw this gave great thanks to God, reported Raymond, for His having comforted His *pauperes*.[59]

In his reports of the visions of Peter Bartholomew, Raymond also used the term *pauperes* in a more sociological sense, one less laden with theological overtones, particularly in describing the social tensions that existed within the expedition over the distribution of plunder. The key visions are briefly summarised here but are discussed in full below in a context provided by the full range of early crusading histories.[60] St Andrew was present in a vision of 3 August 1098 and argued for a distribution of riches to the *pauperes* by diocese.[61] This method of organising sustenance for the *pauperes* was not adopted, reported Raymond and their position worsened due to conflict among the princes over the future ownership of Antioch.[62] An important vision of 1 December 1098 indicated that the *pauperes* desired reparation from those fellow Christians who had plundered from them. Furthermore a tithe was to be taken to support the *pauperes*.[63] In describing the fall of Ma'arat-an-Numan a few days later (11 December 1098), Raymond of Aguilers wrote that having stolen by night through breaches in the walls of the city, the *pauperes* obtained both the plunder and the houses of the city. In the morning when the *milites* entered the city they found little that they could take them.[64] Both the vision of 1 December and the *pauperes* being to the fore in looting the city indicate not only severe hardship being experienced by the *pauperes* but also a tension between rich and poor over the question of property. Again this is discussed in full below, but it is worth noting here that according to Raymond the *pauperes* once more grabbed plunder from under the noses of the rich at Hosn al-Akrad (28 January 1099), while Count Raymond with certain *milites* were still engaged in battle.[65]

---

[56] RA 168.
[57] RA 169.
[58] RA 229-30.
[59] RA 184.
[60] See below Chapter II.1.
[61] RA 146.
[62] RA 147.
[63] RA 77-8.
[64] RA 175.
[65] RA 195-6. For seizure of property and the *pauperes* see below pp. 226, 234 – 7.

Raymond of Aguilers again described a bipartite division for the expedition, between *milites* and *pauperes*, when he reported the recovery of the expedition following the arrival of provisions from the Emir of Shaizar in January 1099.[66] A more sophisticated division of the army, again related to provisioning, was depicted in Raymond's account of a decision to implement a tithe at the siege of Araq, sometime in March 1099. The tithe was specifically taken for the *pauperes* and the many infirm people in the army. A quarter of it was distributed through the priests, a quarter to given to the newly created bishop of Albara,[67] and the rest to Peter the Hermit who shared his portion equally between the *pauperes* and the clergy.[68] The diverse channels through which the tithe was distributed probably reflected the confused organisation of the expedition at this point. As well as horizontal tensions between rich and poor, there were vertical ones between the different regional contingents, many of which were hostile to Count Raymond of Toulouse, who, after his departure from Antioch (23 November 1098), seems to have made a bid to become overall leader of the movement. The distribution of the tithe looks like a compromise. It was all intended to go to the *pauperes* and the infirm, but while some was given generally to those in need by Peter the Hermit, the rest was distributed through the Bishop and priests known to particular regional contingents.

Raymond of Aguilers seems to have believed in the obligation of the leadership of the expedition to show concern for the welfare of the *pauperes*. This idea is present in a vision of 3 August 1098 in which Bishop Adhémar of Le Puy appeared before Peter Bartholomew, having died just two nights earlier. According to Peter, as reported by Raymond of Aguilers, the Bishop said that he was saved from a punishing fire by a robe returned to him by the Lord because the robe had been given away to a *pauper* on his ordination as bishop.[69]

Most of the remaining examples of the term *pauperes* in the *Historia Francorum* are connected with Raymond of Aguilers's account of the actions of Count Raymond of Toulouse. At times the historian portrayed the count as a religious and worthy leader of the poor, but Raymond of Aguilers also indicated a tension between those who were supposedly being led and the count. Count Raymond was described as leading a raid, early in September 1098, from Antioch, *pro causa pauperum.*[70] Raiding again in the latter half of the month, the Count led the *plebs pauperum*, who were suffering hunger and weariness, out of Antioch.[71] These 'commoners of poor means' appear as a variation on *pauperes* used by the author to avoid direct repetition of very similar phrases. So too with the appearance of *populus pauperum* in a sentence that arose in the historian's account of a third raid led by Count

---

[66] RA 188.
[67] Peter of Narbonne, see J. Riley-Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 217.
[68] RA 214-5. For Peter the Hermit, see J. Flori, *Pierre l'Ermite et la Première Croisade* (Paris, 1999), see also below pp. 198 - 200.
[69] RA 138 – 9.
[70] RA 148.
[71] RA 149.

Raymond, which captured Albara on or about 25 September 1098.[72] There are two other appearances of *plebs pauperum* in the *Historia Francorum*, one of which is appears shortly before Raymond of Aguilers's account of the storming of Ma'arat-an-Numan (11 December 1098). Having been inspired by a vision of Peter Bartholomew the faithful offered lavish alms and prayers to God, for the sake of His *plebs pauperum*, before trying to storm the city.[73] Secondly, Raymond reported a speech by Tancred against diverting the expedition from its goal of Jerusalem, at a time, during January 1099, when Count Raymond was being advised to try to take Jabala. Tancred used the idea that God had visited the *plebs pauperum* to insist the expedition should continue.[74] Another similar variation occurs in an interesting passage concerning the dispute between Count Raymond and Bohemond over Antioch. Soon after Ma'arat-an-Numan fell Bohemond refused to pull his troops out of the city until Raymond conceded the towers he controlled at Antioch. Around Christmas 1098, the Bishop of Albara and certain *nobiles* assembled along with the *populus pauperum* and summoned Count Raymond.[75] Count Raymond was then obliged to announce his departure for Jerusalem by this assembly. Raymond of Aguilers therefore described the count has having been conquered by the tears of the *pauperes*.[76] Not long after, on or around 4 January 1098, Count Raymond's hand was forced by a mutiny at Ma'arat-an-Numan of the *pauperes* who had remained in the city while the nobles had held a meeting at Rugia.[77] Count Raymond was therefore obliged to set forth for Palestine, *pro causa pauperum*.[78]

Turbae

The collective term *turba* is not, strictly speaking, one that denotes social status, but it is discussed here for the important social information that accompanies its use in the *Historia Francorum*. Raymond used *turba* on four occasions, two of the which were straightforward: he described a crowd of footsoldiers, *turba peditum*, from the army of Duquq of Damascus, who were scattered in battle by Bohemond (31 December 1097);[79] secondly he wrote of the *turba* that was the Christian army being roused for battle against al-Afdal near Ascalon.[80] The two other usages of the term are more interesting. At an assembly during the siege of Jerusalem, in a speech by the leaders, the Christians were urged to remember the time when Christ entered Jerusalem humbly on an ass, a *turba* running to honour him with a great

---

[72] RA 156.
[73] RA 173.
[74] RA 189.
[75] RA 178. For the Bishop of Albara, Peter of Narbonne, see above n. 67.
[76] RA 178.
[77] RA 180.
[78] RA 183.
[79] RA 45.
[80] RA 368.

procession.[81] This was a correct use of the Vulgate term for the crowd that spread their garments before Christ (Mat 21:8) and who surrounded him on that occasion (Mat 21:9, Luc 19:37, Luc 19:39, Ioh 12:12). But Matthew also used the same term, *turba*, for the armed mob who arrested Christ (Mat 26:47, 26:55, Mar 14:43, Luc 22:47). Mark used the term for the crowd who freed Barabbas rather than Christ (Mar 15:8, Luc 23:18). Raymond of Aguilers was familiar with how the term was used in the Vulgate, not just for a crowd, but a crowd that could be fickle and violently ungodly. This is particularly significant in his account of the ordeal of Peter Bartholomew (8 April 1099).[82] In the light of the Vulgate depiction of the passion of Christ it is noteworthy that in the *Historia Francorum* the watching crowds at the ordeal by fire of the visionary were described initially as *populus*, then *multitudo populi*, then *turba* as they progressed from praying, to watching, to charging across to Peter and inflicting wounds more lethal than those of the flames.[83] In his choice of term for the crowd Raymond appears to have been echoing the scenes in the Vulgate.[84]

Plebs

The typical use of the term *plebs* by Raymond of Aguilers was to indicate something more than simply 'the people'. In most cases where Raymond employed this noun he also had in mind the common occurrences of *plebs* in the Vulgate as 'God's people'. The two examples given under *pauperes* above of the 'people of poor means', the *plebs pauperum*, are worth looking at more closely here, this time to note the association of the term *plebs* with God. One was the report by Raymond of Aguilers that, shortly before the storming of Ma'arat-an-Numan (11 December 1098), the faithful offered lavish alms and prayers to God, for the sake of His *plebs pauperum*.[85] The other was Tancred's argument against the diversion of the army to Jabala, that God visited the *plebs pauperum* with the message that the expedition should continue to Jerusalem.[86] In both cases the *plebs pauperum* were described in such a way as to indicate their closeness to God. Raymond also used the unqualified term *plebs* in the same manner.

In describing the discovery of the Holy Lance, Raymond reported that Peter Bartholomew urged those present to pray to God for the comfort and victory of His *plebs*.[87] On the day of the assault that captured Ma'arat-an-Numan the whole army cried out for the Lord to favour His *plebs*.[88] When the siege of Arqa was abandoned (13 May 1099) Raymond

---

[81] RA 328.
[82] See below pp. 228 - 9.
[83] RA 252 – 254.
[84] RA 252 – 4.
[85] RA 173.
[86] RA 189.
[87] RA 110.
[88] RA 173 – 4.

of Aguilers wrote that although the Count Raymond was very distressed, God did not ignore the desire of His *plebs* on the count's behalf. The historian added that Godfrey, Duke of Lotharingia, wishing the journey to continue, encouraged the *plebs* to leave the siege.[89] In all these examples the *plebs* were God's people and it is also clear that the historian believed that the desire of the *plebs* to march towards Jerusalem better matched God's will than ambition of any prince.

The fact that Raymond several times made a distinction between the *plebs* and the *plebs pauperum* suggests that he was using *plebs* for people generally and *plebs pauperum* for the lower social order. Certainly there is one example in the *Historia Francorum* where the *plebs* were not portrayed as being poor. On the march in January 1099, Count Raymond obtained ample supplies from the governors of various Arab towns; the expedition was also fortunate to come across unexpectedly a large herd of cattle, which, said the historian, allowed the *milites* and many of the strong men of the *plebs* (*multi de plebe viri fortes*), to visit Caesarea and Camela (Homs), so that they could buy Arabian horses.[90] When later, however, Raymond of Aguilers wrote that the proposed duties of the king of Jerusalem included creating the conditions for the *plebs* to return to the land,[91] the term *plebs* seems to have been used to indicate a labouring social order. There is a further usage of the term in the *Historia Francorum* that seems to have a slightly pejorative aspect in its association of *plebs* with rowdiness. On or around 20 September 1098, when Raymond himself was awoken just after a vision by Peter Bartholomew, he asked the others around him if they had heard 'a tumult as if of the *plebs*.'[92]

Artifices, operarii

There was a distinct grouping of craftsmen on the crusade, whose status seems to have been above that of the lowest social order on the expedition, given that pay was set aside for their work. The skills of the craftsmen were required especially in the making of siege equipment for the attacks on Nicea and Jerusalem. It was while preparing equipment for the storming of Jerusalem that they came to the attention of Raymond of Aguilers (8 – 10 July 1099). He noted that while everyone else worked spontaneously, the *artifices* were given wages from the collections that were made among the people. Count Raymond had his own *operarii* whom he paid out of his own wealth.[93] The urgency to have this equipment made led the council of leaders to order those present to lend their mules and boys to the *artifices* and

---

[89] RA 281 – 2.
[90] RA 188.
[91] RA 350.
[92] RA 151: ... *quasi plebis tumultuationem.*
[93] RA 333.

lignarii.[94] The term *operarii* seems to have been used by Raymond as synonymous with *artifices*. Not only is this evident in the first example above, but also in the report that Duke Godfrey and the Counts of Normandy and Flanders placed Gaston, viscount of Béarn, over the same body of craftsmen, now termed *operarii*.[95] Raymond of Aguilers wrote that Count Raymond put the recently arrived Genoese sailor William Ricau in charge of his *operarii* on Mount Zion.[96] Raymond of Aguilers stated that the Genoese aided Count Raymond in the construction of siege equipment with the ropes, iron mallets, nails, axes, pick-axes and hatchets they had salvaged from the loss of their ships at Jaffa.[97] These skilled workers were paid, unlike the captured Saracens described above, who were put to work under the direction of the Bishop of Albara.[98]

Pedites

Pedites in the *Historia Francorum* were invariably footsoldiers; very often the term was coupled with *milites* to indicate the totality of a fighting force. Although present throughout the *Historia Francorum*, in marked contrast to his approach to the *pauperes* Raymond never offered commentary on the views of the *pedites* or their response to the various political issues raised during the course of the First Crusade.

Armigeri

Raymond's attention was drawn to the squires of the expedition on two occasions, both instances concerning their being killed during a search for forage. As considered above, *armigeri* were killed outside of Antioch alongside *rustici*, while taking horses to pasture, in the winter of 1097.[99] Secondly, the *armigeri* who were scattered at Hosn al-Akrad (later Krak des Chevaliers) in January 1099 by an attack of the local population were described as unarmed and roaming through farms in search of provisions.[100] Elsewhere in the early crusading sources there are descriptions of *armigeri* being promoted to *milites*; from Raymond's description it seems that before this turning point in their career they were non-combatants.[101]

---

[94] RA 334.
[95] RA 331 – 2. For Gaston of Béarn see J. Riley – Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 206.
[96] RA 332. For William Ricau see F. Cardini, 'Profilo d'un crociato, Guglielmo Embriaco', *Archivio Storico Italiano*, 136 (1978), pp. 417 – 8.
[97] RA 337:
[98] RA 332 – 3.
[99] RA 36. See above p. 34.
[100] RA 194.
[101] For the promotion of *armigeri* see below pp. 62 – 3.

Domestici, familiares

The members of the households of the senior princes appear as a very significant political force in the *Historia Francorum*. This is particularly the case for the household of Count Raymond, of which Raymond of Aguilers was a member. Certain of the *familia* of the Count and Bishop Adhémar were described as undermining a tower at the siege of Nicea (18 June 1097), indicating that the historian was using the term for military forces.[102] Shortly after the death of Adhémar (1 August 1098), Peter Bartholomew claimed to have a vision of the legate, in which Adhémar was reported as entrusting his *familia* to Count Raymond.[103] The great size of Count Raymond's *familia* was subsequently noted by the historian at the siege of Arqa (mid April 1099).[104] There were so many *familiares* of the count at this stage, that, with their help, along with those who accepted his large gifts, Count Raymond could block the desire of the majority of the people who wished to end the siege.[105] According to Raymond of Aguilers it was the change in heart of these *familiares* that ended the siege of Arqa and led to the Christian forces resuming the march to Jerusalem. When William Hugh of Monteil, brother of Adhémar returned to the siege with the dead legate's cross (13 May 1099), this new relic became the focus of a mutiny when the *familiares* of Count Raymond, defying their lord and other princes, set fire to their tents and were the first to desert the siege.[106] This behaviour was a striking contrast with their role at Ma'arat-an-Numan five months earlier, when along with the Bishop of Albara the *familiares* of the count had tried to prevent the poor from destroying the walls of the city.[107] The estrangement of Count Raymond from his (and Adhémar's) *familiares* flared up again after the fall of Jerusalem when not even his own *familiares* thought it right that the count should seek to keep control of the Tower of David, once it had been asked for by Godfrey, who had been elected ruler of Jerusalem on 22 July 1099. Count Raymond had given control of the tower to the Bishop of Albara but the bishop yielded to the threat of violence and, reported Raymond of Aguilers, often secretly accused the *familiares* of the count for this event.[108] It seems that the aggregation of his following by accepting into it those who had previously been in the household of Bishop Adhémar brought political instability and tension into the *familiares* of Count Raymond of Toulouse.

The other appearances of *familiares* in the *Historia Francorum* are less dramatic. The fact that a priest, Bernard of Le Puy, was described as having been a *familiaris* of Bishop

---

[102] RA 21.
[103] RA 139.
[104] RA 266 – 7.
[105] RA 266 – 7.
[106] RA 281.
[107] RA 180 – 1. For a discussion of the mutiny at Ma'arat-an-Numan and its consequences see below p. 225.
[108] RA 355.

Adhémar of Le Puy is important as establishing that Raymond of Aguilers was not limiting his use of the term to the fighting forces of a princely household.[109] After the fall of Ma'arat-an-Numan (11 December 1098), certain *familiares* of Count Raymond were described as being indignant that Bohemond's knights got the greater share of the towers, houses and captives.[110] In reporting the eleventh and final vision of Peter Bartholomew, which took place on 5 April 1099, Raymond of Aguilers recorded that the vision of Christ had urged the Christian army to appoint judges through *familiae* and *cognatio*.[111] This passage on the need to reform the method of seeking justice among the Christians of the First Crusade indicates that the *familia* and the *cognatio* were given basic features of the organisation of the Christian forces. Finally Raymond interpreted the behaviour of the Byzantine general, Tatikios, through applying to the Byzantine forces his understanding of the term *familia*. Tatikios, who himself was described as a *familiaris* of the Greek emperor, Alexius I Comnenus, was reported as abandoning his *familiares* at the siege of Antioch, early in February 1098.[112]

A less common term for the household of a prince in the *Historia Francorum* was *domestici*. The only example of it being applied to the Christian forces occurred when Raymond wrote about a period of discord among the Christians that broke out following the defeat of Kerbogha, when there were few who did not fight with their comrades or *domestici* from the occurrences of theft.[113] It is hard to establish the meaning of the term here with precision, but, since in general Raymond did not use a classical vocabulary, it is not likely that he is referring to servants. By the twelfth century a knight without a fief who was sustained in the household of his lord was being referred to as a *domesticus*.[114] This seems the most likely status of those *domestici* in the First Crusade who were described by Raymond as fighting one another. This conclusion is reinforced by the one other appearance of the term. Greek and Armenian *iuvenes*, discussed further below, were described as being treated *quasi domestici* by the new rulers of Antioch, on the capture of the city in 1085. That this household service was military is indicated by the fact that when they escaped to the Christians they came on horseback bearing arms.[115]

Equites, milites

Raymond's preferred term for knights was *milites*, but on five occasions he used the older alternative, *equites*. Two of these instances are simply a result of stylistic considerations, the historian preferring not to repeat himself when he wishes to use a noun for

---

[109] RA 239 – 40.
[110] RA 176.
[111] RA 226.
[112] RA 48, 52.
[113] RA 136.
[114] Niermeyer, *Medival Latin Dictionary*, I 457.
[115] RA 74 – 5.

knight twice in the same sentence. So, for example, he reported a speech of Tancred in which the Norman prince said, 'look, from a hundred thousand *equites*, we have hardly a thousand *milites*.'[116]

In one case the historian seems to have selected *equites* because the term had greater associations with riding than *milites*. As seen above, Peter Bartholomew was reported as saying that he went out to fight and was nearly suffocated between two knights. *Equites* was used here, appropriately, to emphasise it was the horses that threatened the visionary.[117] In the Vulgate the term *equites* is used approximately twice as often as *milites* and it might well be that Raymond of Aguilers found *equites* the more appropriate of the terms when he reported a certain vision of divine aid. This miracle took the form of two knights in shining armour who were said to have appeared before the Christian forces at the battle of Dorylaeum (1 July 1097).[118] Similarly, for the climax of the expedition, when Raymond described knights riding over the bodies of the dead at the fall of Jerusalem, he used *equites*.[119]

The use of the ubiquitous term for knights, *milites*, was generally uncontroversial in the *Historia Francorum*. There is a single passage, however, which although applied to Turkish troops in Antioch stands out in so far as it indicates Raymond's willingness to make a distinction between ordinary and senior knights. In the description of Antioch by Raymond of Aguilers at the time of the siege by the Christian army (21 October 1097) he wrote that there were in the city two thousand *milites optimi* and four or five thousand *milites gregarii* and also ten thousand *pedites*.[120] Clearly the distinction here between good knights and common knights is not a reformulation of that between knights and footsoldiers. As Raymond makes this distinction only once, however, in connection with the hostile forces based at Antioch, it could be that he had in mind a very specific point here based on the difference between the lightly armed Turkish riders who fought with bow from horseback and their better armed superiors.

One clear theme with regard to *milites* in the *Historia Francorum* is that of the importance they attached to horses. Outside the walls of Antioch on the evening of 29 December 1097, the historian observed the eagerness of certain knights to chase a horse mid battle, even to the point of incurring a defeat for the Christian forces.[121] This pursuit of the *milites* resulted in the *pedites* thinking that a flight had begun and in the confusion the besieging army sustained many casualties. It is highly significant that one horse should be the source of undisciplined pursuit by *milites*. The incident is best understood within the context

---

[116] RA 193 and 190: *Ecce de centum millibus equitum, vix milites mille habemus.*
[117] RA 89.
[118] RA 25-6.
[119] RA 346.
[120] RA 33.
[121] RA 39.

of the considerable loss of horses that had seen many *milites* numbered among the *pedites* due to the loss of their mount. Under such circumstances a healthy Arab horse was of immense value.[122] The same context makes clear the importance of a council of the Provençals in January 1098, at which a *fraternitas* was created; Count Raymond granted 500 marks of silver, so that those *milites* who lost their horse could have it restored, with the remainder of the silver being given to the 'fraternity'.[123] This agreement addressed the problem that the *milites* were reluctant to defend foraging expeditions due to the potential risk to their horses.[124] Two other passages are also of interest here. While trapped in Antioch by the arrival of Kerbogha, Raymond reported that famine was so severe that although they were not prepared to kill and eat their horses the majority of *milites* did depend on their blood.[125] As noted above, no sooner did the *milites* and wealthier *plebs* obtain booty than they rushed to Caesarea and Camela to buy Arab horses.[126]

Only three individual *milites* were identified by name in the *Historia Francorum*: 'Isoard *miles* of Ganges, a most noble Provençal';[127] 'Roger of Barneville, a most illustrious *miles*, much loved by all'[128] and Raymond Pilet 'a most noble and strong *miles*.'[129] It is instantly obvious that the historian, possibly to distinguish these knights from the general body of *milites*, deliberately underlined the noble status of each of these *miles*.

The phrase *milites Christi* is notable for its near complete absence in the *Historia Francorum*. This is a marked contrast to all the other sources of the First Crusade and the *Gesta Francorum* in particular. Raymond wrote the formulation down only once, in reporting the battle cry of Isadore of Gaye.[130] Although Raymond has the most theological framework for his *Historia* of any of the early crusading historians, his was not a work that praised the deeds of God through His *milites*, but rather through His whole army.[131]

Iuvenes

Iuvenes in classical Latin refers to 'youths' in the sense of young persons, but by the eleventh and twelfth century the term had also acquired a technical sense: *iuvenes* were

---

[122] See below pp. 251 6. See also J. France, *Victory in the East*, 281 – 2.
[123] RA 49. See also J. Richard, 'La confrérie de la première croisade', *Etudes de civilisation médiéval: mélanges offerts à E. R. Labande*, ed. B. Jeannau (Poitiers, 1974), pp. 617 –22.
[124] RA 50; see also J. France, *Victory in the East*, p. 242.
[125] RA 116.
[126] RA 188. See also above p. 42.
[127] RA 66 – 7: *Isuardus miles de Gagia, Provincialis nobilissimus.* For Isoard I, count of Die see RA 66 n. 2, see also J. Riley – Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 213.
[128] RA 84: *Miles clarissimus et karissimus omnibus, nomine Rotgerius de Barnevilla.* For Roger, Lord of Barneville-sur-mer, see RA 84 n. a; see also J. Riley – Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 221.
[129] RA 253-4: *Miles nobilssimus et fortis.* For Raymond Pilet see RA 253 n. a; see also J. Riley – Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 220.
[130] RA 67.
[131] RA 5, 14, 64, 137, 180, 368, 369: *Exercitu Dei.* RA 12: *Populus Dei.*

warriors at a particular stage of their careers, adults who had taken up arms, been received into a company of warriors and had been dubbed, thus becoming knights. They were knights, however, who had yet to be married and therefore yet to become heads of households. As Georges Duby has summarised: 'the stages of "youth" can therefore be defined as the period in a man's life between his being dubbed a knight and his becoming a father.'[132] Raymond of Aguilers sometimes used the term *iuvenes* in this technical sense. The clearest example of this was Raymond's report made with regard to a detachment of knights who were sent from the siege of Jerusalem (18 June 1099) to make contact with six Christian vessels that had arrived at Jaffa. This expedition ran into a troop of Arab and Turkish riders, dispersing them after some losses that included three or four *milites*, along with Achard of Montemerle, 'a noble *iuvenis*, and renowned *miles*.'[133] Achard was a senior figure in the Christian army, mentioned not only by those authors dependent upon the *Gesta Francorum*, but also by Albert of Aachen, who described him as a mighty *dux* of the Christians and a *vir nobilis*.[134] Achard had initially joined the First Crusade having mortgaged the Burgundian properties that he had inherited from his father, for 2,000 solidi and four mules.[135] He was prominent enough to be listed by the *Gesta Francorum* as one of the notables who used the Via Egnatia to journey from Durazzo to Constantinople in the winter of 1096.[136] At some point during the expedition Achard's independent means must have been exhausted, for at the time of his death he was described as being one of the *milites* sent out from the army of Count Raymond of Toulouse.[137] This makes him a very convincing example for Raymond of Aguilers's use of *iuvenis* in the technical sense. It makes little sense to understand the 'noble *iuvenis* and renowned *miles*' as a 'youth' in terms of age, when three years before his death he was of age to mortgage his inheritance. His career indicates that he was a knight who had yet to establish his own family and indeed, like many other *iuvenes* on the First Crusade, was drawn into the following of a senior prince.

The other appearances of the term *iuvenes* in the *Historia Francorum* are likely to carry the same meaning. Raymond of Aguilers noted the death of Bernard Reymond of Béziers in a battle outside of Antioch in which the standard bearer of Adhémar of Le Puy was also killed (29 December 1097). In his account of the battle the historian described Bernard

---

[132] Georges Duby, *The Chivalrous Society*, trans. C. Postan (Berkeley, 1977), p. 113, originally published as 'Les "jeunes" dans la société aristocratique dans la France du Nord-Ouest au XII^{e} siècle,' *Annales: Economies, Sociétés, Civilisations* 19, V (1964), pp. 835-846.
[133] RA 318-9: *Acardus de Monte Merulo, nobilis iuvenis, et miles inclitus*. For Achard of Montemerle see RA 318 n. a; see also J. Riley-Smith, *The First Crusaders*, p. 197.
[134] AA 440.
[135] J. France, *Victory in the East*, p. 86.
[136] GF 5.
[137] GF 88.

Reymond as a noble *iuvenis*.[138] Again, for Raymond, nobility was associated with the term *iuvenis*. From the account of this sortie by the garrison of Antioch in the *Gesta Francorum* it is clear that those Christians killed that day were not the non-combatants in the camp, rather they were *milites* and *pedites*.[139] So here also the term is less likely to have meant a 'young man' than a knight at a certain, early, stage of his career.

Raymond reported many of the stories of visions and miracles that were brought to him. After the trial by ordeal and fall from power of Peter Bartholomew (7 April 1099) the priest Peter Desiderius, chaplain to Isoard I of Die, became the most prominent visionary among the Christian forces.[140] In Raymond's account of the visions of Peter Desiderius is one in which the priest was visited by a certain *iuvenis*, about fifteen years old and most beautiful.[141] Peter Desiderius spoke to the *iuvenis* seeking his identity and was told to name the standard bearer for the Christian army. Having given the response, 'St George', the priest was told by the vision that he had spoken well; he was indeed in the presence of St George.[142] The fact that St George was considered to be not merely a 'youth' but a knight by participants of the First Crusade is supported by the belief expressed by the anonymous author of the *Gesta Francorum* that the saint fought under a white banner in the battle against Kerbogha.[143] The cult of St George was to grow, considerably accelerated by the success of the First Crusade, until by the fifteenth century he was the personification of chivalry. It is very significant that this embodiment of the highest ideal of a crusading warrior and standard-bearer of the whole expedition should be described by Raymond as a *iuvenis*. From other sources it is possible to build up a clearer picture of the *iuvenes* being at the heart of the military actions of the crusade and, through his choice of social term for St George, Raymond seems to have shared this view.[144]

One further reference to *iuvenes* in the work of Raymond of Aguilers was a description of a certain *iuvenis* playing a key role at the point where the breakthrough in Jerusalem occurred (15 July 1099) by firing arrows at the coverings that protected the defences against the tower of the Lotharingian contingent.[145]

An unclear use of the term *iuvenes* occurs in Raymond's description of those Greeks and Armenians in Antioch who brought rumours to the Christian forces outside of the city while it was being besieged. Raymond wrote that fourteen years earlier when the Turks had

---

[138] RA 41. This is the only known reference to Bernard Reymond.
[139] GF 32.
[140] See below p. 234. For Peter Desiderius see J. Riley-Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 216.
[141] RA 291. In contemporary thinking beauty was one of the attributes of persons in the stage of youth, see R. M. Karras, *From Boys to Men* (Philadelphia, 2003), pp.12-13.
[142] RA 291.
[143] GF 69.
[144] See below Chapter II.3.
[145] RA 343-4.

taken the city, from scarcity they treated Armenian and Greek *iuvenes* as if *domestici* and gave them wives. Those who were able to escape came to the Christian camp with horses and arms.[146] The reference to the escapees bringing horses and arms suggests that the obvious interpretation of *iuvenes* here as 'youths' might not be correct. Although not writing with regard to Christian forces and the society with which he was familiar, Raymond might have applied the term *iuvenes* in its technical sense as one that he considered appropriate to the status of those Armenian and Greek people about whom he was writing. The strange statement that they were given wives like *domestici* then makes more sense. It seems that Raymond was explaining that as the Turks had only recently taken Antioch, their lack of numbers led them to build up their military households by giving settled positions to previously unattached and unmarried Armenian and Greek knights. These fled from their masters when given the opportunity by the arrival of the Christian army.

Principes, maiores, nobiles

Raymond of Aguilers used the standard term, *principes*, for the leaders of the First Crusade throughout the *Historia Francorum*. That his use of the term also encompassed a wider group of senior nobles can be seen from the fact that Count Raymond was twice described as holding a council with his *principes*.[147] In other words, there were *principes* within the contingents of each of the most senior leaders. In one instance the historian gave the names of two knights whom he considered to be *principes* in the Provençal contingent: Pontius Rainaud and his brother Peter, who were *principes noblissimi*.[148] One other named *princeps* from outside the ranks of the senior leaders was Gaston of Béarn, who, as detailed above, was put in charge of workers making siege equipment for the storming of Jerusalem.[149] To distinguish the more senior leaders Raymond on one occasion qualified the term *principes*, terming the great princes: *principes maiores*.[150] He also referred to Bohemond and Raymond as the 'two greatest *principes* in the army.'[151]

Raymond of Aguilers used the term *maiores* only once, in a manner which suggests he understood it to by synonymous with *principes*. The term appeared together with *populus* to indicate the body of senior princes and people who had a say in the election of a bishop for Ramla (3 June 1099). An only slightly more frequent term for the upper social layer of the First Crusade in the *Historia Francorum* was *nobiles*. There are three examples of *nobiles* being applied to groups within the Christian forces. At a time of crisis for the expedition,

---

[146] RA 74 – 75.
[147] RA 49, 157.
[148] RA 10: For Pierre and Pons de Fay see RA 10 n. c; see also J. Riley-Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 217 (Pierre), p. 218 (Pons).
[149] RA 332. See also above pp. 42 - 3.
[150] RA 183.
[151] RA 64: *Duo maximi principes in exercitu.*

trapped in Antioch by the arrival of Kerbogha (4 June 1099), the *principes* and *nobiles* went through the streets and to the churches calling on God's help while the *populus* accompanied them bare footed and in tears.[152] The addition of *nobiles* to *principes* in this example seems simply for emphasis, as part of a bipartite distinction between the upper class and the 'people', who both had their own particular way of calling for God's aid. Another similar distinction between the nobles and the people, this time the 'poor people' was the example discussed above in which, around Christmas 1098, the Bishop of Albara and certain *nobiles* assembled along with the *populus pauperum* to summon Count Raymond and insist the expedition depart Ma'arat-an-Numan and continue towards Jerusalem.[153] This passage provides important evidence that a section of the upper class sided with the poor in their disagreement with Count Raymond over the direction of the First Crusade.[154] The point is made even more clearly when the expedition arrived at Tripoli, soon after the mutiny of his own *familiares* had ended the siege of Araq (13 May 1099). Count Raymond was described as giving gifts to all the *nobiles*, that they should besiege Tripoli; but he was, nevertheless, opposed by them all.[155]

Raymond of Aguilers used the term *nobiles* to indicate the status of pagans more often than he applied it to the Christian army.[156] The one passage of interest among them was the historian's comment that bodies of Arabs, both of the *nobiles* and the *vulgus*, outside Tripoli were a delightful sight to the Christian army, following fighting early in March 1099.[157] This example suggests that Raymond of Aguilers understood the division *nobiles* and *vulgus* as a means of expressing the entire body of society.

Dominus

Dominus was a term for lordship used by Raymond of Aguilers at all levels, from describing a rider as a *dominus* of a horse to the leadership of the entire Christian army. He dedicated the *Historia Francorum* to his *dominus*, Leodegar, Bishop of Vivier.[158] The term *dominus* was applied at various appropriate times to Bohemond, Count Raymond, Count Robert of Normandy, Bishop Adhémar of Le Puy, Count Isoard I of Die and Engelrand of Saint-Pol.[159] Raymond also used the term for Turkish rulers, namely the lords of Gibellum and Tripoli.[160] One less prominent person given the title *dominus* was the person whom

---

[152] RA 124.
[153] RA 178. See above p. 40.
[154] For the mutiny at Ma'arat-an-Numan see below p. 225.
[155] RA 282.
[156] RA 23, 125, 186, 262.
[157] RA 262.
[158] RA 4. For Leodegar see RA 4 n. a.
[159] RA 176, 176, 348, 351, 326 – 7, 206. For Isoard I, count of Die see n. 127. For Engelrand see RA 206 n. a, see also A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem* (Oxford, 2000), p. 192 - 3.
[160] RA 217, 258.

Raymond described as being responsible for his writing the *Historia Francorum*, Pons of Balazuc.[161] In reporting the death of Pons it seems that Raymond wished to strike a very respectful note. *Dominus* was also applied to persons who while not great nobles were in a position of lordship. Peter Bartholomew was reported as referring three times to his *dominus*, William Peter.[162] Heraclius, the standard bearer of Bishop Adhémar was described as the *dominus* of the priest Bernard of Le Puy.[163] There are a few other uses of the term in the *Historia Francorum*, all of them straightforwardly indicating a ruler. The Turkish inhabitants of Azāz appealed to the Christians (14-17 September 1098), because they wished to have a *dominus* from the race of Franks.[164] Similarly, in an attempt to persuade Count Raymond to lead the expedition on to Jerusalem, he was urged to become the leader and *dominus* of the army.[165] Raymond of Aguilers reported that, in search of tribute, several senior princes sent letters to Saracen cities claiming to be the *dominus* of the whole army.[166]

The language and perspective of Raymond of Aguilers with regard to social structure is very different from all of the other early crusading sources. His theological outlook placed a much greater emphasis on the deeds of the people than did any of the other accounts. The consequence of Raymond's belief that he was recording the events of a people chosen by God was not a history of irrational mysticism but a valuable insight into the outlook of the poor on the First Crusade.

---

[161] RA 201. For Pons see RA iv-vi, see also J. Riley-Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 218.
[162] RA 97, 98, 99.
[163] RA 242. Bernard of Le Puy, see RA 240 note a.
[164] RA 148.
[165] RA 178.
[166] RA 218.

I.3. The *Historia Hierosolymitana* of Fulcher of Chartres

The text

Heinrich Hagenmeyer published the definitive edition of the *Historia Hierosolymitana* of Fulcher of Chartres in 1913.[1] The main strength of the 1913 edition was the fact that it took into account all fifteen existing manuscripts and the fact that in 1124 Fulcher reworked his history. So while the edition of Jacques Bongars, which was reprinted in the *Patrologia Latina* was based on a reading of manuscripts of the first redaction, the 1913 edition was based on manuscripts containing Fulcher's second redaction, giving variant readings from fourteen codices and all the printed editions.[2] Hagenmeyer's edition therefore allows an examination of the text as it would have appeared both before and after the 1124 revision.

According to his own account, on which we are almost entirely dependent for biographical information,[3] Fulcher was born in 1058 or 1059.[4] He indicated his place of birth from the use of the surname *Carnotensis*, which appeared three times in the *Historia Hierosolymitana*.[5] Fulcher was a participant in the First Crusade. His description of the departure of the various contingents makes it clear that he set out with Duke Robert II of Normandy and Count Stephen of Blois.[6] Just south of Marash Baldwin of Boulogne detached his forces from the main body of the Christian army and marched towards Tarsus (17 October 1097). At this point Fulcher reported that he was in the company of Baldwin.[7] Fulcher stayed with Baldwin after the Lotharingian prince became ruler of Edessa (10 March 1097) and in his account of those events wrote that 'I, Fulcher of Chartres, was the chaplain of this same Baldwin.'[8] This testimony implies that Fulcher was a cleric, probably a priest (*presbyter*), the

---

[1] Fulcher of Chartres, *Historia Hierosolymitana (1095 – 1127)*, ed. H. Hagenmeyer (Heidelberg, 1913), hereafter FC.
[2] J. Bongars, *Gesta Dei per Francos* (Hanover, 1611); J. P. Migne ed., *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series latina* (Paris, 1844), 150, cols. 823 – 942B; *RHC Oc.* 3, 311 - 485.
[3] With the possible exception of the appearance of 'Fulcher' and 'Fulcher, prior of the Mount of Olives' as a witness on three documents from the Kingdom of Jerusalem; see FC 2.
[4] FC III, XXIV, 17 (687); III XLIV, 4 (771).
[5] FC I, V, 12 (153); I, XIV, 15 (215); I, XXXIII, 12 (330).
[6] FC I,VII, 1 – VIII, 9 (163 – 176).
[7] FC I, XIV, 2 (206).
[8] FC I, XIV, 15 (215): *Ego vero Fulcherus Carnotensis, capellanus ipsius Balduini eram.*

position ascribed to him by the northern French monk and historian, Guibert of Nogent, although not as one who knew him, as well as by the title of one of the manuscripts.[9]

Fulcher accompanied Baldwin, now count of Edessa, to Jerusalem late in 1099 to worship at the Holy Sepulchre.[10] He was also present when Baldwin came to Jerusalem (9 November 1100) to obtain the title of king (11 November 1100).[11] Thereafter Fulcher made his home in Jerusalem and lived at least until 1127, the year that his history abruptly ended; at this time Fulcher would have been approximately sixty-eight years old.[12] The first redaction of the *Historia Hierosolymitana* was Fulcher's account of the First Crusade from the Council of Clermont (18 – 28 November 1095) and the history of the Kingdom of Jerusalem up until victory of King Baldwin I at Ramleh (27 August 1105). Much of the history is that of an eyewitness, although once Baldwin's contingent had left the main body of the Christian forces (mid September 1097), Fulcher had to depend on other accounts for his narrative of their experience. The information that Fulcher used for events among the main body of the Christian army while he was at Edessa was mainly derived, as Hagenmeyer demonstrated, from the *Gesta Francorum* and the *Historia Francorum* of Raymond of Aguilers.[13]

Hagenmeyer has plausibly argued that Fulcher began writing his history in 1101, after news of the *secunda peregrinatio* had reached him, but before the death of Stephen of Blois at the second battle of Ramleh (17 May 1102).[14] In 1105 Fulcher probably ceased writing his first version and copies of his work then began to circulate. The strongest evidence for this is the appearance of a near copy of Fulcher's history: Bartolf of Nangi's *Gesta Francorum Iherusalem expugnantium*.[15] As Hagenmeyer has pointed out, Bartolf's placing *finis* after the account of the Third Battle of Ramleh (27 August 1105) might well have marked the completion both of Bartolf's history and that of his source, Fulcher.[16] Guibert, abbot of Nogent, probably writing in 1109,[17] came across Fulcher's *Historia* late in the composition of his own work and incorporated a polemical response to the *Historia Hierosolymitana* in his own history.[18] While manuscripts of Fulcher's first redaction began to be distributed through Europe, he continued his work in the fashion of a chronicle, until reworking the entire text in 1124. The second redaction made only slight modifications in style, but was sufficiently

---

[9] GN 329. FC 16.
[10] FC II, III, 12 (368).
[11] FC II, V, 12 (383 – 4).
[12] FC III, XXIV, 17 (687); III, XLIV, 4 (771).
[13] FC 66.
[14] FC 44 – 45. See Fulcher of Chartres, *A history of the expedition to Jerusalem 1095-1127,* trans. F. R. Ryan (Knoxville, 1941)., p. 19 - 20.
[15] *RHC Oc.* 3, 491 – 543. Nothing is known of Bartolf outside of this work, the internal evidence of which seems to indicate he was a resident in Syria and an acquaintance of *frater Fulcherus Carnotensis*, see *RHC Oc.* 3, 492.
[16] *RHC Oc.* 3, 541, FC 46.
[17] See below p. 148.
[18] GN 329.

different in tone for Verena Epp (1990) to detect a development in Fulcher's thinking. She argued that in his second redaction Fulcher became more willing to admit Christian losses in battle and she claimed that the portrayal of God in the work shifted from God as a ruler to God as a friend.[19] Fulcher then regularly updated the *Historia Hierosolymitana* until it abruptly stopped in 1127, probably indicating the date of death of the author.

Fulcher's terse, straightforward, style does not favour a sophisticated examination of social structure. It is mainly through his occasional digressions from the historical narrative that the historian's strong theological framework can be discerned along with a certain amount of social commentary. The most striking examples of this arose in Fulcher's observations on Christian kingship. Fulcher reported in detail the dramatic escape of Joscelin of Courtenay, count of Edessa,[20] from Kharpurt (Hisn Ziyãd) in August 1123, in which Joscelin had to disguise himself as a peasant. This led the chronicler to comment on the power of God, echoing the idea in I Samuel, 2:7 – 8, by writing that God cast down the mighty from on high and 'raises the *pauper* from the dust.'[21] Fulcher continued by writing that both Baldwin II and Joscelin of Courtenay had the experience of being a ruler in the morning, a slave in the evening.[22] Fulcher made an even stronger formulation concerning the power of God over kings with regard to the fact that the Kingdom of Jerusalem prospered despite the capture of Baldwin II (18 April 1123). The historian went so far as to raise the idea that 'perhaps he was no king.'[23] Furthermore, Fulcher questioned whether someone deserved the title of king if he was lawless, did not fear God, was an adulterer, perjurer or sacrilegious;[24] if the king was a dissipater of churches, if he was an oppressor of *pauperes*, then he did not rule but brought disorder.[25] The perspective from which Fulcher was expressing these extremely critical ideas was not necessarily that of someone with a strong sense of social justice, but rather someone who subscribed to the ideas of ecclesiastical reform, as indicated by the ideas he attributed to pope Urban II concerning simony and the Truce of God at the Council of Clermont.[26] Fulcher was clearly a believer in the rights of the church, although not necessarily an advocate of papal authority. He found himself having to formulate a response to his lord, Baldwin of Edessa, taking the title of 'king' of Jerusalem (11 November 1100) and being

---

[19] V. Epp, *Fulcher von Chartres* (Dusseldorf, 1990), p. 11.
[20] For Joscelin of Courtenay, count of Edessa, see OV 5, 324.
[21] FC III, XXIV, 16 (687): *... de pulvere pauperem sublimet.*
[22] FC III, XXIV, 16 (687).
[23] FC III, XXI, 2 (673): *Forsitan non erat rex ...*
[24] FC III, XXI, 4 (674).
[25] FC III, XXI, 4 (674).
[26] FC I, II, 9 – 14 (126 – 130).

crowned (25 December 1100). Aware of the controversial nature of this step,[27] Fulcher took the side of those who argued that since Christ was crowned with thorns in Jerusalem, God had thereby turned a symbol of humiliation into one of salvation and glory. It was permissible for Baldwin to be crowned.[28] Fulcher, however, qualified his support for the existence of kingship in Jerusalem. A king was only rightly a king, especially in Jerusalem, if he ruled justly. During the relatively successful kingship of Baldwin I, to whom he was a chaplain, Fulcher suspended any expression of criticism. While writing on the kingship of Baldwin II (14 April 1118 – 21 August 1131), however, as we have seen, Fulcher showed no hesitation in raising the question of whether a king was legitimate if he was unjust.

Another interesting passage arising from Fulcher's theological understanding was his view of the attitude to personal property that existed among the participants of the First Crusade. Fulcher diverted from his account of the difficulties of the journey through Asia Minor (August 1097) to comment that although many languages divided them, everyone seemed to be brothers in the love of God and kinsmen with a shared outlook.[29] Fulcher added that if someone found property that had been lost, it would be kept carefully for many days, until the rightful owner was found, when it would be gladly handed back, as was proper among 'those who undertook the pilgrimage rightly.'[30] This is good evidence from an eyewitness that for all the regional differences, there was a sense of community among the Christian forces, at least among those who saw the expedition as a pious one.

Fulcher had a sense of social order, deriving from both the ecclesiastical and military use of the term *ordines*. In his account of the Council of Clermont (18 – 28 November 1095) Fulcher, who may have been an eyewitness although he does not state this directly,[31] quoted Urban II as telling his listeners to 'maintain the Church in its *ordines* in every respect free from all secular power.'[32] At the end of the work Fulcher wrote that in the Kingdom of Jerusalem priests and the minor order (*ordo*) of clergy were known as tribunes of the people (*tribuni plebis*).[33] In addition to this conventional understanding of the 'orders' of the clergy, Fulcher used the term *ordo* for military order of battle in three instances, one of which occurred in the letter of the Christian princes to Pope Urban II after their victory over the

---

[27] FC II, VI, 1 (385 – 6). See also A. V. Murray, 'The Title of Godfrey of Bouillon as Ruler of Jerusalem,' *Collegium Medievale*, 3 (1990), pp. 163-78; J. France, 'The election and title of Godfrey de Bouillon', *Canadian Journal of History* 18 (1983), pp. 321-29; J. Riley-Smith, 'The title of Godfrey of Bouillon', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 52 (1979), pp. 83-86.
[28] FC II, VI, 2 – 3 (386).
[29] FC I, XIII, 5 (203).
[30] FC I, XIII, 5 (203): *... qui recte peregrinantur.*
[31] FC 3 n. 5; Fulcher of Chartres, *A history of the expedition to Jerusalem,* pp. 7 – 8.
[32] FC I, II, 10 (127): *Ecclesiam suis ordinibus omnimode liberam ab omni saeculari potestate sustentate.*
[33] FC III, XXXIV, 10 (738).

Turkish Emir of Mosul, Kerbogha (28 June 1098), which Fulcher inserted into his history.[34] That Fulcher was aware that the term *ordo* could also be used in a social sense is evident from his report of a key passage in Urban II's speech at Clermont. Fulcher described the pope as appealing to his audience to urge 'everyone of whatever *ordo*, whether *equites* or *pedites*, *divites* or *pauperes*' to join the expedition.[35] Perhaps even more interesting is Fulcher's use of the term *gradus* for rank in a similar manner to *ordo*. At one point he wrote of a squire being raised to the *gradus* of a *miles*.[36] This is very significant evidence that for Fulcher being a *miles* involved more than performing the military function of a horseman; it involved being of a certain *gradus*. The same sense of the term *gradus* for rank appeared when Fulcher echoed the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals, writing that secular power had different worth according to its *gradus*, firstly the Augustus or emperor, next the Caesars, then kings, dukes and counts.[37]

Terms denoting social orders in the Historia Hierosolymitana

Inopes, pauperes, minores, egeni,

A key theme for Fulcher's entire work was to emphasise that conditions in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem were favourable for settlers of all ranks. As a result he several times gave particular mention to the situation of the lower social ranks. This was most notable in a late (1124) digression in which the chronicler wrote that in the kingdom those who were poor (*inopes*), God had made wealthy (*locupletes*); those who had little money had countless bezants and those who did not have an estate now possessed, by the gift of God, a city.[38] With this same theme in mind Fulcher twice made the point that *pauperes* had become wealthy through the conquests of the Christian forces. In an important passage describing the fall of Jerusalem (15 July 1099) the historian wrote that 'after such great bloodshed they entered the homes seizing whatever they found in them, such indeed that whoever had entered the home first, whether he was a poor man (*pauper*) or a rich man (*dives*), was in no way to be subject to injury by any other. Whether a house or a palace, he was to possess it and whatever he found in it was his own. They had established this law (*ius*) to be held mutually. And thus many poor (*inopes*) were made wealthy (*locupletes*).'[39] The second appearance of a similar

---

[34] Letter of Princes FC I, XXIV, 10 (263); II, LX, 2 (602); III, XLII, 7 (765).

[35] FC I, III, 4 (134): *Cunctis cuiuslibet ordinis tam equitibus quam peditibus, tam divitibus quam pauperibus ...*

[36] FC III, XXXI, 7 (726 – 7). See also below p. 66.

[37] FC III, XXXIV, 11 (739).

[38] FC III, XXXVII, 6 (749).

[39] FC I, XXIX, 1 (304): *... post stragem tantam ingressi sunt domos civium, rapientes quaecumque in eis reppererunt: ita sane, ut quicumque primus domum introisset, sive dives sive pauper esset, nullatenus ab aliquo alio fieret illi injuria, quin domum ipsam aut palatium et quodcumque in ea repperisset, ac si omnino propria, sibi adsumeret, haberet et possideret. Hoc itaque ius invicem tenendum stabilierant. Unde multi inopes facti sunt locupletes.* The law (*ius*) of property refers to a

formulation arose with Fulcher's description of the fall of Caesarea (17 May 1101) where he reported that many *pauperes* became *locupletes*.[40] Fulcher's version of the speech of Pope Urban II at Clermont had the pope offer the *pauperes* precisely this prospect. Having exhorted every *ordo*, whether *pauperes* or *divites* to support the expedition,[41] Urban was reported as saying that those *pauperes* here will be *locupletes* there.[42] This part of the speech has the appearance of a retrospective formulation made in the light of Fulcher's later examples of the poor becoming rich. The idea is not in keeping with one of the few surviving letters of Urban II, to the Bolognese, which specifically warned against taking the cross for material motives (*pro cupiditate*).[43] Similarly the second canon of the council of Clermont decreed that the journey was a substitute for penance, only for those who set out to free the Church out of devotion and not for the acquisition of honour or wealth.[44] For Fulcher, however, it was clearly important to make the point about the rise in condition of the *pauperes*. The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem suffered a chronic shortage of Christian farmers as well as military forces and this fact seems to have influenced Fulcher's report of Urban's speech at Clermont as well as his own desire to emphasise the gains for the *pauperes* on the fall of Jerusalem and Caesarea and in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem generally.

In January 1098, during a time of extreme hardship for the Christian forces besieging Antioch, Fulcher wrote that both *divites* and *pauperes* suffered from famine or the daily slaughter.[45] Verena Epp noted this passage as one of her examples for the view that Fulcher blurred social distinctions.[46] Certainly Fulcher was emphasising how the entire body of Christians was suffering. But he was also aware that the suffering was unequal, noting that in the same period of famine the poorer people (*pauperiores*) ate even the hides of the beasts and seeds of grain found in manure.[47] A similar awareness of the uneven pressures on the poor seems to be evident when he reported that because of this hardship some left the siege, first the *pauperes* and then the *locupletes*.[48]

Fulcher also used the term *pauperes* in two digressions on kingship. As noted above, Fulcher wrote that if a king was a robber of churches or an oppressor of the *pauperes* then he

---

tradition established during the course of the First Crusade that the first to obtain booty had the right to retain it; see below pp. 234 - 6.

[40] FC II, IX, 7 (403).

[41] FC I, III, 4 (134); see also above pp. 56 - 7.

[42] FC I, III, 7 (137).

[43] Letter of Urban II to the people of Bologna, H. Hagenmeyer, *Die Kreuzzugsbriefe aus den Jahren 1088 – 1100* (Innsbruck, 1902), p. 137.

[44] *Decreta Claromontensia* (n. 32), ed. R. Somerville, *The Councils of Urban II* I, (Amsterdam, 1972), p. 74; see also I. S. Robinson, *The Papacy 1073-1198 Continuity and Innovation* (Cambridge, 1990), pp. 327 – 8, 343 – 4.

[45] FC I, XV, 15 (223).

[46] V. Epp, *Fulcher von Chartres*, p. 242.

[47] FC I, XVI, 2 (226).

[48] FC I, XVI, 6 (228).

did not reign but brought disorder.[49] Again we have seen how Fulcher noted the power of God, which casts down the mighty and 'raises the *pauper* from the dust.'[50] He used the experience of Baldwin II to illustrate this point, saying that in the space of one day Baldwin had been cast down from king to slave.[51] In both these passages the use of the term *pauperes* was biblical. The first has echoes of Job 24:4, 9; the second a strong basis in I Samuel, 2:7 – 8.

One appearance of the term *pauperes* for Christian inhabitants in the region of Jerusalem revealed something of their function. In a late (1125) lament for those who lived around Jerusalem, Fulcher wrote that if they were *pauperes*, either *agricolae* or *lignarii*, they were captured or killed by the Ethiopians in ambush in ravines and forests.[52] The farmers and woodcutters of the region were evidently the main subgroups within the wider category of the poor settlers.

Fulcher used the couplet *minores et maiores* on three occasions to encompass the entirety of society: for his lament on the evils suffered by Europe before the First Crusade; for the hunger of all the Christians besieging Antioch in the early months of 1098 and to emphasise the scale of slaughter of the inhabitants of Ma'arat-an-Numan when it fell to the Christian army (11 December 1098).[53] A slightly different use of the term *minores* arose in Fulcher's account of the fall of Tripoli (12 July 1109) when he wrote that it was the *minores* of the Genoese who stormed the city after a great tumult (*tumultus magnus*) had arisen among them due to dismay that King Baldwin I seemed about to allow the city to surrender on terms.[54] Here *minores* was being used not for the lower part of society in a broad sense, but the inferior Genoese combatant, probably footsoldiers. His sense of the *minores* seems to have been a broad one that grouped together a lower social order that included footsoldiers.

By contrast Fulcher seems to have reserved the term *egeni* for the non-combatant poor of society. The first of only two usages of the term in the *Historia Hierosolymitana* arose in Fulcher's account of the activities in Jerusalem among those left behind, including himself, when the army of King Baldwin I went out to meet an invading force of the Egyptian vizier, al-Afdal (27 August 1105). As well as praying and participating in processions, abundant alms were bestowed upon the *egeni*.[55] Again when those remaining in Jerusalem were praying after the Christian army departed to attempt to relieve a siege of Joppa (May 1123)

---

[49] FC III, XXI, 4 (674); see above pp. 55 - 6.
[50] FC III, XXIV, 16 (687): ... *de pulvere pauperem sublimet*; see above p. 55.
[51] FC III, XXIV, 16 (687).
[52] FC III, XLII, 4 (763).
[53] FC I, V, 11 (152); I, XVI, 1 (225); I, XXV, 3 (267).
[54] FC II, XLI, 4 (533).
[55] FC II, XXXI, 12 (494).

alms were bestowed upon the *egeni*.[56] In both these cases the phrasing echoes John 12:5, with the *egeni* clearly a passive and lowly body to whom charity ought to be extended.

Artifices

Artifices, 'craftsmen', seem to be a distinct category of person for Fulcher. They appear three times in the *Historia Hierosolymitana*, in each case as the builders of siege equipment. Fulcher wrote that *artifices* were ordered to build machines of war for the siege of Jerusalem (15 June 1099).[57] Similarly *artifices* were described as raising the height of a tower during the siege of Caesarea (2 - 17 May 1101).[58] Thirdly, in the ships of the Venetians that arrived at the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem in 1123 were timbers that could be made into siege machinery by *artifices*.[59]

Plebs

In her discussion of Fulcher's use of the term *plebs*, Verena Epp examined a particular passage, which she used to argue that Fulcher identified *plebs* with *pedites*.[60] This was Fulcher's description of the contingent of Duke Robert of Normandy and Count Stephen of Blois as it tried to cross the Skumbi (*Genusus*) river on the *Via Egnatia* between Durazzo and Constantinople (April 1097). Fulcher noted with compassion that very many of the *plebs* drowned in a sudden surge of the current.[61] Shortly after the historian wrote that if *equites* with dextrous horses had not brought help to those *pedites*, many others would have also drowned.[62] Epp's view is a possible one. It is strengthened by Fulcher's observation that during the winter of 1097, while the contingent of Duke Robert of Normandy waited in Calabria for the spring, many of the *plebs* sold their bows and returned home.[63] Given, however, that the other appearances of the term *plebs* in the *Historia Hierosolymitana* seem to indicate non–combatants, it might be that Fulcher simply meant to indicate that those on horse provided assistance to those on foot, both combatants and non-combatants. In Fulcher's report of the fall of Antioch (3 June 1098) the *plebs* were described as seizing everything they could in a disorderly manner, while the *milites* continued to seek out and kill Turks.[64] When Baldwin II set forth from Jerusalem in June 1120, taking the Cross of the Lord with him to

---

[56] FC III, XVIII, 2 (665).
[57] FC I, XXVII, 3 (294).
[58] FC II, IX, 2 (401).
[59] FC III, XIV, 3 (656 – 7).
[60] V. Epp, *Fulcher von Chartres*, p. 236.
[61] FC I, VIII, 6 (172).
[62] FC I, VIII, 6 (172 – 3).
[63] FC I, VII, 5 (128).
[64] FC I, XVII, 7 (234 – 5).

challenge a raid by Il-Ghãzĩ, Fulcher reported that a procession took place of the king, the patriarch and the *plebs*, after which the king set forth while the *populus* returned to the city.[65]

Fulcher used the term *plebs* in a strongly theological context in his report of the speech of Urban II at the council of Clermont. Echoing Matthew 5:13, Fulcher had Urban urge the assembled clergy to 'salt' the *plebs idiota*, who otherwise would be drawn to the lusts of the world.[66] The uneducated *plebs* here seems to be a negative category of person for Fulcher. A more neutral use of the term *plebs* for the laity occurred in Fulcher's observation that in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem the priests and the minor order (*ordo*) of clergy were known as tribunes of the people (*tribuni plebis*).[67] In describing the consequences of an earthquake (29 November 1114) Fulcher wrote that many of the *plebs* died of suffocation in the ruins.[68]

The relatively few usages of the term *plebs* by Fulcher make it difficult to determine with precision its social content. Clearly Fulcher used it to cover a broad grouping of people, generally the laity and, at least in the case of the disorderly looting at Antioch, commoners.

Pedites

For the siege of Antioch and the battle between the Christian forces and Kerbogha Fulcher relied considerably on details supplied by the *Gesta Francorum*. In describing the negotiations between Peter the Hermit and Kerbogha, Fulcher wrote that 'indeed [Kerbogha's forces] knew our *milites* had become *pedites*, weak and poor.'[69] The *Gesta Francorum* at this point reported that Kerbogha offered to give wealth to the Christian forces so that they need not remain *pedites* but could become *milites*.[70] Although, therefore, Fulcher was clearly echoing the *Gesta Francorum*, nevertheless he was an eyewitness to the difficulties of the march of the united Christian army after the battle of Dorylaeum (1 July 1097) when he reported the loss of horses and, again echoing the *Gesta Francorum*, the use of oxen as mounts by some *milites*.[71] Similarly in his account of the march of Baldwin, count of Edessa and Bohemond, prince of Antioch to Jerusalem in the autumn of 1099, Fulcher, who was present, wrote that 'you would see noble *milites*, having lost their horses in some way, become *pedites*.'[72] In his formulation that *milites nobiles* could fall to the state of *pedites*, Fulcher therefore supplies important corroborative evidence that such a change in social

---

[65] FC III, IX, 4 (640).
[66] FC I, II, 5 (125).
[67] FC III, XXXIV, 10 (738).
[68] FC II, LII, 3 (579).
[69] FC I, XXI, 3 (249): *Nostros vero milites sciebant effici pedites, debiles, inopes.*
[70] GF 67.
[71] FC I, XIII, 3 (202). GF 23.
[72] FC I, XXXIII, 13 (331): *Videretis milites nobiles, equis quoquomodo amissis, pedites effici.*

position did take place on the First Crusade and also on the subsequent march of Baldwin and Bohemond to Jerusalem.

Most of Fulcher's other uses of the term are straightforwardly for the footsoldiers of the Christian army. He noted the *pedites* firing bows at the battle of Ascalon (11 August 1099).[73] One other passage of interest concerns the fall of Jerusalem. Fulcher wrote that the *pedites pauperiores* and *scutigeri* of the Christian army searched through the intestines of the dead for hidden bezants.[74] Fulcher was not an eyewitness, so this activity might be apocryphal, but the report gives clear evidence that Fulcher was aware of a differentiation within the category of *pedites*, with his identification of the poorer footsoldier.

Scutigeri, armigeri, clientela, clientes

The term *scutigeri* in the passage quoted directly above is an unusual one, not used by any other of the early crusading sources. It has troubled modern translators, with Martha McGinty opting for the literal 'shield bearers'[75] and F. R. Ryan for the more interesting 'squires.'[76] Hagenmeyer also considered Fulcher's use of the term *scutiger* to indicate a squire, without elaborating upon the point.[77] An 1114 charter for Valenciennes is helpful here.[78] The charter lists fines for different categories of person, placing a *scutifer* below an *armiger* but above a *burgensis*. It is assumed in the charter that a *scutifer* has a *dominus* and, unlike the *burgensis*, a right to trial by combat. It is perhaps worth noting that in the early twelfth century Valenciennes was under the control of the counts of Hainaut[79] and that Baldwin II count of Hainaut had accompanied Fulcher's lord, Baldwin of Boulogne on the First Crusade.[80] The language of the Lotharingians may have therefore affected Fulcher's own vocabulary. It might well be that Fulcher used the term to indicate someone who cared for horses, but was not in the same category of an *armiger*, with their prospect of becoming a knight. Such a differentiation would fit with his description of the *scutiferi* joining with the poorest footsoldiers in the scramble to search dead and burnt bodies in the hope of finding coins.

Fulcher used the term *armigeri* unambiguously for squires. He wrote that a few days before the first battle near Ramleh (6 September 1101) King Baldwin I 'ordered each one who

---

[73] FC I, XXXI, 7 (315).
[74] FC I, XXVIII, 1 (301 – 2).
[75] Fulcher of Chartres: *Chronicle of the First Crusade*, trans. M. E. McGinty (Philadelphia, 1941), p. 69.
[76] Fulcher of Chartres, *A history of the expedition to Jerusalem,* p. 122.
[77] FC 302 n. 3.
[78] *Charta Pacis Valencenensis*, *MGH SS* 21, 605 – 6.
[79] *MGH SS*, 21, 606.
[80] For Baldwin II, count of Hainaut, see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem* (Oxford, 2000), p. 186 – 7.

could to make a *miles* of his *armiger*.'[81] This is a significant report, not only for illustrating Fulcher's use of the term *armiger* but also for illustrating the fact that Fulcher considered the condition of a *miles* to be one that was achieved by promotion. In other words to be a *miles* was to occupy a social position, rather than simply being a mounted warrior. A similar passage confirms that this was Fulcher's understanding of the relationship between an *armiger* and a *miles*. Soon after the death of Nũr-ad-Daulah Belek, emir of Aleppo (5 May 1124) in battle with Joscelin of Courtenay, count of Edessa, a messenger came to the army of Pons, count of Tripoli,[82] with the head of Belek to proclaim the news. Fulcher reported that this messenger was the *armiger* of Joscelin and since he had brought such welcome news 'having received arms, he was advanced from *armiger* to *miles*. Indeed it was the Count of Tripoli who raised him to this *gradus*.'[83] This passage is even more clear-cut in showing that the position of a *miles* was a *gradus*, a social rank. It is also worth noting that the right to promote a squire to a knight was in the hands not only of the king of Jerusalem but also the count of Tripoli. One other mention of an *armiger* occurs in the *Historia Hierosolymitana*, but the passage is relatively uninformative, with Fulcher describing King Baldwin I's escape after a severe defeat at the second battle of Ramleh (17 May 1102) in the company of one knight and his *armiger*.[84]

Fulcher was untypical among the Crusading historians in his propensity to use the term *clientes*. He did so for persons engaged in a broad range of activities, usually associated with the lower ranks of the army, from baggage handler through to the personal followers of a prince, possibly knights. Fulcher often used the variation *clientelae* but it does not seem to represent any distinction of function, despite Hagenmeyer's suggestion that it was Fulcher's term of choice for those who minded the baggage and herds of an army.[85] In describing the journey of Baldwin I to take up the kingship of Jerusalem (25 October 1100), Fulcher, who was present, wrote that the beasts loaded with possessions preceded the army, driven by *clientes*.[86] Soon after, however, he described how the Christian fighting forces, having been victorious in an ambush, returned to the *clientela* who had been guarding the loaded animals.[87] In Fulcher's account of the retreat of Baldwin II from the siege of Aleppo (January 1125) the Christian forces were described as losing one *cliens* and six tents, indicating that the *cliens* was among the baggage train rather than the fighting forces.[88]

---

[81] FC II, XI, 2 (408 - 9): ... *quicumque potuit de armigero suo militem fecit.*
[82] Pons of Tripoli (c. 1098–1137), son of Bertrand of Tripoli and count of Tripoli from 1112 to 1137.
[83] FC III, XXXI, 7 (726): *Acceptis armis ab armigero in militem provectus est. Comes nempe Tripolitanus ad hunc gradum eum sublimavit.*
[84] FC II, XX, 1 (445).
[85] FC 363 n. 12; 792 n. 41; 726 n. 13.
[86] FC II, II, 5 (360).
[87] FC II, III, 3 (363).
[88] FC III, XXXIX, 3 (755).

The term *clientes* was more usually used in the *Historia Hierosolymitana* to indicate a section of the fighting forces distinct from the *milites*. In the wider medieval usage of the term, it covered a variety of positions, from vassal to squire to footsoldier.[89] Describing the seizure of Antioch by the Christian forces (3 June 1098), Fulcher, not an eyewitness, wrote that twenty *clientes* climbed up the walls on rope ladders.[90] There is no doubt these men were combatants, but can a more precise status be determined for them? In the *Gesta Francorum*, which Fulcher tended to follow at this point, one of these soldiers was described as a *serviens*, itself a term open to a variety of interpretations.[91] Other early crusading accounts of the same incident described the first men onto the walls of Antioch as *iuvenes*, that is, in its technical sense of a knight in the early part of his career, someone yet to establish a household.[92] When, in 1122, Baldwin II learned of incursions near Antioch he hurriedly departed for the city with 300 *milites lectissimi* and 400 *clientes probissimi*.[93] The division of *milites* and *clientes* here is suggestive of the common description of armies as consisting of knights and footsoldiers, but the close proportion between their numbers and the similar epithets indicate that Fulcher had in mind a grouping similar to the *milites* such as squires, *iuvenes* or hired knights; the latter is the view of Hagenmeyer.[94] A sense that Fulcher sometimes used the term *clientela* for hired military forces comes from his report in January 1124, that to raise money for a siege of Tyre and Ascalon, even the valuable ornaments of the Church of Jerusalem were used to obtain credit. Fulcher wrote that a large sum was collected to pay *militia* and *clientela*.[95] Here again the distinction between *clientela* and *clientes* is not consistent. *Clientela* were almost certainly combatants and not baggage handlers in Fulcher's report that in the battle between Baldwin II and Atabeg Tughtigin of Damascus (25 January 1126) 'our king conducted himself bravely on that day, together with all his *equitatus* and *clientela*.'[96] Similarly, casualties of a successful battle by Joscelin of Edessa against Nūr-ad-Daulah Belek, emir of Aleppo, in early 1124 near Manbij, included 30 *milites* and 60 *pedestris clientela*.[97] Again Fulcher wrote that when Joscelin, count of Edessa and Baldwin II fought Tancred near Edessa (September 1108), 500 of Tancred's *clientela* were killed; such a high figure suggests they were combatants.[98] Although in the first two of these cases, F. R. Ryan, striving for consistency, translated *clientela* as baggage handlers, it seems more likely that Fulcher himself was not

---

[89] Niermeyer, *Medival Latin Dictionary*, 1, 251.
[90] FC I, XVII, 5 (232 – 3).
[91] GF 46; Niermeyer, *Medival Latin Dictionary*, 2, 1255; see also above pp. 15 - 16.
[92] RM 800; GP 164-6; RC 654-5. For a discussion of *iuvenes* and the First Crusade see below Chapter II.3.
[93] FC III, XI, 4 (649).
[94] FC 649 n. 8.
[95] FC III, XXVII, 2 (694).
[96] FC III, L, 13 (791): *Optime se habuit rex noster in die illa, cum omni equitatu suo, nec non et clientela.*
[97] FC III, XXXI, 4 (725).
[98] FC II, XXVIII, 4 (480 – 1).

rigorous in his application of the term.[99] Other *clientes* displaying military activity were those fifty who were smuggled into Kharpurt (Hisn Ziyãd) to help the escape of Baldwin II and Joscelin of Edessa in August 1123.[100]

Fulcher also seems to have interchanged *clientela* and *clientes* in writing about servants. A Egyptian raid from Cairo that reached as far as Ramleh (16 May 1102) threatened the bishop, Robert,[101] and the *clientela* who stayed with him in the Church of St George.[102] After the escape from Kharpurt, Joscelin hid while his *cliens* brought an Armenian farmer back to his lord (*dominus*).[103] This same *cliens* was also described by Fulcher as being Joscelin's *famulus*.[104]

Familia, familiares

On two occasions Fulcher used the term *familia* for the retinue of a senior prince. In describing the losses of the William IX, duke of Aquitaine on the Crusade of 1101, Fulcher wrote that 'the Count of Poitou lost there whatever he had, his *familia* and money.'[105] On Joscelin of Edessa's return to Tell Bashir, in the second half of August 1123, Fulcher reported that the *familia* exulted.[106] Both these examples are likely to conform to the wider medieval use of the term for the mixed social status of the aggregate body of the household.[107]

The term *familiares* was used only once in the *Historia Hierosolymitana*, at the very end of Fulcher's work, when he reported that in 1125 Baldwin II redeemed his daughter, Iveta, and several of his *familiares* for a cash payment.[108] These were likely to be relatively high status members of his household, important enough to feature in the negotiations between Baldwin II and Aksungur al-Bursukĩ, emir of Mosul.

Equestres, equites, milites

Verena Epp made a detailed examination of Fulcher's use of the term *milites* as part of her overall study of the historian. Her analysis of Fulcher's use of the term found that in approximately half the passages in which the term *milites* appeared it was associated with a

---

[99] Fulcher of Chartres, *A history of the expedition to Jerusalem,* p. 291 and p. 263.
[100] III, XXIII, 3 (678); III, XXIII, 4 (679).
[101] Robert of Rouen, Norman priest and possibly former chaplain to Duke Robert of Normandy, created Bishop of Ramleh soon after its capture by the forces of the First Crusade (3 June 1099). See J. Riley-Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 221.
[102] FC II, XV, 3 (426 – 7).
[103] FC III, XXIV, 5 (683).
[104] FC III, XXIV, 4 (683).
[105] FC II, XVI, 5 (432): *Illic perdidit comes Pictavensis quaecumque habebat, familiam suam atque pecuniam.* For William IX, duke of Aquitaine, count of Poitou see FC 429 n. 4; see also J. Riley-Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 225.
[106] FC III, XXIV, 13 (686).
[107] J. Niermeyer *Medival Latin Dictionary*, I, 535 – 6.
[108] FC III, XLIV, 2 (770). Iveta, later Abbess of the Convent of St. Lazarus at Bethany (WT XVIII, 27; XXI, 2), see also FC 770 n. 6.

social dimension and of the other half, she found *milites* to be equally often used for a soldier in general and for a mounted soldier.[109] A typical report of this nature would be, for example, Fulcher's description of a potential ambush set against Baldwin, count of Edessa, on his journey to Jerusalem in October 1100, in which he wrote that 'truly only four of our *milites* lost their life.'[110] Many other appearances of the term *milites* are statements that straightforwardly describe the military activities of Christian knights.[111] Is it right, however, to make such a separation? Did Fulcher sometimes use *milites* to indicate 'knights', that is, members of a certain social rank, but at other times to simply mean 'soldiers' without any connotation as to their social status? As Epp herself observed, for Fulcher the functional and social sense of the term *milites* frequently overlapped. It would perhaps be imposing an artificial distinction to assume that in examples where *milites* are described as fighting Fulcher intended to convey only the meaning 'soldiers' rather than 'knights.'[112]

Crucial evidence that Fulcher considered *milites* to be of a particular social rank is that provided by his descriptions of the promotion of *armigeri*, 'squires', to *milites*. As discussed above, in Fulcher's report of the elevation of the *armiger* of Joscelin soon after the death of Nūr-ad-Daulah Belek (5 May 1124), the squire is described as being raised to the *gradus* of a *miles*.[113] Fulcher also provided important evidence that a *miles* could lose this rank and become a *pedes* through the loss of his mount. Fulcher's account of the negotiations between Peter the Hermit and Kerbogha has been discussed above with regard to *pedites*.[114] He wrote that the Turkish forces knew that the Christian *milites* had become *pedites*, weak and poor.[115] Fulcher was not present with the main body of Christian forces at this point and was clearly basing his report of the negotiations on his reading of Kerbogha's purported offer in the *Gesta Francorum*, which was that none need remain *pedites* but through his generosity they could become *milites*.[116] Whether or not Kerbogha made such a reference, Fulcher's repetition of the point shows that for the historian at least, it was understood that *milites* could become *pedites*. As we have seen, the same idea was present in Fulcher's report that during the march of Baldwin of Edessa and Bohemond of Antioch to Jerusalem in the autumn of 1099, *milites nobiles*, having lost their horses, became *pedites*.[117] This passage has greater

---

[109] V. Epp, *Fulcher von Chartres*, p. 251.
[110] FC II, II, 3 (359): *De nostris vero IV milites vitam amiserunt.*
[111] FC I, XVII, 5 (233); I, XXIV, 10 (263); I, XXVII, 6 (296); I, XXXI, 5 (314); II, II, 3 (359); II, II, 5 (361); II, III, 2 (363); II, VI, 9 (389); II, IX, 2 (402); II, XI, 2 (408); II, XI, 14 (414); II, XVIII, 7 (440); II, XXXII, 2 (495); II, XXXII, 3 (496); II, XXXVII, 3 (517); II, XLIII, 4 (540); II, XLV, 8 (556); II, XLVI, 3 (560); II, XLIX, 5 (569); III, XXVIII, 4 (698); III, XXXI, 4 (725); III, XLIV, 4 (769); III, L, 8 (789).
[112] V. Epp, *Fulcher von Chartres*, p. 251.
[113] FC III, XXXI, 7 (726); see above p. 57.
[114] See above p. 61.
[115] FC I, XXI, 3 (249): *Nostros vero milites sciebant effici pedites, debiles, inopes.*
[116] GF 67.
[117] FC I, XXXIII, 13 (331); see above p. 61.

importance than that concerning the alleged offer of Kerbogha. From it Verena Epp drew the conclusion that since Fulcher described some *milites* as being *nobiles* the implication was that there were other *milites* present who were not *nobiles*.[118] Whilst this is a possible understanding of the passage, another is that Fulcher was simply emphasising that the harsh conditions were such that even senior knights fell to the condition of *pedites*. Fulcher's first redaction of 1105 seems to bear out this view as instead of *milites nobiles* he wrote of *milites progenie inclyti*, 'knights of illustrious ancestry', becoming *pedites*.[119] Exactly the same issue arises with a second, similar, passage: Fulcher's lament for the loss of many '*nobiles* and *probos milites*,' at the second battle of Ramleh (17 May 1102).[120] Again Epp observed of this passage that it implied there were other losses of non-noble *milites*.[121] This is a possibility, but equally the more simple explanation of its meaning was that Fulcher was trying to emphasise that certain senior princes had been killed; in other words his intended distinction might not have been between noble and non-noble *milites* but between *milites* and very distinguished princes, all of whom were noble. That this was Fulcher's intended meaning is suggested by the fact that immediately after this general lament he recorded the deaths of Count Stephen of Blois, a *vir prudens et nobilis* and Count Stephen of Burgundy.[122] One further passage concerning *milites* is significant in discussing whether Fulcher considered them to be always of a high social status. When the army of Jerusalem marched out to meet an invasion by al-Afdal, vizier of Cairo (27 August 1105), Fulcher, an eyewitness, wrote that 'there were 500 of our *milites*, excepting those who, although riding, were not counted with the name of a *miles*.'[123] Hagenmeyer discussed this unusual phrase and plausibly suggested that Fulcher was drawing a distinction between those of noble birth, who were counted as *milites* and the others, who were perhaps squires.[124] Even if Hagenmeyer's view is not accepted, this passage does show that Fulcher did not extend his use of the term *milites* down a social or military scale beyond a certain point. They were a group apart, in some sense other than riding horses. While it is not possible to prove that for Fulcher all *milites* were necessarily noble, neither has the opposite proposition, that he used the term *milites* for non-nobles, been satisfactorily established.

By including Fulcher's use of the term *equites* in this discussion, something neglected by Epp, it is possible to focus more accurately on Fulcher's meaning for the terms. That Fulcher considered it possible to use the terms *milites* and *equites* synonymously was shown

---

[118] V. Epp, *Fulcher von Chartres*, p. 256.
[119] FC I, XXXIII, 13 (331 d).
[120] FC II, XIX, 4 (443).
[121] V. Epp, *Fulcher von Chartres*, p. 257.
[122] FC II, XIX, 4 (443).
[123] FC II, XXXII, 3 (496): *Milites nostri erant D, exceptis illis, qui militari nomine non censebantur, tamen equitantes.*
[124] FC 496 n. 9.

in his description of an expedition of King Baldwin II in 1125. Fulcher initially referred to the *equites* of the king and soon after the same body of knights were termed *milites*.[125] In fact when Fulcher wished to describe an army as consisting of knights and footsoldiers he tended to refer to *equites* and *pedites*.[126] In a critical passage Fulcher indicated that the distinction between an *eques* and a *pedes* was not simply that of a soldier on horse and a soldier on foot.[127] In Fulcher's account of Pope Urban II's speech at Clermont he described the pope asking his audience to urge 'everyone of whatever *ordo*, whether *equites* or *pedites*, *divites* or *pauperes*' to join the expedition.[128] Here Fulcher made it clear that the distinction between knight and footsoldier mirrored that of rich and poor: it was a distinction of rank, of *ordo*. This distinction was so important to the *equites* of the First Crusade that Fulcher observed that due to the loss of horses in the difficult march after the battle of Dorylaeum (1 July 1097) *equites* sometimes mounted on oxen.[129]

Did the description, discussed above, of *milites* becoming *pedites* due to the loss of their horses, contradict the view that Fulcher saw the *milites* as being of a certain social status? Fulcher made it clear that the change was a temporary one in his description of the very many *milites* who were in Joppa in May 1102 awaiting to cross to France. These *milites* had no horses because they had lost everything in Anatolia, on their way to Jerusalem (a reference to the Crusade of 1101).[130] For this large body of *milites* in Joppa, no longer part of a campaigning army, their lack of horses did not mean they were termed *pedites*. Fulcher went on to report that many of them, including the very senior nobles Geoffrey I Jordan, count of Vendôme, Stephen, count of Burgundy and Hugh VI of Lusignan, borrowed horses in order to fight in the second battle of Ramleh (17 May 1102).[131] The fact that this body of men were termed *milites* whilst awaiting return on foot to France does make their distinct social status, rather than their function, evident here.

Fulcher used the term *equestres* only once, in 1118, for those knights in the company of Baldwin I at the Nile near al-Faramā', where they were described as skilfully using their

---

[125] FC III, XLVI 2 and 3 (773).
[126] FC I, III, 4 (134); I, VIII, 6 (172 –3); I, XI, 5 (193); I, XXI, 3 (249); I, XXXI, 7 (315); I, XXXIII, 8 (328); II, II, 6 (364); II, XV, 1 (425); II, XVI, 3 (431); II, XXXI, 1 (490); II, XXXI, 11 (493); II, XXXII, 11 (500); III, II, 1 (618); III, XI, 2 (647 – 8); III, XXXI, 1 (722); III, XXXI, 4 (725); III, L, 12 (791); III, L, 15 (793).
[127] Epp considers that Fulcher used *eques* to indicate a person defined by their function as a horseman. V. Epp, *Fulcher von Chartres*, p. 252.
[128] FC I, III, 4 (134): *Cunctis cuiuslibet ordinis tam equitibus quam peditibus, tam divitibus quam pauperibus ...*
[129] FC XIII, 3 (202).
[130] FC II, XV, 6 (427 - 8).
[131] FC II, XVIII, 4 (437 – 8). For these princes see J. Riley-Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 207 (Geoffrey); p. 222 (Stephen) and p. 213 (Hugh).

lances to spear fish.[132] The context makes it clear that these *equestres* were not simply riders, as Fulcher considered them to be *equestres* even while dismounted and fishing.

Fulcher described several prominent individuals with the term *miles*. Walter Sanzavohir (whom Fulcher termed *Walterus, Sine Pecunia cognomine dictus*) was a *miles peroptimus*;[133] Anselm of Ribemont, a *miles strenuus*; Baldwin of Boulogne, a *miles optimus*; Tancred, a *miles prudens et probus*[134] and Count Raymond of Toulouse, a *miles emeritus*.[135] This list shows that Fulcher, like all the early crusading historians, included very senior princes in the category of *milites*.

On balance, this dissertation is inclined to the view that Fulcher did, in fact, use the terms *milites*, *equites* and *equestres* to indicate a distinct social *ordo* or *gradus*, that of 'knights', rather than simply use the terms with a functional sense of 'soldier'. Epp's view that Fulcher made indirect reference to non-noble *milites* when he singled out the activity or losses of *milites nobiles* is a possible one, but unreliable given that there are no direct examples of Fulcher using the term in such a way.

Optimates, proceres, principes, barones, maiores, domini, nobiles

The term *optimates* was one that Fulcher initially applied to the senior princes of the First Crusade. In his early version of the *Historia Hierosolymitana* Fulcher wrote that the *optimates* of the Franks at the battle against Kerbogha (28 June 1098) were Hugh the Great, Robert, duke of Normandy, Robert, count of Flanders, Duke Godfrey, Count Raymond of Toulouse, Bohemond and many other *nobiles*.[136] In his second redaction, however, Fulcher preferred to substitute the term *principes* for *optimates* and change 'many other *nobiles*' to 'many other lesser [princes].'[137] The effect of this change was twofold. The later version made it clear that Fulcher saw a gap in status between the senior princes and other nobles of the First Crusade. It also meant that his use of the term *optimates* became consistently and solely for the prominent nobles of the Kingdom of Jerusalem who were involved in the decision making of the kingdom. In 1108 *optimates* intervened in the warfare between Tancred, then lord of Antioch and temporarily of Edessa, and the recently released Count Baldwin of Bourcq, former lord of Edessa, with his ally Joscelin of Courtney, then lord of Turbessel. The *optimates* of the land led the princes back to harmony.[138] Similarly Fulcher reported that it was the *optimates* whose words convinced Pons of Tripoli to restore friendly

---

[132] FC II, LXIV, 1 (610).
[133] FC I, VI, 8 (159). For Walter Sanzavohir of Poissy see J. Riley-Smith, *First Crusaders* p. 224.
[134] FC II, VII, 1 (393).
[135] FC II, XXX, 1 (484).
[136] FC I, XXII, 1 (251).
[137] FC 251 n. a; n. g: *multi alii minores tamen horum.*
[138] FC II, XXVIII, 5 (481).

relations with King Baldwin II of Jerusalem (1122).[139] Again, following the capture of Baldwin II (18 April, 1123), it was Gormond, the patriarch of Jerusalem and the *optimates* of the land who elected Eustace Granarius, lord of Caesarea and Sidon as regent.[140] In 1126 Bohemond II of Antioch made an agreement with Duke William of Apulia that each would be the heir to the other. This was done with the *optimates* of both princes bearing witness.[141] In mid September 1126 Bohemond II was formally enthroned as prince of Antioch and all his *optimates* vowed obedience to him.[142] In all these instances Fulcher seems to have used the term *optimates* when he wished to describe senior magnates playing a legalistic, formal role. He used the term outside of a legal context in only one instance. Before the army of Jerusalem marched out to meet an invasion by al-Afdal, vizier of Cairo (27 August 1105), Fulcher, an eyewitness, wrote that the *optimates* went to Evremar, the patriarch of Jerusalem, to be absolved of their sins and, echoing Ovid, 'to hear some healing words from him.'[143]

The term *proceres* was also a popular one for Fulcher. Although he used it generally for senior nobles, he seems to have favoured using the term in a military context. At the battle of Dorylaeum (1 July 1097) Fulcher wrote of *proceres nostri* resisting until support could arrive. Those senior princes so termed were Duke Robert of Normandy, Stephen of Blois, Robert of Flanders and Bohemond.[144] Fulcher commented on the banners of the *proceres* at the battle against Kerbogha (28 June 1098).[145] It was on the signal of the *proceres*, said Fulcher, that the Christian forces attempted to storm Jerusalem in their initial, unsuccessful, assault (13 June 1099).[146] At the battle of Ascalon (11 August 1099) Fulcher wrote that Duke Godfrey and the other *proceres* advanced, some in the first line, others in the second.[147] Marching out to the disastrous battle at the 'Field of Blood' (28, June, 1119) were Roger, prince of Antioch, together with his *proceres*.[148] By way of preparing his readers for the

---

[139] FC III, XI, 2 (648).
[140] FC III, XVI, 2 (660). For Eustace Granarius, see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem*, pp. 193 – 4, see also FC 660 n. 7. For Gormond of Picquigny, patriarch of Jerusalem (1118 – 1128) see FC 625 n. 6.
[141] FC III, LVII, 2 (807). Bohemond II, prince of Antioch (1126 – 1130), son of Bohemond I and Constance of France, m. Alice, daughter of Baldwin II. William, duke of Apulia (1111- 1127), son of Roger Borsa, duke of Apulia (1085 – 1111).
[142] FC III, LXI, 5 (822).
[143] FC II, XXXII, 1 (495): ... *optimates verbum aliquod salubre ab eo audire.* Here Fulcher was associating the blessings of the patriarch with the restorative powers of Aesculapius' *verba salubria* in Ovid's *Fasti* 6: 735. For Evremar's troubled, interrupted, patriarchate (1102 - 8) and subsequent career as archbishop of Caesarea (1108 – 1129) see B. Hamilton, *The Latin Church in the Crusader States*, (London, 1980), pp. 56 – 7.
[144] FC I, XI, 10 (197).
[145] FC I, XXII, 4 (253).
[146] FC I, XXVII, 2 (294).
[147] FC I, XXXI, 6 (314- 5).
[148] FC III, III, 2 (621). Roger of Salerno, son of Richard of Salerno, member of the Apulian contingent of the First Crusade. Roger was the 'son of the sister of Tancred' according to Albert of Aachen (AA 832) and ruler of Antioch 1113 – 1119. He was married to Cecilia of Bourcq, sister of King Baldwin II.

defeat of the Christian forces, Fulcher explained that Roger of Antioch and his *proceres* were living arrogantly and wantonly.[149] An attack by a united Christian army on Egyptian forces besieging Joppa (30 May 1123) was conducted by an assembly of Christian forces in the absence of King Baldwin II, who was in captivity at the time. Fulcher wrote that it was *nostri proceres* who drew up the battle formation of the Christians.[150] The two other uses of the term *proceres* in the *Historia Hierosolymitana* were not in a direct military context, although they were both concerned with the consequence of military action. Fulcher reported that on the fall of Nicea (19 June 1097) the Byzantine Emperor, Alexius I Comnenus, gave gifts to *nostri proceres*.[151] When Baldwin II came to Antioch (18 August 1119) to deal with the consequences of the catastrophic Christian defeat at the 'Field of Blood', among other duties, he made judgements concerning the granting of the lands of the *proceres* who had died in that battle.[152]

Fulcher changed the term *optimates* to *principes* in his revision of the *Historia Hierosolymitana* when he listed the leaders of the Christian forces entering battle against Kerbogha.[153] This was the passage discussed above in which he also changed the phrase 'many other *nobiles*' to 'many other lesser [princes].'[154] So the later version reads: 'The *principes* of the Franks were: Hugh the Great, Robert, count [sic] of Normandy, Robert, count of Flanders, Duke Godfrey, Count Raymond [of Toulouse], Bohemond and many other lesser princes.'[155] The point of the change seems to have been to reserve the term *optimates* for the body of nobles in the Kingdom of Jerusalem who featured in decision-making. The revision also made a distinction between the senior princes and lesser princes. Fulcher was thus consistent in using the term *principes* for very senior nobles. When Fulcher reported on the first contingents to depart on the 'pilgrimage' he listed a number of *principes*. These were Hugh the Great, Bohemond, Godfrey, duke of Lotharingia, Count Raymond of Toulouse and Bishop Adhémar of Le Puy.[156] When he reported the arrival of Robert, duke of Normandy and Stephen of Blois at the siege of Nicea, early in May 1097, Fulcher described them as *nostri principes*.[157] The leaders of the expedition resolving upon co-operation for the siege of Antioch, which began on 21 October 1097, were also termed *nostri principes*.[158] In the battle against Kerbogha Fulcher twice referred to the banners of the leaders, the first time describing

---

See also Walter the Chancellor's *The Antiochene Wars*, ed. and trans. T. S. Asbridge and S. B. Edgington (Aldershot, 1999), pp. 12 – 26.

[149] FC III, III, 4 (623 - 4).
[150] FC III, XVIII, 3 (665).
[151] FC I, X, 10 (188).
[152] FC III, VII, 1 (634).
[153] See above p. 69.
[154] FC 251 n. a; n. g: *multi alii minores tamen horum.*
[155] FC I, XXII, 1 (251).
[156] FC I, VI, 3 (154).
[157] FC I, X, 1 (181).
[158] FC I, XV, 5 (218).

them as *signa procerum nostrum*,[159] the second *vexilla principum nostrum*.[160] The change was made simply for Fulcher to avoid repetition, but is helpful in showing that for the historian *proceres* and *principes* were synonymous. Fulcher again referred to all the leaders of the First Crusade as *principes* with regard to their movements in and around Antioch in November 1098.[161] Those leaders of the expedition at the time of its arrival at Jerusalem (6 June 1099) who ordered the construction of ladders were termed *principes*.[162] Baldwin of Edessa and Bohemond of Antioch on their march to Jerusalem (January 1100) were termed *principes*.[163]

Fulcher also used the term *princeps* in a legalistic manner, as the formal title of a ruler. After the departure of Bohemond from Antioch to Apulia in the autumn of 1104, Fulcher accorded Tancred the title of '*princeps* of Antioch.'[164] Roger of Antioch was termed *princeps* of the city three times by Fulcher.[165] When Bohemond II was enthroned at Antioch, late in October 1126, he was made *princeps* of the city.[166] When Godfrey became ruler of Jerusalem (23 July 1099) Fulcher described him as *princeps regni*.[167] Similarly, Fulcher reported that following the death of Godfrey, ruler of Jerusalem (18 July 1100), a message was sent to his brother, Baldwin of Edessa stating that all the people of Jerusalem expected him to be the *princeps regni*.[168] The wording was almost certainly deliberate. Although Fulcher wrote in the knowledge that Baldwin had taken the title of *rex* of Jerusalem (11 November 1100), he was well aware that Godfrey had not and at this point the issue was still a contentious one.[169]

Fulcher described the departure of the First Crusade from Nicea at the end of June 1097 by writing that '*nostri barones*' received permission from the Byzantine Emperor Alexius I to depart.[170] Quite apart from the interesting implication that Fulcher saw Alexius as having authority over the expedition at this point, his use of the term *barones* for the crusading princes was unusual. Its use was not particularly common in the early twelfth century and none of the other early crusading historians used the term. Fulcher himself used *barones* only this once, in his first redaction of the *Historia Hierosolymitana*, although he clearly found the term unproblematic as he retained it in the later version of his work.[171]

---

[159] FC I, XXII, 4 (253).
[160] FC I, XXII, 6 (253).
[161] FC I, XXV, 1 (266).
[162] FC I, XXVII, 1 (293).
[163] FC I, XXXIV, 2 (335).
[164] FC II, XXX, 2 (486).
[165] FC II, LIII, 2 (582); III, III, 2 (621); III, VII, 1 (635). For Roger of Antioch see above n. 148.
[166] FC III, LXI, 4 (822). For Bohemond II of Antioch see above n. 141.
[167] FC I, XXX, (308).
[168] FC II, I, 1 (353).
[169] For Fulcher on kingship see above pp. 55 - 6. For references to secondary literature on the title of 'King of Jerusalem' see n. 27.
[170] FC I, XI, 1 (189).
[171] FC 189 n. e.

Another rare term for the senior princes of the First Crusade for Fulcher, although this time a relatively common one in other early crusading sources, was *maiores*. Fulcher used the term just once, when explaining that Bohemond and Count Raymond of Toulouse were the *maiores* of the army on its march from Antioch to Ma'arat-an-Numan (November 1098), because the other *principes* remained in the region of Antioch. Although nearly synonymous with *principes*, Fulcher here seems to be giving a functional quality to the term *maiores*, that of leadership.[172]

Fulcher used the term *dominus* as a title for a particular senior prince and not for a social grouping of lords. Those so termed in the *Historia Hierosolymitana* were Baldwin of Boulogne;[173] Bohemond I Taranto;[174] Joscelin of Courtnay[175] and Tancred.[176]

Fulcher tended to indicate noble birth by means of the adjective *nobilis*. A very limited number of individuals mentioned in the *Historia Hierosolymitana* were given the epithet 'noble' or 'most noble'. These were Matilda, Countess of Tuscany, a *nobilissima matrona*;[177] Count Stephen of Blois, a *vir probissimus et valde nobilis*,[178] and a *vir prudens et nobilis*;[179] Duke Godfrey of Lotharingia, who on his election as ruler of Jerusalem, was described as having *nobilitas*[180] and Stephen, count of Burgundy.[181] Although these individuals were of very high social position, Fulcher seems to have used the term *nobiles* in such as way as to also include nobles outside the ranks of the most senior princes. In describing the journey of the contingent of Duke Robert of Normandy in 1096, Fulcher wrote that it was accompanied by Stephen, count of Blois, and Robert, count of Flanders and many other *nobiles*.[182] As has been discussed above, in his early version of the *Historia Hierosolymitana* Fulcher wrote that the *optimates* of the Franks at the battle against Kerbogha (28 June 1098) were: Hugh the Great, Robert, duke of Normandy, Robert, count of Flanders, Duke Godfrey, Count Raymond of Toulouse, Bohemond and many other *nobiles*.[183] Fulcher's later revision of this passage made the distinction between *principes* and *minores principes* rather than *optimates* and other *nobiles*. This was probably because in later life Fulcher had a

---

[172] FC I, XXV, 2 (266).
[173] FC I, XIV, 2 (206); I, XXXIII, 1 (323); I. XXXIV 6 (341); II, II, 2 (359); II, IV, 1 (370); II, XXVIII, 1 (477).
[174] FC I, XXXIII, 1 (322); II, VII, 1 (393); II, XXVII, 2 (470), 5 (474); II, XXVIII, 3 (479); II, XXXVIII, 2 (521); III, XXXIV, 16 (741).
[175] FC II, XXVII, 4 (473); III, XXIV, 2 (681).
[176] FC II, XXVII, 5 (474).
[177] FC I, V, 5 (149). Matilda, margravine of Tuscany (1046 – 1114), daughter and heiress of the Marquess Boniface of Tuscany, m. Godfrey III, duke of Lower Lotharingia, supporter and patron of Gregorian reformers. See also I. S. Robinson, *The Papal Reform of the Eleventh Century* (Manchester, 2004), pp 45 – 50.
[178] FC I, XVI, 7 (228).
[179] FC II, XIX, 4 (443).
[180] FC I, XXX, 1 (307).
[181] FC II, XVI, 1 (430). For Count Stephen I of Burgundy see J. Riley-Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 222.
[182] FC I, VI, 8 (161).
[183] FC I, XXII, 1 (251).

distinct understanding of the term *optimates*.[184] He preserved the sense of there being a distinction between the senior princes and a wider body of nobles, these latter originally being referred to as *nobiles*. As we have seen, Fulcher was prepared to apply the term *nobiles* to *milites*, in emphasising that during the march of Baldwin of Edessa and Bohemond of Antioch to Jerusalem in the autumn of 1099, it was *milites nobiles*, who became *pedites*, having lost their horses.[185] Similarly Fulcher lamented for the loss of many *nobiles* and *probi milites* at the second battle of Ramleh (17 May 1102).[186] In both cases he probably did so to emphasise that among the *milites* so described were figures of very high status.

Fulcher of Chartres was a relatively terse author, given to succinct accounts of events without significant literary flourishes or extemporisation; nevertheless his work does convey a considerable amount of social information concerning the First Crusade and the early period of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem. It is notable that Fulcher had a more sophisticated and consistent vocabulary for the higher social orders than the poor. He was unusual in the early crusading sources in lumping together the non-combatant poor with the footsoldiers as *minores*. Fulcher's interest in writing about the condition of the poor was particularly directed towards illustrating to potential settlers in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem that the lower orders had benefited from their participation in the First Crusade.

---

[184] See above p. 69.
[185] FC I, XXXIII, 13 (331): *Videretis milites nobiles, equis quoquomodo amissis, pedites effici.*
[186] FC II, XIX, 4 (443).

I.4. Albert of Aachen's *Historia Iherosolimitana*

The Text

The *Historia Iherosolimitana* of Albert of Aachen has been restored to prominence as a very important source for the First Crusade, in large part due to the work of Peter Knoch and Susan B. Edgington.[1] Although not an eyewitness account, the strength of Albert's history is that it is rich with vivid descriptions, supplying a great amount of detail that makes the other sources appear sparse in comparison. It is a substantial work that covers the period from the initiation of the Crusade, ascribed to the itinerant preacher, Peter the Hermit, through to 1119.[2] It is around 128,000 words long, in comparison to the 20,000 words of the *Gesta Francorum*.[3]

The reason for the relative obscurity of this important text relates to the quality of printed editions available to historians. There are thirteen surviving manuscripts and a surviving record of a fourteenth that was destroyed in 1940. R. Reineck published the first edition of the work in Helmstedt (1584) under the title *Chronicon Hierosolmitanum.* Edgington has demonstrated that this edition is unsatisfactory. It was based on a, now lost, manuscript that can be shown to have been relatively distant from the archetype; the edition contained an unclear combination of material from other manuscripts and also probable 'corrections' by the editor.[4] The Reineck edition was nevertheless used by J. Bongars in his 1611 *Gesta Dei per Francos*,[5] which in turn was the version used by J. P. Migne in 1854 for volume 166 of the *Patrologia Latina*. P. Meyer took a new approach for the 1879 volume of the *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades.* He listed nine manuscripts as the basis for his edition.[6] Unfortunately, as Edgington puts it, 'his manuscript descriptions have so many

---

[1] P. Knoch, *Studien zu Albert von Aachen* (Stuttgart, 1966); S. B. Edgington, *The 'Historia Iherosolimitana' of Albert of Aachen, a critical edition* (unpublished PhD. thesis: University of London, 1991), hereafter AA; S. B. Edgington, 'The First Crusade: reviewing the evidence', *The First Crusade, Origins and Impact*, ed. J. Phillips (Manchester, 1997), pp. 55 – 77; S. B. Edgington, 'Albert of Aachen reappraised', *From Clermont to Jerusalem* ed. A. V. Murray (Turnhout, 1998), pp. 55 – 68.
[2] For Peter the Hermit see J. Flori, *Pierre l'Ermite et la Première Croisade* (Paris, 1999); see also H. Hagenmeyer, *Peter der Eremite* (Leipzig, 1879); E. O. Blake and C. Morris. 'A hermit goes to war: Peter and the origins of the First Crusade,' *Studies in Church History* 22 (1984), pp 79 - 107; M. D. Coupe, 'Peter the Hermit – A reassessment,' *Nottingham Medieval Studies 31* (1987), pp. 37 – 45 and below pp. 198 - 201.
[3] S. B. Edgington, 'Albert of Aachen reappraised', p. 55.
[4] AA 71 – 2.
[5] J. Bongars, *Gesta Dei per Francos* (Hanover, 1611) 1, 184 – 381.
[6] *RHC Oc.* 4, xxviii - xxix.

errors that it would appear that he did not even look critically at most of them.'[7] Her conclusion was that the text in the *RHC* is not sound and overly dependent upon Reineck.[8] Thus the two editions most easily available to modern historians are, in fact, unreliable, which considerably affects the great amount of scholarly debate that has taken place over the value of Albert's work to the history of the First Crusade. Susan Edgington's carefully constructed PhD. edition (1991) is therefore the one used for this study.[9]

The *Historia Iherosolimitana* was written in twelve books by one person, whom historians refer to as Albert of Aachen on the basis of a thirteenth century introductory sentence to one of the manuscripts.[10] The first six books form a distinct unity in style and framework, as they narrate the history of the First Crusade. Thereafter the work becomes more like a chronicle and continues up to 1119. It is on the basis of this clear distinction in style that Edgington and Knoch have argued that completion of the first part of the work should be considered separately from the second six books. They have dated the completion of the first six books to soon after 1102. Knoch dated the prologue of the work as being written 1100 – 1101, 'with some probability', then books I –VI were, 'evidently written in one flow of literary activity', in 1102 or soon after. Edgington made a similar case, seeing the author's original intention as rounding off the work with the victory of the Christians over al-Afdal, vizier of Egypt (12 August 1099).[11] This perception, that the first six books were written up shortly after the events they described, represents something of a revolution. Earlier historians saw the *Historia Iherosolimitana* as a much later work, with Steven Runciman, for example, dating it to around the 1130s, nonetheless relying heavily on it for his famous narrative of the crusades.[12]

In his prologue Albert wrote that despite his own wish to join those making the journey to Jerusalem, various obstacles prevented him from participating, so, 'with reckless daring I have decided to commend to *memoria* at least some of those things which became known from hearing and the narration of those who were present.'[13] This statement confirms the evidence of the text, which suggests that Albert was basing his history on the reports of returning crusaders. The songs that had rapidly been composed about the events of the First Crusade also attracted the attention of Albert and were incorporated into his work. In particular the Old French epic, the *Chanson d'Antioche*, has descriptions of events that are

---

[7] AA 75.
[8] AA 76.
[9] An edition of this has long been forthcoming from Oxford Medieval Texts, but at present only the PhD. edition is available.
[10] AA 5 – 6.
[11] Knoch, *Studien zu Albert von Aachen*, p. 89; AA 9.
[12] S. Runciman, *A History of the Crusades*, 3 (fifth edition: London, 1991), 1, 331.
[13] AA 85: *Temerario ausu decreui saltem ex hiis aliqua memorie commendare que auditu et relatione nota fierent ab hiis qui presentes affuissent.*

sufficiently closely related to passages in the *Historia Iherosolimitana* for the most recent editor to regard it to have been one of Albert's unwritten sources.[14] Robert Cook has argued that in fact the relationship is the other way around, based on an analysis that places the dating of the *Chanson* to the late twelfth century.[15] Edgington was not convinced by this argument, however, finding it hard to accept that a source richer in incidents came before the sparser version.[16] John France sided with Edgington on this question and gave a formulation that this study considers to be correct, which is that 'Albert selected material which he heard in recitations and used it and that some of this was incorporated into the *Chanson*, often in slightly different form.'[17]

Even more disputed is Albert's relationship to written sources. Knoch follows Heinrich Hagenmeyer in making the case for Albert having been aware of the *Gesta Francorum* or some close variant.[18] This would have the important consequence of proving that the *Gesta Francorum* was indeed written at a very early date, for it to have reached Lotharingia by 1102. Unfortunately the textual comparisons are insufficient to establish the connection with complete confidence. Susan Edgington firmly rejects the connection (and also that suggested by Hagenmeyer between Albert of Aachen's work and Fulcher of Chartres' *Historia Hierosolymitana*), writing that such a claim 'cannot be sustained – it requires Albert to have used such tiny fragments and ignored so much else in the narratives.'[19]

There has been a long tradition of assuming that Albert of Aachen used a now missing source.[20] Peter Knoch's study of Albert of Aachen brought a great innovation and also contention into the debate, when he gave a detailed comparison of the *Historia Iherosolimitana* with the *Chronicon* of William, archbishop of Tyre (c.1130 – 85). It is commonly taken for granted that William of Tyre wrote his history, set down in final form around 1184, with a copy of Albert's work to hand. There are very many passages in the *Chronicon* that seem to be taken directly out of the *Historia Iherosolimitana*. However Knoch's new textual comparison showed important differences between the two. His conclusion was that the two writers were both using a now missing source, written in the summer of 1098, soon after the victory over Kerbogha, atabeg of Mosul (28 June 1098).[21] Susan Edgington, however, rejected the argument for this source. John France believed her

---

[14] S. Duparc-Quioc, 'La Composition de la *Chanson d'Antioche*', *Romania* 83 (1962), pp. 1 – 29 and 210 – 47; *La Chanson d'Antioche*, ed. S. Duparc-Quioc, 2 (Paris, 1977) 2, 148 – 70.
[15] R. F. Cook, *'Chanson d'Antioche', Chanson de Geste: le Cycle de la Croisade est-il épique?* (Amsterdam, 1980), pp. 40 – 45 and 49 – 69.
[16] AA 11 – 15, repeated in S. B. Edgington, 'The First Crusade: reviewing the evidence', p. 62 - 3.
[17] John France, *Victory in the East* (Cambridge, 1994), p. 379.
[18] Knoch, *Studien zu Albert von Aachen*, p. 69 –71. *Anonymi Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum*, ed. H. Hagenmeyer (Heidelberg, 1890), p. 62 – 68.
[19] AA 11.
[20] Summarised, AA 17 – 21.
[21] Knoch, *Studien zu Albert von Aachen*, pp. 36 – 63.

'demolition' of the argument to be so convincing that we have been 'freed from the tyranny' of the lost source.[22] A more cautionary position on the missing source debate is taken here. Part of Edgington's argument is that Knoch was limited in his analysis by the use of the flawed *RHC* edition. However this does not undermine Knoch's case as all the excerpts he cited still stand in Edgington's edition with only irrelevant differences. The other, more forceful, point that Edgington makes is that naturally a scholar such as William of Tyre reworked passages before him; his history is a work of synthesis from several sources. However Knoch's textual comparisons raise several questions over the way in which William rewrote certain incidents: where did William obtain the information that caused him to write passages so close to Albert's, yet more exact? How did William, unlike Albert, get the correct date of departure for Walter Sanzavohir? Where did William obtain the full names of crusaders which Albert only gives in part? How is it that there exists an early fragmentary history relating to Peter the Hermit that partly matches both William and Albert?[23] Knoch presents a sufficiently strong case that there is no doubt that William had material available to him that we do not. Rather than accept the existence of a major source, now lost, Edgington points out that the simplest explanation in answer to these questions is that William 'may have had information since lost such as letters.'[24] Jean Flori came to a similar conclusion in his study of Peter the Hermit.[25] Accepting this view of the debate as most likely, means that the existence of such missing material is of greater importance for studies of William of Tyre than Albert of Aachen.

Albert emerges from the arguments of modern historians as someone who based his history primarily on oral sources 'the narration of those who were present' and epic songs. This makes him a very valuable source, independent of the other traditions, so much so, that the opinion of France is that 'given the early date and the nature of his sources Albert's work deserves to be treated as an eyewitness account.'[26]

As a social historian Albert is by far the most valuable of the early crusading sources. Not only is his vocabulary far richer than that of his contemporaries, but also he reported vivid details that give an insight into social life, such as the falcons of the lords dying of thirst as the First Crusade crossed Anatolian plateau.[27] The manner of Albert's description of events was straightforward, lively and full of anecdote. In contrast to the northern French revisers of the *Gesta Francorum*, Albert did not organise his material to suit theological themes, in fact

---

[22] John France, *Victory in the East*, p. 379-80 and n. 21.
[23] Knoch, *Studien zu Albert von Aachen*, pp. 37, 38, 45 – 51. For Walter Sanzavohir, a leader of the People's Crusade see J. Riley-Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 224.
[24] AA 25.
[25] J. Flori, *Pierre l'Ermite et la Première Croisade* (Paris, 1999), p 55.
[26] John France, *Victory in the East*, p. 381
[27] See below p. 101.

his biblical citations were, as Susan Edgington noted, mainly references to well-known gospels and the psalms.[28] Nor did Albert engage in displays of classically inspired rhetorical oratory. His main stylistic peculiarity was a very helpful one for a study of Albert's language of social order: he was fond of forming couplets from synonymous words. As Edgington put it, 'Albert was addicted to duplication. He duplicated nouns, like *cedes et strages*, *menia et muri*; adjectives such as *nudus et vacuus*, *fessus et gravatus*; verbs, as in *videre et intelligere* and *offere et dare*.'[29] This habit of Albert's makes it easier to establish social terms that he considered to be synonymous, such as *magni* and *nobilies*, *parvi* and *ignobiles*.

Albert was aware of the existence and importance of social gradations and used the terms *ordo*, *gradus*, *manus* and *status* to express them. In a very interesting passage concerning the departure of great princes on the crusade he wrote that along with so many *capitanei primei* 'were no few *sequaces* and *inferiores*: *servi*, *ancillae*; married and unmarried maids; men and women of every *ordo*.'[30] Most of the early crusading historians did not go beyond simple bipartite schema, rich and poor, for the social structure of the First Crusade; here Albert was indicating his awareness of a variety of *ordines* among the *inferiores*. Even Raymond of Aguilers, who wrote with particular interest in the activity of the *pauperes*, did not have this conscious sense of gradation among the lower ranks. Albert similarly differentiated *ordines* within the ranks of the princes. In his account of Pope Urban II's call to the crusade at Clermont, he wrote that 'the great *principes*, of every *ordo* and *gradus*' vowed to undertake the expedition.[31] The implied gradations among the nobility are reflected in his vocabulary.[32] A social group between the nobles and commoners, soldiers in the following of Count Baldwin of Boulogne, probably footsoldiers, were also termed a *plebeius ordo* by Albert.[33] He also made a reference to the city of Edessa having inhabitants of every *status*.[34] It seems that Albert adopted a hierarchical framework for social order, where a grouping was defined by its social 'status', rather than the framework of the 'three orders' that grouped together those who fought, prayed and worked by function.[35]

---

[28] AA 41.
[29] AA 31.
[30] AA 167: .. *non paucos affuisse sequaces et inferiores, servos, ancillas, nuptas et innuptas, cuiusque ordinis, viros ac mulieres.*
[31] AA 90: ... *magnique principes, cuiusque ordinis et gradus ...*
[32] See below pp. 100 - 104.
[33] AA 214. See below 86.
[34] AA 224-5.
[35] For the 'three orders' see G. Duby, *The Three Orders, Feudal Society Imagined* (London, 1980).

Terms denoting social orders in the Historia Iherosolimitana

Inferiores, servi, ignobiles, parvi, minores, egeni, vulgus, rustici, pauperes

Albert of Aachen had the most sophisticated vocabulary for the lower social orders of any of the early crusading sources. Albert twice used the adjective *inferiores* to group together the entirety of the lower social order. As we have noted, many *inferiores*, encompassing men and women of every *ordo*, accompanied the captains of the first rank.[36] Albert also reported that in August 1098 the generosity of Count Baldwin of Boulogne, led at last to his being worn out by the size of gifts that he had conferred, not only on the *primates* of the *Galliae* but also on the *inferior manus*.[37]

Unnoticed by the other historians were those people brought along as servants to the princes. *Servi* and *ancillae*, as noted above, were listed among those inferiors who accompanied the captains of the first rank.[38] The only appearance of such servants in Albert's history, however, occurred when, in August 1098, Omar of Araz invited Duke Godfrey to assist him in defending the city from Ridwan, emir of Aleppo, the Christians agreed in return for his son as a hostage. The boy is described as being so well looked after that twelve of Godfrey's own *servi* remained in Antioch with him to make sure that he lacked for nothing at any hour.[39]

A common term for Albert, used to indicate a fundamental bipartite division in the crusade, was *ignobiles*. It never appeared other than in the couplet *nobiles et ignobiles*. At the siege of Antioch, sometime during the spring of 1098 Count Hugh of Saint–Pol and his son Engelrand[40] led a successful foray against those Turks who were preventing his followers bringing forage to the camp. As a result of their victory *nobiles et ignobiles* came running up from every side.[41] Despite this victory famine soon pressed hard on many *nobiles et ignobiles*.[42] Soon after the flight of Count Stephen of Blois from Antioch (2 June 1098) the Church Father, Bishop Ambrose of Milan, appeared in a vision. Albert wrote that Ambrose's speeches produced great comfort to clerics and lay people, *nobiles et ignobiles*.[43] Similarly on the death of Bishop Adhémar of Le Puy, *nobiles et ignobiles* mourned with extreme

---

[36] AA 167.
[37] AA 394.
[38] AA 167.
[39] AA 402: *Puer autem Mahumet filius principis de Hasarth, obses Godefrido datus, sub diligenti custodia tam servorum suorum duodecim quam sub sollerti cura clientele Godefridi, Antiochiae remansit cui nihil necessariorum de domo ducis ullis horis deficiebat.*
[40] Hugh of Saint – Pol, aged vassal of Count Eustace III of Boulogne, see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom*, p. 213. For Engelrand see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom*, p. 192 - 3.
[41] AA 266.
[42] AA 272.
[43] AA 347.

lamentations.[44] When, in August 1098, plague struck the Christian forces in Antioch, 'both *nobiles et ignobiles* gave up the spirit of life.'[45] Furthermore 'whether *equites* or *pedites*, *nobiles et ignobiles*, *monachi et clerici*, *parvi et magni*, to say nothing of the female gender, more than 100 thousands were laid waste by death without being struck down by swords.'[46] While *parvi et magni* seems to be synonymous with *nobiles et ignobiles* in this passage, the appearance of clergy and fighters alongside them has confused overtones of the notion of 'three orders.' The image created of the Christian army here is one in which there was a basic horizontal division between the great and the lesser men, with a separate, vertical, order of clergy and indeed a further distinct grouping, women. Although there is an ambiguity here as to whether the *ignobiles* should be considered to mean footsoldiers or a broader category of lesser people including non-combatants, on two other occasions Albert clearly did mean a military category, probably footsoldiers, as he wrote of 'the men of the army, *nobiles* and *ignobiles*.'[47] Again, the three thousand troops that accompanied Duke Godfrey, now ruler of Jerusalem, to Arsuf in the late autumn of 1099, were divided into *nobiles et ignobiles*, *equites et pedites*.[48] The association of *nobiles et ignobiles* with *magni et parvi* occured again in Albert's description of the ceremony by which Duke Godfrey became *Advocatus Sancti Sepulchri* (22 July 1099), where everyone became his subjects, *magni et parvi*, *nobiles et ignobiles*.[49] Here it is clear that the couplet encompassed the entire population. Another example of the duplication of *magni et parvi*, *nobiles et ignobiles* occured in Albert's description of the defeat of the crusade of 1101 in July of that year, where everyone made haste to flight, *magni et parvi*, *nobiles et ignobiles*.[50] A final appearance of the couplet *nobiles et ignobiles* was for a great number of Christians who drowned off the island of Cyprus in a storm (20 September 1113).[51]

Albert used the couplet *parvi et magni* independently but with the same sense in several other instances, particularly those where formal decisions were made. During the siege of Nicea, towards the end of May 1097, the *magni et parvi* having gathered, it was decided to send troops to the port of Civitote.[52] At a council held in Antioch, early November 1098, the decision to leave for Jerusalem was taken by all, *magni et parvi*.[53] Baldwin I was

---

[44] AA 379.
[45] AA 379: *Tam nobilies quam ignobiles spiritum vite exalarent.*
[46] AA 380: *... tam equites quam pedites, nobiles et ignobiles, monachi et clerici, parvi et magni, quin sexus femineus supra centum milia sine ferro morte vastati sunt.*
[47] AA 391.
[48] AA 510.
[49] AA 477.
[50] AA 627.
[51] AA 838.
[52] AA 179.
[53] AA 407.

established as king of Jerusalem by all, *magni et parvi* (11 November 1100).[54] There are several other similar examples,[55] in all of which the point of the couplet seems to be to indicate the consent of the entirety of the population to a decision. Albert used the phrase a few other times, with a similar sense but in a military setting. At Nicea, he wrote about the 'whole of the Christian army, *parvi et magni.*'[56] When the Christian forces went out to meet Kerbogha, they advanced, *magni et parvi*.[57] On or about 6 June 1099, everyone *magni et parvi* hurried all day and night to reach Jerusalem.[58] Finally, Bohemond's attempt to besiege Lattakieh late in August 1099 had to be abandoned, when everyone *magni et parui* of the Christian forces nearby armed against him.[59] *Parvi* was not used to indicate a social grouping other than in conjunction with *magni* to depict an entire body of people. One variation on *magni et parui* was that of *magni et pusilli.* It occurs in an interesting passage in which it is joined with *primores et subditi,* a rare phrase but expressive of a social relationship between the two orders, the 'magnates and subordinates.' In August 1099, at Jerusalem, *magni et pusilli, primores et subditi*, planned to return home.[60] Again the point of the couplets was to emphasise the unanimity of feeling on the issue.

A less frequent term in the *Historia Iherosolimitana* for the lesser of two basic social orders was *minores*. When Baldwin first triumphantly entered the city of Edessa (6 February 1098) everyone ran to meet him, whether *maiores* or *minores*.[61] During the siege of Antioch, towards the end of 1097, due to his success in a counter attack against those raiders from the city threatening the Christian foragers, the *iuvenis*, Engelrand, son of Hugh of Saint-Pol, was raised up with the goodwill and applause of all persons *maiores ac minores*.[62] In August 1099 Daimbert, Archbishop of Pisa, unexpectedly encountered Raymond of Toulouse, Robert of Normandy and Robert of Flanders, returning from Jerusalem, near Lattakieh. Albert gave an implied indication of the untrustworthy nature of the future controversial Patriarch of Jerusalem through a description of the over effusive greeting that Daimbert then proceeded to make. Daimbert was described as weeping with joy and rushing upon the necks of everyone, *maiores ac minores*, to kiss them all warmly, declaring everyone to be the sons and allies of the living God.[63]

Albert twice used the term *egeni* as a means of indicating the destitute. At the funeral of Guy of Possesse and Walo of Lille, during the siege of Nicea, a large amount of alms were

---

[54] AA 561.
[55] AA 210; 230; 360; 419; 515; 560; 753.
[56] AA 186.
[57] AA 360.
[58] AA 433.
[59] AA 506.
[60] AA 499.
[61] AA 226.
[62] AA 268. For Engelrand see n. 40.
[63] AA 503-4.

generously distributed to the *egeni* and the *mendici*.[64] In a very interesting comment on the effect of hardship on the different social classes, Albert wrote that during the siege of Jerusalem a rich supply of wine always abounded among the *primores*. For the *egeni*, however, even drinking water was in short supply.[65]

The term *vulgus* was an important and much used one in the *Historia Iherosolimitana*. In a significant passage concerning Peter the Hermit, Albert described how 'through his assiduous warnings and summonses and by calling upon bishops, abbots, clerics, monks, then the most noble laity, the princes of various kingdoms, and the whole of the *vulgus*, whether pure or unchaste, adulterers, murderers, thieves, perjurers, robbers, everybody, in fact, of the Christian faith, even the feminine sex, joyfully undertook the journey, led by penitence.'[66] In a manner similar to his description of those who died of plague at Antioch, noted above,[67] Albert seems to be presenting the crusade as consisting of the order of clergy, then the laity, both great and lesser, including conspicuous numbers of criminals. Additionally the presence of women was significant enough to be noted and again they were outside the bipartite schema, clergy and laity.[68] The implicit connection between the *vulgus* and irresponsible, seditious, behaviour created by the inclusion of the unchaste and criminals under the term is sustained in Albert's writing concerning the People's Crusade. He described Peter's following as 'the rebellious and incorrigible *vulgus* on foot' when they set off from Nish (4 July 1096).[69] When, early in June 1098 while trapped in Antioch by Kerbogha, a vision of St Ambrose of Milan appeared to the Christian forces, the saint accused French *primores* and very many of the *vulgus* of having been motivated by an improper lightness of mind.[70] According to the saint, the difficulties of the expedition arose because of this *levitas* by the *vulgus* and Ambrose urged an end to greed, theft, adultery and fornication.

Thereafter the term *vulgus* was used in a less pejorative sense. It was his term of choice for unarmed commoners, especially when there were large numbers of women present.[71] At Wieselberg (Moson) where Count Emicho of Leisingen's expedition was destroyed in the autumn of 1096 as it tried to enter Hungary with the capture of the city, Albert reported that so many of the *vulgus* of both sexes were slaughtered that the waters of

---

[64] AA 176-7. For Guy of Possesse see J. Riley – Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 210. For Walo of Lille see J. Riley – Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 224.
[65] 443-4.
[66] AA 86: *Huius ergo admonitione assidua et invocatione, episcopi, abbates, clerici, monachi, deinde laici nobilissimi diversorum regnorum principes, totumque vulgus, tam casti quam incesti, adulteri, homicide, fures, periuri, praedones, universum scilicet genus Christiane professionis, quin sexus femineus penitentia ducti ad hanc letanter concurrerunt viam.*
[67] See above p. 81.
[68] See above p. 79.
[69] AA 103 – 4: *Pedestris vulgus rebellis et incorrigibilis ...*
[70] AA 348.
[71] Albert nevertheless used *vulgus* as a masculine noun, rather than neuter, its classical form.

the Mosoni - Danube and the Laja rivers were changed to bloody waves.[72] The rearguard of Peter the Hermit's contingent was attacked as it departed Nish (4 July 1096); in Albert's description of the attack he divided Peter's forces into *maiores* and *vulgus*, the latter being associated with the baggage train at the rear of the army.[73] In Albert's imagined letter from Kilij Arslan, Sultan of Rũm, to Kerbogha after the destruction of the army of Peter the Hermit (21 October 1096) the sultan of Asia Minor described the forces of the People's crusade as a weak and beggarly band, footsoldiers and a useless *vulgus* of women, all being wearied from the long journey, with only 500 *equites*.[74] Although the letter is fanciful it does provide a useful summary of how Albert thought that an outsider would have seen the People's Crusade at Civitote. After the town of Antioch fell (3 June 1098) the Turkish garrison of the citadel nevertheless continued to resist the Christians, and, reported Albert, their arrows struck very many incautious Christians of the *vulgus*, men and women.[75] The plague that devastated the Christian army in Antioch in August 1098, destroyed an uncountable multitude of the Christian army, whether *nobiles proceres* or *humile vulgus*.[76] On or around 18 May 1099 the army was near Jebail, where the *debile vulgus*, who had been overcome by the hardship of the journey were buried.[77] A few days later at a river bank near Sidon they found enough shade for the *debile* and *pauper vulgus* to rest.[78] At the siege of Jerusalem, early in July 1099, the *iners vulgus* risked drinking bad water and many died of the swelling that resulted.[79]

A more complicated depiction of layers within the *vulgus* is indicated by Albert during his account of the siege of Antioch. Trapped in the city by Kerbogha (7 – 28 June 1098) famine led the inactive and *modicum vulgus* to devour the leather from their shoes.[80] If the 'middle commoners' ate their shoes, some from the *humile vulgus* secretly left the city at night to escape to the port of St. Symeon.[81]

A priest, Godschalk, leader of one of the contingents of the People's Crusade, was described as gathering together more than 15,000 soldiers and *pedestre vulgus*.[82] It would be natural to understand this distinction to be between fighting forces and non-combatants, but for the fact that elsewhere the *pedestre vulgus* were clearly fighters. Thus it is likely that Albert intended to convey that Gottschalk had gathered to himself 15,000 knights and footsoldiers. When the battle against Kerbogha began (28 June 1098), a whole band of

---

[72] AA 131.
[73] AA 104.
[74] AA 301.
[75] AA 326.
[76] AA 379.
[77] AA 423.
[78] AA 425.
[79] AA 443.
[80] AA 341-2.
[81] AA 344.
[82] AA 121 – 2. For Godschalk see J. Riley-Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 209.

archers of the class of *pedestre vulgus* were sent ahead.[83] In Albert's description of the battle of Ascalon (12 August 1099) the Christians charged into the midst of their enemies with the war-cry of the *pedestre vulgus*.[84] The victory was miraculous, with no one dying, except a few of the *pedestre vulgus*.[85]

Albert recorded that during the siege of Nicea a certain Turkish soldier flung rocky stones in the middle of the *vulgus* with both hands.[86] The *vulgus* here were sufficiently close to the enemy that it seems that they might have been playing a part in the battle. Equally, it could simply have been that, anticipating a breakthrough, non-combatants drew too close to the city. This seems to be the case for the two uses of *vulgus* that arose in Albert's description of the fall of Jerusalem (15 July 1099). Here, in both instances, the *vulgus* were described as being let into the city once the gates had been breached, to engage in slaughter with extreme cruelty.[87] These are probably better understood to be a crowd of non-combatant poor than the common footsoldiers for whom Albert seemed to prefer the phrase *pedestre vulgus*.

A key term for the lower social orders in other early crusading sources, especially in the work of Raymond of Aguilers, was *pauperes*. For Albert of Aachen, however, it was a relatively infrequent term. The *pauperes* appear in the *Historia Iherosolimitana* almost always as a passive category, the weak and poor who require charity or assistance. There is only a limited sense in the *Historia Iherosolimitana* that the *pauperes* were an active grouping, although Albert did indicate that he considered their presence on the crusade to accord with the holy nature of the expedition through his use of the phrase *pauperes Christi*.

During the siege of Antioch, Albert described how Count Hugh of Saint-Pol urged that his son Engelrand should free and avenge his *pauperes* and fellow Christians from the attacks and slaughter of the Turks.[88] Similarly, Duke Godfrey, in August 1098, blinded twenty of the knights of the Armenian Bagrat, brother of the robber prince Kogh Vasil, in retribution and in revenge for the injuries that Bagrat dared to inflict on himself and to the *pauperes Christi*.[89] When Baldwin of Edessa arrived in Jerusalem to inherit the kingdom, the knights of Godfrey swore that they had kept none of the things of his brother for themselves, but had dispersed them in alms to the *pauperes* and in order to pay off debts.[90] After the first battle of Ramleh (6 September 1101), Baldwin I asked for a tenth part from all the plunder and booty of the enemy for the hospital and the *pauperes Christi*.[91] Seriously ill in March

---

[83] AA 364. See also J. France, *Victory in the East*, p. 290.
[84] AA 490.
[85] AA 494.
[86] AA 181.
[87] AA 459 and 464.
[88] AA 265. For Hugh of Saint – Pol and Engelrand see n. 40.
[89] AA 391.
[90] AA 561.
[91] AA 602.

1117 Baldwin I ordered the immediate distribution of many thousands of bezants that he had in his treasury to the *pauperes*. Likewise, wine, fruit, oil and barley from Jerusalem and many other places he ordered distributed to the *pauperes*, orphans and widows.[92]

Two slightly less passive appearances of the *pauperes* in the *Historia Iherosolimitana* appear in connection with the First Crusade in September 1098, a period of growing discontent among a large body that the expedition seemed to be stalled at Antioch. Albert wrote that Duke Godfrey was being assailed by the complaints of the *pauperes Christi*.[93] Godfrey having learned of the attacks of Bagrat on messengers sent by his brother Baldwin therefore undertook an expedition north from Antioch to Turbessel (Tell Bashir) and Ravendel, 'having been stirred by these injuries and the complaints of the *pauperes*.'[94]

Plebs, populus

With the exception of Baldric of Dol, for whom the term meant 'commoners', all the early crusading historians, including Albert of Aachen used the term *plebs* very broadly, to indicate 'the people'. An important example, however, that shows Albert consciously using the adjective *plebeius* for a specific *ordo* relates to Baldwin's control of Tarsus in September 1098. Having just wrested the city from Tancred, Baldwin refused to let 300 soldiers into the city who had come from the main army to reinforce Tancred. These soldiers and the whole of the *plebeius ordo* from the escort of Count Baldwin pleaded with him to let them inside the city.[95] Since Baldwin had left his wife and baggage behind when he had parted from the main army to enter Cilicia this grouping making a protest were combatants, in all likelihood footsoldiers. A similar formulation was used in Albert's description of the plague in Antioch, August 1098, where many of the princes together with a plebeian class (*plebeia manus*) were dying.[96]

When Albert used the term *plebs* to indicate the poor, he qualified it. In the winter of 1098, during the siege of Antioch, a famine led to an uncountable mortality of the *humilis plebs*.[97] As a result Duke Godfrey agreed to lead an expedition so as to restore the *adtenuata plebs*.[98]

The other three occurrences of *plebs* in the *Historia Iherosolimitana* arise from the phrase *plebs Christiana*, 'the Christian people.' In each case Albert seems to have envisaged it as an all-embracing term for Christian society. He wrote of the army at Antioch overcoming

---

[92] AA 848.
[93] AA 390.
[94] AA 391: *Hiis itaque iniuriis et pauperum querimoniis dux nunc commotus ...*
[95] AA 214.
[96] AA 389.
[97] AA 271.
[98] AA 279.

the enemies of the *plebs Christiana*;[99] of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre as a place where *milites* and defenders of the *plebs Christiana* and of the kingdom of Jerusalem should be able to hold out[100] and of Baldwin I referring to his nobles as *primores* of the *plebs Christiana.*[101]

Populus is such a broad term for the people, covering all the social orders, that its unqualified use in the *Historia Iherosolimitana* offers little insight into the internal stratification of the people it was applied to. There are, however, some events described by Albert in which he used the term that do give interesting information with regard to social tensions on the First Crusade. At the town of Nish (now Niš, in South Eastern Serbia) on the fringes of the Byzantine Empire, on or around 4 July 1096, two thousand *iuvenes* from the army of Peter the Hermit attacked the city in an action which Albert described as *seditio*. Peter himself and his more experienced leaders stood aside, disapproving of the attempt to take the city. Albert then reported that the Bulgarians decided to attack, 'seeing this *scisma* in the *populus*.'[102] Not long after Peter is described as speaking 'in vain to the foolish and rebellious *populus*.'[103] In his opening remarks to an account of the expedition of Count Emicho, Albert wrote of a certain detestable crime in that assembly of foolish and insanely fickle *pedester populus*.[104] The offence that aroused Albert's indignation was that they allowed themselves to be led by a goose.[105] Albert described those who suffered most from famine in the winter of 1098 during the siege of Antioch by the Christian forces as the *humilis populus*.[106] The same phrase was used for the people on the crusade of 1101 to whom Alexius I, the Byzantine emperor, sent money out of concern for their poverty.[107] In all these cases, usually qualified by an appropriate adjective, there is a sense that Albert was using the term *populus* for the lower social orders.

Populus appeared in a few passages concerning discontent directed against the princes. When it was discovered that Baldwin's refusal to let Tancred's troops enter Tarsus, on or around 20 September 1097, had led to their deaths, uproar arose throughout the *populus Catholicus*.[108] With the expedition being stalled at Antioch in October 1098, a great dissension took place among the *populus*. Many of the *populus* of Duke Godfrey, Robert of Flanders and Bohemond, who had no faith or trust in their replies and their words about soon leaving for Jerusalem, withdrew themselves.[109] In early May 1099, at the unpopular siege of

---

[99] AA 295.
[100] AA 591.
[101] AA 770.
[102] AA 102: *Videntes hoc scisma in populo...*
[103] AA 110 – 111: *Sed frustra insipienti et rebelli populo locutus est.*
[104] AA 132.
[105] AA 132.
[106] AA 268.
[107] AA 635.
[108] AA 215.
[109] AA 407.

Arqa, a murmur of discontent grew among the *populus* of Duke Godfrey and Robert of Flanders.[110] Eventually (13 May 1099) Count Raymond of Toulouse was obliged to lift the siege, seeing that all the *populus* intended to follow Godfrey.[111]

A very common phrase in Albert was *populus Christianus*,[112] as well as the phrases *populus Dei*,[113] *populus Christi*[114] and *populus catholicus*.[115] These terms, often generalised terms for the entirety of the Christian forces more than his limited use of biblical citations, indicated Albert's theological framework, that the crusaders were performing the work of God.

Pedites

Albert generally used *pedites* in a conventional and uncontroversial manner to indicate footsoldiers. A noteworthy variation of the term is the phrase *pedestre vulgus*, discussed under *vulgus* above. Unusually, one of the important leaders of the People's Crusade was described as a *pedes*, 'Godfrey, surnamed Burel native of the city Etampes, master and standard-bearer of two hundred *pedites*, who was himself a *pedes*.'[116] On three occasions Albert used the phrase *pedites Christiani* simply to identify the Christian forces and not as an emphasis on the spiritual qualities of the troops.[117] By analogy, this is important with regard to the use of the phrase *milites Christi* in early crusading chronicles. Other than in the writings of a Gregorian reformer, which Albert was not, it cannot be assumed that the phrase was used as a reference to a new institutional form of knightly piety.

Albert wrote a key passage concerning *equites* and *pedites* at the time of the battle with Kerbogha.

> 'There were very many illustrious and most noble *equites*, whose number lies hidden, their horses having died and been consumed because of the hunger of famine, who were reckoned in the number of *pedites*. And they whom from their boyhood had always been accustomed to horses and had been in the habit of riding horses into battle learned to do battle as *pedites*. Indeed any of these illustrious men who could now acquire a mule or ass or worthless beast of burden or palfrey, would use it as a

---

[110] AA 419.
[111] AA 420.
[112] AA 110, 353, 360, 374, 376, 426, 443, 478, 512, 555, 614, 654, 663, 701, 766, 856.
[113] AA 178, 182, 214, 216, 271, 279, 282, 322, 328, 341, 342, 360, 377, 409, 447, 484, 621, 762, 861.
[114] AA 182, 217, 254, 264, 303, 407, 483, 485, 548, 645.
[115] AA 176, 349, 430, 435, 444, 486, 606, 650, 654.
[116] AA 119: *Ad hec Godefridus quidam, cognomen habens Burel, de Stampis civitate ortus, magister et signifer ducentorum peditum, qui et ipse pedes erat.* Godfrey is unknown outside Albert of Aachen.
[117] AA 493, 510, 686.

horse. Among them were *principes*, most powerful and rich in their own lands, who entered the conflict sitting on an ass.'[118]

The statement that illustrious and noble *equites* were numbered among the *pedites* seems to be carefully chosen by Albert, especially in the light of his following remark. The loss of status indicated was temporary and could be alleviated by the *eques* obtaining any kind of mount on which to ride. The *eques* did not become a *pedes*, but was counted among them, his years of training from boyhood still represented a differentiation from those with whom he now fought. It must have been a major concern for the unmounted *eques* that if his difficult circumstances continued his status as a *pedes* might become permanent.[119]

Sequaces, familiares, domestici, satellices, collaterales, contubernales

A common term used in the *Historia Iherosolimitana* for followers was *sequaces*. It appeared in the important list of social categories described by Albert in the sentence 'with so many *capitanei primei* were no few *sequaces* and *inferiores*', discussed above.[120] It was a socially vague term that seems to have encompassed both *milites* and *pedites*. In his description of the foraging expedition of Bohemond and Robert of Flanders which was ambushed (31 December 1097), Albert wrote that very many of their *sequaces* were surrounded and worn away. He described the same forces as *pedites*.[121] But when, in September 1098, Duke Godfrey undertook an expedition north from Antioch to Turbessel (Tell Bashir) and Ravendel he was described as choosing 50 *milites* from his *sequaces*.[122] All the other instances of its use are references to unspecified followers of a senior prince or in one case all the princes with all the '*sequaces legiones*.'[123]

The more senior members of the households of the senior princes were often referred to by other terms. Two examples, though not drawn from the Christian forces, nevertheless indicate that for Albert a *familiaris* could be of a very high social status. Tatikios, the Greek commander, was described as a *familiaris* of the emperor.[124] Similarly Kerbogha was depicted

---

[118] AA 371: *Plurimi sequidem egregii equites et nobilissimi quorum latet numerus, equis mortuis et pre famis inopia consumptis, in numero peditum computati, pedites prelia discebant, qui a puerili euo semper equis assueti et invecti certamen inire solebant. Ex hiis vero egregiis viris qui mulum aut asellum vel vile iumentum vel palefridum nunc adquirere poterat pro equo utebatur. Inter quos fortissimi et ditissimi sua in terra principes asino insidentes certamen inierunt.*

[119] See below pp. 251 - 6.

[120] See above p. 80.

[121] AA 270. See also J. France, *Victory in the East*, pp. 237 – 240.

[122] AA 391.

[123] AA 237.

[124] AA 253.

as a *familiaris* of the king [sic] of Babylon.[125] A *familiaris* of the following of Baldwin of Boulogne was entrusted with the delivery of gold and silver from Edessa to the other leaders of the crusade after Baldwin became ruler of the city (10 March 1098).[126] That Albert used *familiaris* and *domesticus* interchangeably is shown in a couplet of the synonymous type, so characteristic of Albert, applied to William of Grandmesnil, brother-in-law to Bohemond, who was 'at one time a *familiaris et domesticus* of the emperor of Constantinople.'[127] By his use of the term *dapifer*, 'seneschal', Albert identified two individual members of the household of Duke Godfrey. Due to famine at the siege of Antioch, Duke Godfrey's *dapifer* Baldric was described as giving three marks for a she-goat to the seller.[128] The fact that Baldric was reported as being engaged in haggling over the price of a goat for his lord is a portrayal that says more about the harsh circumstances of the famine than his status. He must have been a relatively senior knight as he formed part of the delegation sent by Duke Godfrey to King Coloman of Hungary.[129] Of similar importance was the *dapifer* Matthew who was listed among the group of senior figures who invited Baldwin of Edessa to take up the rule of the kingdom on the death of their lord (18 July 1100).[130]

Another term for the armed, knightly, personal followers of a prince in the *Historia Iherosolimitana* is *satellices*. On the fall of Antioch, Count Raymond, seized the tower which overlooked the Ferne bridge towards the harbour of Saint Symeon, which he fortified with his *satellices*.[131] When Tancred invaded the Temple of the Holy Sepulchre on the fall of Jerusalem, he did so with his *satellices*.[132] A term similar to those used by Albert for members of the household of a prince was *collaterales*. In the battle that brought an end to Emicho's expedition, in Autumn 1096 at Wiesselburg (Moson), William, the prince of the Hungarian army, was killed. He was described as a *collateralis* of King Coloman.[133] Those of Duke Godfrey's following to whom Alexius I Comnenus, the Byzantine emperor, gave the kiss of peace were all the *primates* and *collaterales*.[134] Albert wrote of a certain Fredelo, one of the *collaterales* of Duke Godfrey.[135] Fredelo can, in fact, be identified as a relative of Duke Godfrey and advocate of the abbeys of Malmédy and Echternach.[136] Before Duke Godfrey, ruler of Jerusalem, died (18 July 1100) he had a period of illness in which he was attended by

---

[125] AA 300.
[126] AA 307.
[127] AA 346: *Willelmus ... quondam familiaris et domesticus imperatoris Constantinopolis.* For William of Grandmesnil see J. Riley-Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 226.
[128] AA 342. Baldric is unknown outside the work of Albert of Aachen.
[129] AA 135.
[130] AA 548.
[131] AA 377.
[132] AA 462.
[133] AA 130.
[134] AA 156.
[135] AA 343.
[136] A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom*, p. 48.

four of his *collaterales*.[137] In all these examples a *collateralis* seems to be a very close follower, indeed a relative, of a senior prince. One use of the term, however, has Albert use it for a less intimate body of followers. The Turkish garrison of Athareb who were bombarded into submission by the stone throwing machines of Tancred in 1110 are described as *collaterales*.[138]

Albert used a rare term, *contubernales* in a way that suggests he was using it in much the same way as *collaterales*. It appeared only twice in the *Historia Iherosolimitana* and in both cases with regard to the comrades of Duke Godfrey. On the march from Nicea (29 June 1097) the army split into two, the second section of which consisted of Duke Godfrey and his *contubernales* with the Bishop of Le Puy and Count Raymond.[139] At the siege of Antioch, Duke Godfrey and his *contubernales* took it ill that the Turks were devising ambushes from among long grasses and reeds, and decided to cut them all down.[140] In the *Annales Altahenses maiores* for 1044 is an entry which indicates that it was a term meaning 'peers', which suggests that Albert might have been using the term to indicate the very senior comrades and relatives of Duke Godfrey, such as his two brothers, his cousin Baldwin of Le Bourcq and other notable Lotharingian princes.[141]

Armigeri

Albert noted the actions of *armigeri*, 'squires', in several straightforward instances. They were listed among those killed by arrows in a skirmish during the siege of Antioch.[142] Near Sidon, soon after 20 May 1099, Walter of Verra gathered together huge quantities of booty, which he committed to *armigeri* to be sent to the army.[143] Not long after the expedition left Ramleh (6 June 1099) a very great band of *armigeri* was sent across two miles to the village of Emmaus where they discovered cisterns and watering sources, as a result of which they returned with quantities of water and a great amount of horses' fodder.[144] Seventy *armigeri* were unfortunate in 1112 having been ordered by King Baldwin I to search for fodder, when they inadvertently ran headlong into the army of Toghtekin, atabeg of Damascus.[145] In retailing the story of Arnulf of Oudenaarde, the escort of Ida of Brabant, wife of Count Baldwin II of Hainaut, Albert describes Arnulf's *armiger* as riding in the hunt alongside his master, as well as reporting that when the squire's horse bolted, Arnulf alone,

---

[137] AA 534.
[138] AA 814.
[139] AA 191.
[140] AA 263.
[141] *Annales Altahenses maiores*, *MGH SS*, 4, 38. For Baldwin of Bourcq see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom*, p. 185.
[142] AA 240.
[143] AA 426. For Walter of Verra see J. Riley–Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 224.
[144] AA 430-1.
[145] AA 825.

since he could not do without the assistance and the services of the *armiger*, went out a great distance in search of the horse.[146] The report illustrates the close connection between knight and squire as well as the importance of the horse to the knight. Alongside all these examples of the conventional duties of a squire, Albert reported a more unusual action by the *armiger* of Baldwin of Bourcq, who, at the siege of Jerusalem in sight of the tower of David, publicly beheaded a Muslim knight.[147] There is one incident, important in the history of the Kingdom of Jerusalem, which shows that the relationship between the *armiger* and his master could be a troubled one. In 1109 William-Jordan, count of Cerdagne, claimant to the principality of Tripoli, was shot by an arrow at a very convenient moment for his rival Bertrand of Toulouse, count of Tripoli. Albert records that William-Jordan's own *armiger*, who had been angered at a petty offence, fired the arrow.[148] The point of Albert's phrasing seems to be to suggest that the cause of the murder was too minor for it to have really been a crime of passion, but regardless of the circumstances, the fact remains that it was considered plausible at the time that an *armiger* could be driven to murder through anger at his master.

Milites, equites

Over the course of his long work, Albert identified very many individuals as *milites*, usually with a praiseworthy epithet: Walter Sanzavohir, one of the leaders of the People's Crusade was a *miles egregius*;[149] Henry of castle Esch was variously *miles*, *miles nobilis* and *miles nobilis genere*;[150] Warner, count of Grez, was 'a *miles* irreproachable in the art of war';[151] Thomas of Marle of the castle of La Fère a *miles acerrimus*;[152] Engelrand, son of Hugh of Saint – Pol a *miles egregius*;[153] Milo Louez a *miles famosissimus*;[154] Oliver of the castle Jussey a *miles audax et pugnax*;[155] Welf of Burgundy a *miles egregius*;[156] Richard of the Principate, count of Salerno, brother-in-law of Tancred, and Robert of Anzi, together *milites acerrimi*;[157] Roger of Barneville;[158] Udelrard of Wissant, a *miles inreprehensibilis*, in

---

[146] AA 719. For Arnulf of Oudenaarde see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom*, p. 184.
[147] AA 442. For Baldwin of Bourcq see n. 141.
[148] AA 784. For this dispute see FC 526 – 30; see also S. Runciman, *A History of the* Crusades, 2 (second edition: London, 1990), pp. 66 – 68; H. S. Fink, 'The Foundation of the Latin States, 1099 – 1118,' K. M. Setton ed. *A History of the Crusades* 1 (Philadelphia, 1955), pp. 368 – 409, 398. For William-Jordan, count of Cerdagne and Bertrand of Toulouse, count of Tripoli see FC 526 n. 2 – 4.
[149] AA 90.
[150] AA 343, 371, 379. For Henry of Esch see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom*, p. 209.
[151] AA 164: *Warnerus de Greis castro, miles inreprehensibilis in arte bellica.* For Warner, count of Grez see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom*, pp. 234 - 5.
[152] AA 165. For Thomas of Marle see J. Riley – Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 223.
[153] AA 165. For Engelrand see n. 40.
[154] AA 165.
[155] AA 166. For Oliver of Jussey see J. Riley – Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 215.
[156] AA 212. For Welf of Burgundy see J. Riley – Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 224.
[157] AA 221. See J. Riley – Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 220 (Richard), p. 221 (Robert).
[158] AA 245. For Roger of Barnville see J. Riley – Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 221.

the household of Duke Godfrey 'who always shared secrets with him before all others';[159] Everard III, lord of Le Puiset;[160] Walbricus, Ivo, Rodolphus of Fontanais, Raimbald Croton, Peter son of Gisla, together *milites Christiani*;[161] Tancred, *miles acerrimus*, *miles gloriosus*;[162] Reinhard of Hemmersbach, 'a *miles* most famous in deeds and birth';[163] Folbert, 'a *miles egregius* by birth from the castle Bouillon';[164] Heribrand of Bouillon, *miles nobilis*;[165] Gerard, close confidant of Count Baldwin of Boulogne, and Pisellus, son of the sister of Udelard, both from Wissant, *preclari milites et nobilissimi*;[166] Walter of castle Verra, 'a man and *miles* of noble parents', also a *miles egregius*;[167] Henry, of the Rhine;[168] Gerard born of the castle Avesnes, a *miles egregius* and *miles acerrimus*;[169] Franco I of Maasmechelen on the river Meuse, *miles inperterritus*;[170] Rothold a *miles acerrimus*;[171] Ralph of Mousson, a *miles probus*;[172] Peter, a *miles preclarus* from Lombardy;[173] Robert, kinsman to Warner, count of Grez, a *miles probus* from Apulia, also a *miles preclarus*;[174] Geldemar Carpenel, a *miles egregius* and *nobilis* also *miles ferocissimus* and *miles probus*;[175] Wirich the butler of Duke Godfrey, a *miles egregius* and *miles probus*;[176] Wicher the Swabian, *miles magnificus*, 'a great and terrible lion';[177] Milo of Claremont;[178] King Baldwin I, 'always a *miles imperterritus*';[179] Walter and Baldwin of Tahun;[180] Rodulf of Montpinzon, a *miles probus*;[181] Berwold, a *miles nobilissimus*;[182] Guy of Biandrate, a *miles egregius*;[183] Baldwin of Grandpré

---

[159] AA 237: *Udelarus de Wizan ... miles inreprehensibilis ... de domo ducis Godefridi semper secretorum illius ante omnes conscius.* For Udelrard of Wissant see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom*, p. 231.
[160] AA 245.
[161] AA 336. For Raimbold Croton see J. Riley – Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 218.
[162] AA 338, 468.
[163] AA 379: *Reinardus de Hamerbach, miles clarissimus opere et genere.* For Reinhard of Hemmersbach see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom*, p. 224.
[164] AA 380: *Folbertus, miles egregius de castello Bullon ortus*. For Folbert of Bouillon see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom*, p. 195 – 6.
[165] AA 389. For Heribrand of Bouillon see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom*, p. 209 – 10.
[166] AA 400. See A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom*, p. 199 (Gerard), p. 221 (Pisellus).
[167] AA 426, 427. For Walter of Verra see J. Riley – Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 224.
[168] AA 474.
[169] AA 499: *Gerardum, orteum de castello Avennis.* Also AA 511. For Gerard of Avesnes see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom*, p. 199.
[170] AA 513. For Franco I of Maasmechelen see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom*, p. 196 - 7.
[171] AA 514.
[172] AA 559. For Ralph of Mousson see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom*, p. 223 – 4.
[173] AA 514.
[174] AA 524, 525.
[175] AA 539, 559, 595. For Geldemar Carpenel see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom*, p. 198.
[176] AA 540, 559. For Wirich the butler see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom*, p. 238.
[177] AA 602: *Hic miles magnificus leonem magnum et horribilem...* For Wicher the Swabian see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom*, p. 236 – 6.
[178] AA 540. For Milo of Clermont see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom*, p. 218.
[179] AA 556: *Baldwinus semper miles imperterritus.*
[180] AA 557.
[181] AA 559.
[182] AA 559. For Berwold see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom*, p. 189.
[183] AA 604.

a *miles pulcherrimus*;[184] Stephen, count of Burgundy, a *miles clarissimus* and *miles egregius*;[185] Conrad, constable of King Henry IV Germany, a *miles inperterritus*, *egregius*, *famosus et mirabilis*;[186] Dodo a *miles egregius*;[187] Count William II of Nevers, a *miles egregius*;[188] Engelbert;[189] Arpin, a *miles egregius*;[190] Count Stephen of Blois, a *miles egregius*;[191] Reinold, a *miles* of King Baldwin I;[192] Otto Altaspata;[193] Baldwin of Bourcq a *miles egregius* and also a *miles inperterritus*;[194] Joscelin of Courtenay a *miles egregius* and a *miles fidelissimus*;[195] Reinard of Verdun, a *miles egregius*;[196] Arnulf of Oudenaarde, a *miles illustris*;[197] Roger and Gerhard, *milites Christianorum*;[198] Hugh of Cassel and Albert surnamed Apostle, *milites egregii*;[199] Gervase of Basoches, a *miles egregius*;[200] Robert of Vieux-Ponts, a *miles indefessus*;[201] William of Wanges, a *miles gloriosus et nobilis*;[202] Eustace I Granarius, Lord of Caesarea, a *miles preclarus*[203] and lastly Rainier of Brus, a *miles imperterritus*.[204]

This list has some interesting features. As a rule the term *milites* is not used for the most senior princes. During the course of the first six books, none of the leaders of the First Crusade are singled out by the term. Only in writing his later, chronicle style, history of the Kingdom of Jerusalem did Albert begin to apply the term to notable figures such as Joscelin of Courtenay, Baldwin of Bourcq and Count William II of Nevers. The fact that at one point Albert wrote that Baldwin I was 'always a *miles imperterritus*' is as much a comment on the king's unvarying tactic of charging at the enemy regardless of the odds than an as epithet concerning his status.

In the cases of Henry of Esch, Warner, count of Grez, Thomas de Marle, Oliver of Jussey, Folbert of Bouillon and Walter of Verra, Albert introduced the knights as being from a particular castle. There is a considerable debate on the origin of the castle, but private

---

[184] AA 611. For Baldwin of Grandpré see J. Riley – Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 200.
[185] AA 622, 657. For Stephen, count of Burgundy see J. Riley – Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 222.
[186] AA 622, 657, 658. For Conrad the constable see J. Riley – Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 203.
[187] AA 632.
[188] AA 634. For William II Nevers see J. Riley – Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 225.
[189] AA 651.
[190] AA 657.
[191] AA 657.
[192] AA 673. For Reinold see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom*, p. 224.
[193] AA 685. For Otto Altaspata see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom*, p. 218.
[194] AA 685, 860. For Baldwin of Bourcq see n. 141.
[195] AA 685, 753.
[196] AA 715. For Reinhard of Verdun see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom*, p. 224.
[197] AA 718. For Arnulf of Oudenaarde see n. 146.
[198] AA 733.
[199] AA 751. For Hugh of Cassel see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom*, p. 210 – 11.
[200] AA 769. For Gervase of Basoches see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom*, p. 201 – 2.
[201] AA 770.
[202] AA 822.
[203] AA 823. For Eustace I Granarius see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom*, p. 193 – 195.
[204] AA 823. For Rainier Brus see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom*, p. 221 – 222.

ownership of castles, flourishing from around the year 1000 onwards, has generally been considered an important feature of post–Carolingian society.[205] Albert's brief epithets fit with a perspective that considers the castle to be of growing importance, for they provide evidence that by 1100 some *miles* at least were defined by their ownership of a certain castle.

Albert also provides important evidence that by the time of his writing many *milites* were 'noble.' Not only were several of the knights described by the adjective *nobilis*, but Henry of Esch was called a *miles nobilis* by birth.[206] Similarly Walter of castle Verra was described as 'a man and *miles* from noble elevated parents'[207] These examples make it clear that Albert was not using *nobilis* in the same way as *egregius*. For him 'nobility' was a condition of birth, while 'excellence' was an adjective to indicate the praiseworthiness of the knight.

The appearance of unnamed *milites* in the *Historia Iherosolimitana* is straightforward, except perhaps in one instance. In mid September 1097 a fleet of Danes, Frisians and Flemings led by Guynemer of Boulogne arrived in the bay of Mersin, just below Tarsus. When asked who they were, they replied that they were *milites* of the Christian faith.[208] It is surprising to find those whom Albert also described as *piratae* being termed *milites*.[209] But then this particular fleet was unusual and given that three hundred of these 'pirates' subsequently formed a garrison of the city, it should perhaps be accepted that many *milites* had indeed joined the fleet.[210]

Albert attached to the Christian fighting forces the phrase *milites Christi* on very many occasions.[211] An interesting variant used four times by Albert was *milites peregrini*.[212] This latter use suggests that in some cases at least Albert must have considered there to be a pious content to the phrase *milites Christi*, although, as noted above, he used *pedites Christi* simply to identify Christian footsoldiers from non-Christian forces and by analogy it cannot be taken for granted that all the instances of *milites Christi* in the *Historia Iherosolimitana* are examples of a particular theological framework held by the author. The fact that no individual knight was described as a *miles Christi* by Albert puts him in distinct contrast with the

---

[205] For a summary of the discussion see D. Crouch, *The Birth of Nobility* (Harlow, 2005), p. 204 – 7. For castles in the era of the crusades, see J. France, *Western Warfare in the Age of the Crusades, 1100 – 1300* (London, 1999), pp. 77 – 106. See also J. Flori, 'Knightly Society', *The New Cambridge Medieval History IV c. 1024 – 1198*, ed. D. Luscombe and J. Riley-Smith, 2 (Cambridge, 2004), I, 169.
[206] AA 379: M*iles nobilis genere.*
[207] AA 426: *Vir et miles nobili editus parentela.*
[208] AA 217-8. For Guynemer of Boulogne see J. Riley – Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 210.
[209] AA 218.
[210] AA 218.
[211] AA 189, 197, 303, 317, 320, 359, 360, 410, 517-8, 524, 530, 541, 542, 590-1, 619, 626, 637, 687, 689, 700, 701, 707, 722, 822, 843.
[212] AA 121, 256, 336, 349.

anonymous author of the *Gesta Francorum* who conveyed in his a work a stronger spiritual dimension in being a *miles* on the First Crusade.[213]

For the classicising northern French monks who based their work on the *Gesta Francorum*, *equites* was commonly substituted for *milites* and, indeed, was their preferred term for 'knight'.[214] For Albert, on the other hand, *equites* was an uncommon term in proportion to *milites*. He identified just four *equites* by name: Rainald of the castle of Broyes, an *eques insignis*, one of the leaders of the People's Crusade;[215] Guy of Posesse, an *illustris eques*;[216] Arnulf of castle Tirs, 'who was an *eques* always hot blooded and ready for war'[217] and Gerard, an *eques* of the household of king Baldwin.[218] As with *milites* it is interesting to note the association of the knight with his castle, rather than simply their geographical location.

Albert's limited employment of the term *equites* included a cluster of usages in his account of the defeat of the People's Crusade at Civitote (21 October 1096). He reported Godfrey Burel, master of the footsoldiers, as inciting the army to premature action by declaring that the timid by no means prevailed in battle like *equites egregii*.[219] Although *equites* were courageous, the arrows of the Turks killed their horses.[220] The pithy phrase of Godfrey Burel's has a classical feel to it and Albert may have chosen *equites* rather than his more favoured *milites* for that reason.

Iuvenes, adolescentes, tyrones

The *iuvenis* is understood by historians of noble society in the Central Middle Ages to be a knight who has yet to establish himself as the head of a household. That is, he was unmarried and dependent upon a senior prince.[221] This is a status that is not necessarily determined by being young in years. Albert's use of *iuvenes* is consistent with this definition. Although in some instances he clearly associated the *iuventus* as a group with a particular, negative, quality: unruliness. They first appear as a distinct social grouping in Albert's description of the contingent of the People's Crusade led by Peter the Hermit. At the town of

---

[213] See above pp. 18 - 19.
[214] See below pp. 123, 189, 161 - 2.
[215] AA 95: *Reinoldus de castello Breis, eques insignis.* For Rainald of Broyes see J. Riley – Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 218.
[216] AA 176: *Wido de Porsessa illustris eques*. For Guy of Posesse see n. 64.
[217] AA 263 *Arnolfum de Tirs castello, qui eques semper bello fervidus fuit et providus.*
[218] AA 732: *Gerardus eques de domo regis Baldwini.* For Gerard see n. 166.
[219] AA 115: *Godfridus autem Burel, magister peditum... timidos et minime in bello valere tam egregios equites asserens.*
[220] AA 118.
[221] See Georges Duby, *The Chivalrous Society*, trans. C. Postan, University of California Press (Berkely, 1977) p. 113 originally published as 'Les "jeunes" dans la société aristocratique dans la France du Nord-Ouest au XII[e] siècle,' *Annales: Economies, Sociétés, Civilisations* 19, 5, (1964), pp. 835-846.

Nish (now Niš, in South Eastern Serbia) on the fringes of the Byzantine Empire, on or around 4 July 1096, a dispute arose between Nicetas, governor of Bulgaria, and the crusading forces.

> 'A thousand irrational men, *iuventus* of extreme frivolousness, of stiff neck, an untamed and headstrong people, without cause, without prudence, rushed beyond the aforementioned bridge of stone with a serious attack on the town walls and gate of the city, to whom were joined a thousand of the same frivolous *iuventus* running across the fords and bridge with mighty shouts and fury in order to help.'[222]

In response to this attack Nicetas unleashed his full force, scattering the crusaders, who eventually reformed with the loss of about a quarter of their number. Similarly, the final disaster to meet the People's Crusade, their defeat and slaughter at Civitote (21 October 1096) by the forces of Kilij Arslan was precipitated, reported Albert, by the rash advances of the *iuvenes* on a raid near Nicea. Despite warnings from their more experienced leaders, the stormy and fickle *iuvenes* pillaged and plundered from the meadows and pastures before the walls of Nicea, in sight of the Turks.[223] On a raid of Baldwin I's near Hebron (November 1100), forty *iuvenes* were described as secretly forming a plan to hasten ahead in order to obtain money and booty.[224]

This negative aspect of the *iuvenes* is only one part of the picture, for Albert frequently praised them as a body and individually for their warlike prowess. *Iuvenis* was clearly not a negative term in the description of Ruthard son of Godfrey, 'a most famous *iuvenis*.'[225] A similar positive description was given for Baldwin of Bourcq, 'a splendid *iuvenis*,'[226] as well as for Tancred, his brother William Marchius and Engelrand, son of Hugh of Saint–Pol.[227] William was also referred to as an excellent *iuvenis*.[228] When Engelrand died in Ma'arat-an-Numan (10 December 1098), he was described as 'an uncommonly daring *iuvenis*.'[229] Roger of Salerno, before he became prince of Antioch (December 1112), was

---

[222] AA 102: *Mille insensatorum hominum, iuventus nimie levitatis et dure cervicis, gens indomita et effrenis, sine causa, sine ratione, trans predictum pontem lapideum ad menia et portam civitatis in gravi assultu vadunt, quibus mille eiusdem levitatis iuventus trans vada et ipsum pontem concurrentes ingenti vociferatione et furore in auxilium iunguntur.*

[223] AA p. 111.

[224] AA 567.

[225] AA 166: *Rothardus filius Gosfridi, iuvenis clarissimus*. For Ruthard see J. Riley Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 222; his father, an otherwise unknown Godfrey, is not to be confused with Duke Godfrey of Lotharingia.

[226] AA 206: *Baldwinus de Burch iuvenis preclarus.* For Baldwin of Bourcq see n. 141.

[227] AA 208 (Tancred), 192 (William), 268 (Engelrand). For William Marchius see J. Riley – Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 225. For Engelrand see n. 40.

[228] AA 193.

[229] AA 410: *Iuuenis mire audacie.*

described as an 'illustrious *iuvenis* and knight.'[230] Arnulf of Oudenaarde was termed a *iuvenis* three times by Albert, his other epithets included *eques* and *princeps*.[231] Hugh of Fauqeumbergues was described as a *iuvenis bellicosus* on his leading the third rank of knights in a charge at the first battle of Ramleh (6 September 1101). Although Hugh rose rapidly under the patronage of Baldwin I to become lord of Tiberias after Tancred left the fief for Antioch early in 1100 he seems to have been childless on his death in 1106, when the lordship passed to his brother.[232] Finally, an otherwise unknown Hugh, a noble *iuvenis* and illustrious *miles*, died in battle in a skirmish in the Jordan, 1113.[233] For Albert therefore, a *iuvenis* was invariably associated with valour, albeit sometimes rash.

Albert used the term *adolescentes* in a manner that suggests he saw it as synonymous with *iuvenes*. He used the term three times, twice for Christian *milites* and once for a Muslim also termed a *miles*. In each case the knights were in an early stage of their careers. The first example was Gerard of Avesnes, a knight of Hainaut who was given as a hostage to the Arabs of Arsuf by Duke Godfrey as part of an agreement that was subsequently broken at great peril to Gerard's life. Surprisingly Gerard reappeared on 25 March 1100, released as a peace offering from the townspeople. Albert wrote that when the duke saw the beloved *miles* and excellent *adolescens* Gerard unharmed, he rejoiced exceedingly.[234] The other Christian *adolescens* in Albert's work was the above-mentioned Arnulf of Oudenaarde, killed while searching for his horse on the return of a raiding expedition to Jerusalem in 1106. Arnulf was described at various times as a *nobilissimus iuvenis*, a *princeps*, an *illustris miles* and *adolescens*.[235] In the third example, although applied to a Turkish *miles*, the sense of the term *adolescens* seems similar to the other two. In 1105 Albert reported a certain Turkish *adolescens*, a vigorous *miles* called Mohammed, as being in the company of King Baldwin I.[236] This was probably a Turkish soldier who had arrived at the court in the company of the twelve year old Irtash, brother of the recently deceased Duqaq of Damascus (d. 1104). Irtash had fled to Jerusalem due to the threat to his life posed by Toghtekin, atabeg of Damascus.[237]

Another apparent synonym for *iuvenes* in the *Historia Iherosolimitana* is *tyrones*. The classical meaning of the term was for a recruit, a beginner or a novice.[238] Albert, however, was not given to classical allusion and it is clear from those he applied the term to that they

---

[230] AA 828: *Illustrissimum iuuenem et militem.*
[231] AA 718 – 20. For Arnulf of Oudenaarde see n. 146.
[232] AA 595: *Hugo ... de Tabaria, iuvenis bellicosus ...* For Hugh of Fauqeumbergues see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem*, p. 211.
[233] AA 831: *Iuvenis nobilis et miles illustris.*
[234] AA 529. For Gerard of Avesnes see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom*, p. 199.
[235] AA 718-20.
[236] AA 712.
[237] Ibn Al-Qalānisī, *The Damascus Chronicle of the Crusades*, trans. H. A. R. Gibb (New York, 2002), pp. 70 – 1.
[238] C. T. Lewis and C. Short, *A Latin Dictionary* (new impression: Oxford, 1987).

were fully trained knights, the sense in which they were still beginners probably being that they were yet to establish their own households. The knights who were named and described as a *tyro* were: Tancred, his brother William, Guy of Possesse, Rainald of Beauvais, Engelrand, son of count Hugh of Saint-Pol, Franco I and Sigemar of Maasmechelen on the river Meuse, blood relations, and Otto surnamed Altaspata, son of the sister of Albert of Biandrate.[239] As noted above, Tancred, William and Engelrand were also termed *iuvenes* by Albert. In fact the description of William makes the close connection between *iuvenes* and *tyrones* clear. 'William, most audacious *iuvenis*, and most beautiful *tyro*, brother of Tancred.'[240] The appearance of the epithet *pulcher* seems inappropriate for a knight, but was a medieval convention when discussing youth.[241] A Venetian was termed *tyro* by Albert at the siege of Haifa (25 July 1100), when he was the only one of his companions not to abandon a siege machine.[242]

Collectively the *tyrones* differed slightly from the *iuventus* in that they were not associated with rash behaviour. In battle with the forces of Kerbogha, Duke Godfrey and the Christian *tyrones* were portrayed as violently pursuing and cutting down the Turkish soldiers.[243] According to Albert the body of scouts sent ahead when the First Crusade approached Ramlah (3 June 1099), included 500 *tyrones*.[244] In 1100 the Armenian town of Melitene was successfully defended against the forces of Malik Ghazi Ghumushtekin, the Danishmend emir of Sebastea, by troops posted there by Count Baldwin of Edessa (soon to be king Baldwin I of Jerusalem), which included 50 *tyrones*.[245] And at the unsuccessful siege of Tyre by Baldwin I (November 1111), certain *tyrones* were picked to occupy the siege towers and keep up a bombardment of missiles.[246] The term was also used for Muslim knights, when in Albert's version of Peter the Hermit's embassy to Kerbogha (27 June 1098), Peter asked that the emir pick out 20 *tyrones* as hostages for a proposed trial by single combat.[247]

There is one other appearance of *tyrones*, which casts doubt on the equation that for Albert *tyro* was synonymous with *iuvenis*. In his description of the crusading princes at the

---

[239] AA 164 (Tancred), 165 (Guy), 192 (William), 248 (Rainald), 265 (Engelrand), 343 (Fracon and Sigemar) and 685 (Otto). For other references to these knights see J. Riley-Smith, *The First Crusaders*, p. 210 (Guy); p. 225 (William); p. 218 (Rainald). See also see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom*, p. 196 (Franco); p. 228 (Sigemar); p. 218 (Otto). For Engelrand see n. 40.
[240] AA 192 (330): *Willelmus iuvenis audacissimus et tyro pulcherrimus, frater Tancredi.*
[241] R. M. Karras, *From Boys to Men* (Philadelphia, 2003), pp.12 - 13.
[242] AA 540.
[243] AA 368.
[244] AA 429: *Robertus vero Flandriensis et Gastus militaris homo de Bederz, assumptis quingentis tyronibus a societate premissi, ad portas et explorandos muros precesserunt.*
[245] AA 547: *Sed viriliter a quinquaginta predictis tyronibus a Baldwino ibidem constitutis urbs defensa ab hostibus intacta et invicta remansit.* The *tyrones* are called *milites* in the previous paragraph.
[246] AA 823: *In hac ergo idem Eustachius cum electis manens tyronibus, Tyrios mane, meridie, vespere per urbem gradientes omni genere iaculorum alios interimebant, alios vulnerabant, per turres, menia et omnia urbis loca speculantes.*
[247] AA 358.

battle of Dorylaeum (1 July 1097), Albert wrote that a great ruin of the Turks was brought about by these distinguished *tyrones* and their associates.[248] Here unusually, the term was applied to *principes*. One explanation for this is the possibility that the term *tyrones* was being used in a slightly different sense, the princes being cast in the role of God's individual champions. Later (ca. 1210), Arnold, abbot of Lübeck wrote in this spirit.[249] Curiously Arnold's *tyro* was none other than Drogo of Nesle, himself a *iuvenis* according to Robert the Monk.[250] In Arnold's clearly fictional crusading story, Drogo took up a challenge of single combat *pro Dei honore* in general and for Duke Godfrey of Lotharingia in particular. As another David he slew a Goliath, Helias, the apostate champion of the Turks. It is possible that Albert's use of the term marked a step in its evolution towards that of Arnold of Lübeck. Alternatively and perhaps more simply, in three of the manuscript traditions of Albert's *Historia*, including one early manuscript close to the archetype, *viri* is substituted for *tyrones* at this point, removing the one exceptional use of the term, and thus suggesting that Albert himself, or a later correcting hand, was entirely consistent in equating the *tyro* with the *iuvenis*.[251]

As noted above, several of those described as *miles* were also termed *iuvenis*, *adolescens* or *tyro* by Albert. Engelrand, Tancred and Arnulf of Oudenaarde were *iuvenes*; Tancred, Engelrand, Franco I of Mechelen and Otto Altaspata were *tyrones* and Arnulf of Oudenaarde was an *adolescens*. The interconnection between all four terms is consistent with them being used to represent persons of the same status, albeit at different stages of their careers.

Nobiles, magni, maiores, optimates, primores, potentes, principes, proceres, capitales, capitanei, domini

As with his vocabulary for the lower social orders, Albert had a rich and varied range of terms for the upper classes. He used the term *nobiles* to refer to the nobility in a broad sense. As the term was often coupled *nobiles* with *ignobiles* to mean the entire population many examples of his use of the term have been discussed above. Unlike the term *magni*, which never appears in the *Historia Iherosolimitana* other than coupled with *parvi*, Albert did detach the term *nobiles* to refer separately to the nobility. An interesting cultural detail is revealed in Albert's description of the hardship of the journey across the Anatolian plateau (July 1097) where even the tamed falcons and birds beloved of the highest *nobiles* were dying

---

[248] AA 173.
[249] Arnold, abbot of Lübeck, *Chronica Slavorum*, *MGH SS*, 21, 128 – 9.
[250] RM 833. For Drogo of Nesle see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom*, p. 191. See also below p. 260 - 1.
[251] *RHC Oc.* 4, 320.

from thirst and heat.[252] When Duke Godfrey remembered his experience of plague while in Rome with King Henry IV he recalled that in the pestilential month of August 500 very brave knights and very many *nobiles* had died.[253]

Albert used the term *nobilis* for a number of individuals. Count Emicho of Flonheim, leader of one of the contingents of the People's Crusade, was a *vir nobilis*;[254] Duke Godfrey also was a *vir nobilissimus*.[255] Gilbert of Traves and Achard of Mountmerle, together 'mighty leaders of the Christians and *viri nobiles*;'[256] Geldemar Carpenel, a *miles egregius et nobilis*[257] and William of Wanges, a *miles gloriosus et nobilis*;[258] An example of nobility being conferred by birth was given by Albert with respect to Baldwin of Bourcq, a *vir nobilis generis*.[259] Again, for the forces that accompanied Duke Godfrey, now ruler of Jerusalem, to Arsuf in the late autumn of 1099, Albert wrote: 'The duke ... and the other *nobiles et ignobiles* who had remained with him, William of Montpellier, Werner, count of Grez, Geldemar Carpinel, Wicher the Swabian, and all the Christian *equites et pedites*, to the number of three thousand, surrounded the town.'[260] Albert twice used the term *nobilitas*, 'nobility,' in connection with prominent figures of the First Crusade. He wrote of Robert of Flanders, Robert, count of Normandy, Cono of Montaigu, Count Raymond of Toulouse and all the *nobilitas* of *Gallia*.[261] He described Ralf of Scegones, a relative of Duke William IX of Aquitaine, as a *vir magne nobilitatis*.[262]

The most common term for the upper class of a bipartite division of society in the *Historia Iherosolimitana* was *maiores*. As discussed above, it was several times coupled with *minores* to encompass the whole of a population. But it was also Albert's term of choice for the general activities of the 'greater' people. Albert often described the *maiores* as giving advice to princes and leaders of the First Crusade. Peter the Hermit sent an embassy to Duke Nicetas of the Bulgarians, *ex consilio maiorum*.[263] Duke Godfrey went ahead of his army to

---

[252] AA 200.
[253] AA 389. For King Henry IV of Germany see I. S. Robinson, *Henry IV of Germany, 1056 – 1106* (Cambridge, 1999).
[254] AA 126. For Emicho of Flonheim see J. Riley – Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 204.
[255] AA 134.
[256] AA 440: *Gisilbertus de Treva et Achart de Montmerla, fortes Christianorum duces et viri nobiles.* See J. Riley – Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 208 (Gilbert of Traves), p. 197 (Achard of Montmerle).
[257] AA 539. For Geldemar Carpenel see n. 175.
[258] AA 822.
[259] AA 549: *... viro nobili generis...* For Baldwin of Bourcq see n. 141.
[260] AA 510: *Dux ... et ceteri nobiles et ignobiles qui secum remanserant, Willelmus de Montpehlir, Warnerus de Greis, Geldemarus Carpenel, Wicherus Alemannus, et uniuersi equites et pedites Christiani, cum tribus milibus urbem cinxerunt.* For William, count of Montpellier see J. Riley – Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 226. For Warner, count of Grez see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom*, p. 234. For Geldemar Carpenel see n. 175. For Wicher the Swabian see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom*, p. 235.
[261] AA 292. For Cono of Montaigu see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom*, p. 189 – 191.
[262] AA 642. This is the only known reference to Ralph of Scegones.
[263] AA 99.

Constantinople *ex consilio maiorum*.[264] On the advice of Baldwin of Boulogne's *maiores* in Cilicia (mid-September 1097) peace was made between himself and Tancred.[265] Duke Godfrey demanded the return of a disputed tent from Bohemond *ex consilio maiorum*.[266]

It was the social group *maiores* that, for Albert, were the leaders of the First Crusade. Tatikios, the Greek envoy on the First Crusade, was described as having to satisfy the council of the *maiores* of the army before his departure from the siege of Antioch (February 1098).[267] When Baldwin sought to persuade Tarsus to surrender to him rather than Tancred he argued that the citizens should not believe that Bohemond and Tancred were the *maiores* of the Christian army.[268] Approaching Antioch (20 October 1097) 1,500 armed men were sent to take control of the city of Artah *ex decreto maiorum*.[269] At Antioch a decree of the 'people of God' against adultery and fornication, was corroborated by the opinion of the *maiores*.[270] Three siege engines were ordered to be constructed for the attack on Jerusalem *ex consilio maiorum*.[271] The *maiores* accepted a suggestion of Tancred and three days after the fall of Jerusalem massacred the remaining Muslim inhabitants (18 July 1098).[272] Only two individuals were specifically named as *maiores* in the *Historia Iherosolimitana*. Hartmann, count of Dillingen was described as one of the *maiores* of Swabia[273] and Richard of the Principate, count of Salerno, was described as one of the *maiores* of the household of Bohemond.[274]

In a speech that Albert imagined taking place between Peter the Hermit and the Patriarch of Jerusalem, he had Peter say that 'I will search out all the *primates* of Christendom, *reges*, *duces*, *comites* and those who hold the foremost place of royal power, to destroy the yoke of slavery and the impatience of your difficulties.'[275] This passage provides a useful definition of the way in which Albert used the term *primates*, namely for those senior princes in positions of authority. *Primates* were involved in decision-making. So King Coloman of Hungary was described as having received the advice of his *primates* concerning Duke Godfrey.[276] Similarly Emperor Alexius I Comnenus was described as taking advice

---

[264] AA 138.
[265] AA 222.
[266] AA 308.
[267] AA 188.
[268] AA 210.
[269] AA 242.
[270] AA 279.
[271] AA 446.
[272] AA 469.
[273] AA 177. For Hartmann of Dillingen see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom*, p. 208 – 9.
[274] AA 545. For Richard of the Principate, count of Salerno see J. Riley-Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 220.
[275] AA 88: ... *omnes primates Christianorum, reges, duces, comites, et principatum regni tenentes, iugum servitutis vestre reserans, et angustiarum vestrarum intolerantiam.*
[276] AA 137.

from his *primates*.[277] Alexius extended his kiss of peace to Duke Godfrey's *primates*.[278] The election of Duke Godfrey as ruler of Jerusalem took place before all the *primates*.[279] Four of the knights on the First Crusade were explicitly termed *primates*: Drogo of Nesle, Rainald III, count of Toul, Gaston of Béarn and Fulcher of Chartres.[280] This group, important for a discussion of *iuvenes* on the First Crusade, were here identified as going to Edessa after Baldwin had been made ruler there.[281] Although the speech attributed to Peter the Hermit made it clear that even a king could be numbered among the *primates*, in practice Albert used the term for the leading nobles of a prince rather than the princes themselves. So three times he wrote of Duke Godfrey and his *primates*.[282] Similarly Baldwin I held a council with all his *primates*.[283] Again Albert referred to Baldwin I and his *primates*.[284] Albert used a similar phrase for King Magnus of Norway and his *primates*[285] and with respect to Baldwin II.[286] Only once did Albert use the phrase *primates* in such a way as to make the term inclusive of the senior princes, in a reference to Duke Godfrey and Bishop Adhémar of Le Puy.[287] One of Albert's most common terms for magnates was *primores*. He used it for the leaders of the People's Crusade, the First Crusade as well as Greek, Hungarian and Muslim princes.[288] For example, in an imagined message of Duke Godfrey to King Coloman of Hungary, Albert had the letter begin: 'To Coloman, King of Hungary, Godfrey, duke of Lotharingia and the other *comprimores* of *Gallia* salute you.'[289] All of Coloman's *primores* then swore an oath not to bring harm to the pilgrims about to cross.[290] As noted under *egeni*, Albert used the term *primores* to contrast those who were never without wine with those poor who were dying of thirst.[291] In several instances the *primores* were indicated as being involved in decision-making. As a result of Godfrey's contingent halting at Selymbria (12 December 1096) and ravaging the land, the Greek emperor sent a legation urging the army to continue to Constantinople in peace, Godfrey, after holding council with the other *primores*, assented to

---

[277] AA 353.
[278] AA 156.
[279] AA 473.
[280] AA 391-2. For Drogo of Nesle see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom*, p. 191. For Rainald III of Toul see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom*, p. 221. For Gaston of Béarn see J. Riley – Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 206. For Fulcher of Chartres see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom*, p. 197.
[281] See below pp. 260 - 1.
[282] AA 156, 526, 535.
[283] AA 570.
[284] AA 724.
[285] AA 800.
[286] AA 861.
[287] AA 282.
[288] AA 115, 135, 139, 145, 148, 159, 171, 184, 190-1, 192, 193, 219, 266, 288, 289, 305, 308, 337, 339, 389, 407, 408, 414, 436 (of *Gallia*), 443-4, 473, 513, 604 (of Italy), 728 (of England and Denmark), 758, 760 (of *Gallia* and Italy), 770, 861.
[289] AA 135: *Godefridus dux Lotharingiorum et ceteri comprimores Gallie salutem.*
[290] AA 139: *Et universi primores regni sui in iureiurando, non ultra peregrinis nocere transituris.*
[291] AA 443 – 4. See above pp. 82 - 3.

the embassy of the emperor.[292] Albert described those involved in the election of a ruler of Jerusalem as being the *primores* of the Christians.[293] During the siege of Antioch Godfrey and Bohemond fell out over a tent that mistakenly came to Bohemond although the Armenian prince Nicusus had sent it to Godfrey. Finally, wrote Albert, Bohemond, on the advice of the *comprimores* of the army, restored the tent to the duke.[294] This, emphasised, version of *primores*, *comprimores*, was a term which seems to have suggested a body of equals or 'fellow *primores*.' Albert wrote three times of Duke Godfrey and the other *comprimores*,[295] once of Godfrey, Robert of Normandy and the other *comprimores*,[296] and once also for Count Raymond and his *comprimores*.[297] The idea of there being a body of *primores* within each nation recurs in the *Historia Iherosolimitana*. Albert referred to the *primores* of *Gallia*, England, Denmark, Italy and of the Kingdom of Jerusalem.[298]

Primi appear in the *Historia Iherosolimitana* much as do *primores*, as the 'foremost' people. In his account of Duke Godfrey's making his oath to the Byzantine emperor, Alexius I Comnenus, Albert wrote an interesting depiction of the ceremony of vassalage in which Godfrey 'surrendered himself to [Alexius] not only as a son but also as a vassal with clasped hands, along with all the *primis* who were present.'[299] The term was used both for the senior princes as well as for a wider layer of leading nobles. Albert reported that early in February 1099, Jalal al-Mulk Abu'l Hasan, emir of Tripoli sent envoys to the *primi* of the army, namely Duke Godfrey, Count Raymond, Robert of Flanders, and Duke Robert of Normandy.[300] Albert wrote of Duke Godfrey and the *primi* of the army.[301] King Baldwin I was described as sending a message to the *primi* of the army and being with the *primi* of the Kingdom.[302]

Another term for the nobility, *optimates*, entered Albert's vocabulary only in later life, to judge by the fact that it appears only in books seven to twelve of the *Historia Iherosolimitana*. He seemed to have had a fixed stylistic idea of how to use the term, as *optimates* always appeared in connection with a person or a kingdom, generally through the phrase 'the *optimates* of ...' The term was used in the main for the expression King Baldwin I 'and his *optimates*.'[303] Once it was used for the magnates of Bohemond[304] and once for the

---

[292] AA 145.
[293] AA 473: *Primores Christianorum.*
[294] AA 308.
[295] AA 201, 339, 388.
[296] AA 337.
[297] AA 408.
[298] AA 436, 604, 728, 760, 861.
[299] AA 156: *Non solum se ei in filium, sicut mos est terre, sed etiam in vassallum iunctis manibus reddidit, cum universis primis qui tunc aderant.*
[300] AA 422.
[301] AA 438.
[302] AA 790, 834 – 5.
[303] AA 570, 578, 580, 723, 825.
[304] AA 572.

report that Baldwin I was accused of many crimes by the *optimates* of Tancred, Bohemond and Daimbert.[305] The term was also used for the *optimates* of the Kingdom of Jerusalem.[306] After the first battle of Ramleh (6 September 1101), Albert attributed to Baldwin I the report that 'our *optimates* and all our *equites* except for ourselves were killed.'[307]

On rare occasions Albert used the phrase *viri magnifici* or *magnifici exercitus* to indicate magnates and the leading prince with whom they were associated. This was the case for the following of Duke Godfrey,[308] Bohemond,[309] Robert of Flanders,[310] as well as for the leaders of the crusade of 1101.[311]

There are a number of usages of *potentes* and the more emphatic form *praepotentes* in the *Historia Iherosolimitana* that show the term sometimes functioned as a noun for magnates in addition to its more general use as an adjective for 'powerful'. Albert wrote of peace being established between Emperor Alexius, Duke Godfrey and all the *prepotentes* of the army.[312] Baldwin, having become ruler of Edessa (10 March 1097), was described as sending gold and silver to Godfrey, Robert of Flanders, Robert of Normandy, Raymond of Toulouse and the other *prepotentes*.[313] Duke Godfrey and the other *potentes* avoided Antioch during the month of plague.[314] Tancred was reported as remaining with Duke Godfrey and the other *prepotentes*, despite having taken gold from Count Raymond for military service.[315] In praising the qualities of Duke Godfrey on his election as ruler of Jerusalem Albert listed all those categories of leading nobles who undertook the crusade, before or since: *principes* and *potentes*, bishops and counts, and sons of kings.[316] Baldwin I was asked to become ruler by the *prepotentes* of Jerusalem.[317] Godfrey's knights and *prepotentes* informed Baldwin they had distributed his brother's possessions as alms to the poor.[318] In enumerating those on the Crusade of 1101 Albert wrote of many of the foremost *potentes* of the army.[319]

In Albert's account of Pope Urban II's call to the crusade at Clermont, he noted that great *principes*, of every *ordo* and *gradus*, vowed to join the expedition.[320] The comment is interesting in showing Albert's awareness of gradations within the ranks of the nobility,

---

[305] AA 572: ... *scelere multum a suis optimatibus criminaretur.*
[306] AA 582, 589.
[307] AA 600: *Optimates nostri et equites universi preter nos ceciderunt.*
[308] AA 147.
[309] AA 288.
[310] AA 498.
[311] AA 617.
[312] AA 147.
[313] AA 307.
[314] AA 402.
[315] AA 417.
[316] AA 475.
[317] AA 550.
[318] AA 561.
[319] AA 624.
[320] AA 90.

gradations which were reflected in his vocabulary. Albert generally used the term *principes* for senior nobles, particularly the leaders of the First Crusade and the main Muslim leaders.[321] Duke Godfrey in particular was referred to variously as *egregius princeps*,[322] *praeclarus princeps*,[323] *clarissimus princeps*,[324] *magnificus princeps*,[325] *nominatissimus princeps*[326] and, on becoming ruler of Jerusalem, 'foremost *princeps* of Jerusalem.'[327] Robert of Normandy was termed prince more often than any other, as Albert used the phrase *Robertus Nortmannorum princeps* as a title, 'prince of the Normans', rather than an epithet.[328] Several times during Albert's account of the First Crusade Baldwin of Boulogne was termed a *princeps*,[329] later he was *princeps* of Edessa,[330] then, at his coronation as King Baldwin I, he received the epithet *princeps gloriosissimus*[331] after which he was referred to as *magnificus princeps*[332] as well as by the title *princeps* of Jerusalem.[333]

Proceres was another term in the *Historia Iherosolimitana* used for the senior nobles of the Christian army. As discussed under *vulgus* above, when Albert wanted to emphasise how the plague at Antioch killed both the higher and lower social order, he wrote that it destroyed an uncountable multitude, whether *nobiles proceres* or *humile vulgus*.[334] When word spread that the senior nobles were abandoning the expedition between the fall of Antioch (3 June 1098) and the battle with Kerbogha (28 June 1098), Albert emphasised that it was believed that even *egregii proceres* sought to flee the city.[335] After the capture of Nicea, a nun who had been held prisoner called out to the *proceres et milites Christi*.[336] Bohemond, Count Robert of Flanders, Duke Godfrey, Robert of Normandy were collectively termed by

---

[321] AA 134, 153 (Bohemond), 155, 163 (Kilij Arslan, sultan of Nicea), 164 (Bohemond), 165, 166, 169 (Kilij Arslan), 191 (Stephen of Blois), 192 (Kilij Arslan), 218 (Count Eustace of Boulogne), 220, 221, 240 (Bohemond), 284, 290 (Count Raymond of Toulouse), 297 (Kerbogha), 309 (Kerbogha), 311 (Kerbogha), 329 (Yaghi-Siyan governor of Antioch), 337 (Kerbogha), 340 (Kerbogha), 352 (Kerbogha), 357 (Kerbogha), 346 (Bohemond), 365, 370 (Kerbogha), 410 (Count Eustace of Boulogne), 410 (Tancred), 585-6, 633, 669 (Tancred), 670 (Tancred), 697 (Jerkermish, atabeg of Mosul), 703 (Bohemond), 709 (Ridwan, emir of Aleppo), 711 (Tancred), 727, 809, 833 (Toghtekin, atabeg of Damascus), 842 (Mawdud, mameluk of Sultan Mohammed ibn Malik-Shah), 843.
[322] AA 138.
[323] AA 140.
[324] AA 550.
[325] AA 548.
[326] AA 139.
[327] AA 492: *Dux Godfridus summus princeps Iherusalem.* For the title of Godfrey as ruler of Jerusalem see p. 56 n. 27.
[328] AA 173, 337, 360, 377, 404, 405, 422, 429, 436, 482, 489, 494, 498, 509, 761.
[329] AA 222, 226, 234, 303.
[330] AA 232.
[331] AA 561
[332] AA 569.
[333] AA 562.
[334] AA 379. See also above p. 84.
[335] AA 347.
[336] AA 188 – 9.

Albert *magnifici proceres*.[337] Tancred, Baldwin of Bourcq and William IX, duke of Aquitaine together were termed *egregii proceres*.[338]

Albert used the expression *capitales exercitus* once to indicate the leaders of the First Crusade.[339] He also applied it to Muslim forces. Albert reports that there was a commander of Kerbogha's army called Rossilion at the battle outside of Antioch, who was one of four *capitales* of Antioch.[340] He further reported that when the crusade of 1101 captured Ankara (23 June 1101) six of the *capitales* of Kilij Arslan escaped.[341]

A rare term in Albert's work used for senior princes was *capitanei*, a term with a considerable range of meaning in the twelfth century, from a dependent subject, prominent vassal or citizen to a military commander or baron.[342] Albert seems to have used it consistently for those from the class of most senior nobles, including the leaders of the First Crusade. In the important passage discussed above, in which Albert drew attention to the fact the great princes brought along with them very lowly figures of every *ordo*, the phrase he used for the upper class was *capitanei primi*.[343] Duke Godfrey, Bohemond, Robert, Raymond, together were termed by Albert *capitanei exercitus*,[344] a term which he used again for the same group.[345] Because of evil rumours concerning the People's Crusade in Hungary, Albert reported that Duke Godfrey decided to send ahead no one from the *nominatissimi et capitanei viri* except an envoy, Henry of Esch.[346] In Albert's report on the election of a ruler for Jerusalem he wrote that only after Count Raymond and all the other *capitanei* who were offered the honour had declined did Duke Godfrey finally accept it.[347] In writing about the crusade of 1101 Albert referred to Count Raymond and all the leaders and *capitanei*.[348] Finally, he wrote that the citizens of Beirut, under siege in 1110 by Baldwin I, sought terms, seeing the emir and all the *capitanei* had fled.[349]

Albert used the term *domnus* for senior members of the nobility and the clergy particularly to express a social relationship, that of lordship over a place or a body of people. Godfrey was introduced as duke of Lotharingia, prince and *domnus* of the castle of

---

[337] AA 337.
[338] AA 666. For Baldwin of Bourcq see n. 141; for William IX, duke of Aquitaine see J. L. Cate, 'A Gay Crusader,' *Byzantion* 16 (1942 – 3), 503 – 26.
[339] AA 240.
[340] AA 365.
[341] AA 613.
[342] See J. F. Niermeyer, *Medival Latin Dictionary*, I, 177 – 8.
[343] AA 167, see above p. 79.
[344] AA 312, 316.
[345] AA 316.
[346] AA 135. For Henry of Esch, see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom*, p. 209.
[347] AA 473.
[348] AA 616: *Comes Reimundus et universi ductores et capitanei.*
[349] AA 787: *Cives autem, videntes quoniam ammiraldus et omnes capitanei aufugissent.*

Bouillon.[350] When Baldwin sought to obtain the surrender of the citizens of Tarsus to himself rather than Tancred, he explained that his brother Godfrey had been elected and ordained head and *domnus* of the army by everyone.[351] In the same speech he referred to Godfrey as his *domnus* and brother.[352] The people of Edessa were described as wanting to make Baldwin *domnus* and duke of the city.[353] Bishop Adhémar of Le Puy was twice called *domnus*.[354] When Baldwin I was made ruler of the kingdom Albert wrote that he was ordained king and *domnus*.[355] Later Bohemond and Tancred wrote to him and according to Albert the address of their message read 'to our *domnus* Baldwin, most Christian king of Jerusalem.'[356] Similarly Tancred was reported as addressing Bohemond as his *domnus*.[357] Albert's version of the embassy of Peter the Hermit to Kerbogha is interesting in regard to the content of the offer he believed the leaders of the army to have made. This included the proposal that should Kerbogha consent to believe in Christ, they were prepared to become his *milites* and serve him as their *dominus* and *princeps*.[358] The term *dominus*, however, seems to have also been applicable to group of magnates in a purely social sense. In an imagined address by Bohemond to Duke Godfrey, Robert of Flanders and Count Raymond, Albert had the Norman prince begin: 'My most beloved *domini* and brothers.'[359]

Albert of Aachen was unusual in early crusading historians in that his reports were evenly spread across all the social orders. Whereas Raymond of Aguilers paid particular attention to the activities of the *pauperes*, the anonymous author of the *Gesta Francorum* the *milites* and Fulcher the nobility, Albert was much more balanced. His vocabulary was rich and nuanced, with a straightforward style largely unadorned by classical allusion or biblical citation. This makes him a key source for social *ordo* on the First Crusade.

---

[350] AA 164.
[351] AA 210 – 211.
[352] AA 211.
[353] AA 230.
[354] AA 189, 356.
[355] AA 561.
[356] AA 708: *Domno suo Baldwino regi Christianissimo Iherusalem...*
[357] AA 703.
[358] AA 357: *... tibi sicut domino et principi servire parati sunt.*
[359] AA 315: *Domini et fratres mei dilectissimi...*

I.5. The *Historia Hierosolymitana* of Baldric, Archbishop of Dol

The text

Baldric was born at Meung-sur-Loire in 1046. He was a monk of the Benedictine monastery of Bourgeuil, becoming abbot of there in 1089. In 1107 he was made Archbishop of Dol, a position he held until his death in 1130.[1] Baldric had a high level of education and extensive knowledge of the classics, reflected in his poetry and hagiography, for which he is perhaps better known than his history.[2]

The *Historia Hierosolymitana* was written not long after Baldric's appointment to the Archbishopric of Dol. This is the convincing conclusion of the editors of the *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades*, made on the basis of Baldric's dedication of the work to Abbot Peter of Maillezais, himself an *orator* and *viator* of the First Crusade.[3] In reply Peter of Maillezais congratulated Baldric's achievement in becoming a bishop, praise that only seems appropriate if Baldric had been recently raised to that position.[4] Furthermore, in his prologue to the work, Baldric claimed to have been writing for nearly sixty years.[5] If his education was similar to that of his friend Orderic Vitalis, he would have been 'taught letters' from the age of five.[6] Even without a certain exaggeration arising from the prestige of being venerable, this would indicate the history was being written before 1111 with Peter's congratulations indicating a date closer to 1107.

There is no modern edition of the *Historia Hierosolymitana*. The 1611 edition in the collection of Jacques Bongars was based upon Paris, B. N. MS latin 5513. This manuscript has been the subject of a recent study by N. L. Paul, who concluded that it was an untypical version of the *Historia Hierosolymitana* 'redacted to suit the political and commemorative imperatives of the seigneurial family of Amboise.'[7] J. P. Migne reproduced Bongar's edition for volume 166 of the *Patrologia Latina* (1854). The editors of the 1898 fourth volume of the *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades* considered seven manuscripts for the construction of

---

[1] Baldric of Dol, *Hierosolymitanae Historiae, RHC Oc.* 4, 1 – 111 (hereafter BD), here iii.
[2] See F. J. E. Raby, *A History of Secular Latin Poetry in the Middle Ages*, 2 (Oxford, 1997), I, 337 – 348.
[3] BD vi, 5, 8.
[4] BD 7.
[5] BD 10.
[6] OV 6, 550; 6, 551.
[7] N. L. Paul, 'Crusade, memory and regional politics in twelfth-century Amboise', *Journal of Medieval History*, 31.2 (June 2005), pp. 127 – 41, here p. 127

their text. They recognised the untypical features of MS 5513, producing the best edition to date and the one used by this study.

Baldric was one of the three Benedictine monks who took the *Gesta Francorum* as the *fons formalis* of their own history. He amended the original text for much the same reasons as those given by Guibert of Nogent and Robert the Monk, namely that the anonymous author was rustic, simple and that as a consequence a noble subject matter had become worthless.[8] The effect of Baldric's rewriting of the *Gesta Francorum* was to expand on the original to make the work more dramatic, richer in detail and, at a cost to historical precision, more favourable to the Christian forces. Baldric was also keen, where opportunity arose, to make the writing more poetic and indeed it was the sound of the concatenation of Baldric's sentences that was singled out for praise by Peter of Maillezais.[9]
The following comparison provides a useful illustration of the relationship of the *Historia Hierosolymitana* to the *Gesta Francorum*. It is the account of cannibalism by the Christian forces at Ma'arat-an-Numan (December 1098).

Gesta Francorum	*Hierosolymitanae Historiae*
Caedebant carnes eorum per frusta, et coquebant ad manducandum. GF 80, referring to the dead bodies of Saracens.	*Relatum est enim et compertum quia multi carnes turcinas, carnes scilicet humanas, verutatas et ignibus assas, inverecundis morsibus tetigere ... Palam tamen verbum hoc factum est in exercitui; sed quoniam fame praevalebat, ultio suspendebatur. Majores tamen pectus et os percutiebant at horrentes silebant; nec tamen imputabatur eis pro scelere, quoniam famem illam pro Deo alacriter patiebantur, et inimicis manibus et dentibus inimicabantur.* BD 86.

For the terse comment in the *Gesta*, Baldric substituted not only a more vivid description but also an attempt to absolve the *maiores* from their failure to act, as well as an explanation that not only did famine make this cannibalism less of a crime but so did the fact

[8] BD 10.
[9] BD 86.

that some of the Christian forces had only their hands and teeth with which to attack their enemies.

The *Historia Hierosolymitana* is a much longer work than the *Gesta Francorum* as a result of these elaborations; the *Gesta* is a little over 20,000 words, the *Historia* 36,000. For a historian attempting to reconstruct a narrative of events these revisions have to be treated extremely carefully. The additional information cannot always be dismissed as imaginative; Baldric himself drew attention in his prologue to the fact that the work as a whole did include new information from returning veterans.[10] It is likely that Baldric had read the work of Raymond of Aguilers and occasionally drew upon information from it to supplement that of the *Gesta Francorum*, the work on which he was otherwise so dependent that the editors of the *RHC* edition did not seek for other written sources that might have informed Baldric's account.[11] It has also to be borne in mind that Baldric dedicated his history to someone who he knew had been present on the expedition and therefore could not have engaged in completely fanciful invention. In the particular case of the report of cannibalism at Ma'arat-an-Numan, however, the idea that some crusaders were so impoverished that they fought with hands and teeth has enough of an echo of the description of the cannibalism and gnashing of teeth of the *tafurs* in the *Chanson d'Antioche* to cast doubt on it as an example of new material arising from the reports of returning crusaders.[12]

As a classicist Baldric's enrichment of the text of the *Gesta Francorum* is of mixed value. Some of his language for social orders seems to have been chosen to display his powers of rhetoric rather than convey accurate social information. So, for example, Baldric was unique among historians of the First Crusade in referring to its leaders as *patres conscripti*. He was sufficiently attracted to the term that he used it on six occasions, all of them in passages of *oratio recta*.[13] *Patres conscripti* was a much used classical term for the senate; it was notably used by Cicero, whose works were to become an essential part of the *trivium*.[14] By Baldric's day, however, the term was an unusual one, Orderic Vitalis, who imported large extracts of Baldric's history verbatim into his own, edited it out of his version of events, probably considering it inappropriate. It is perhaps significant, given that Baldric only ever used the phrase within a passage of *oratio recta*, that an early medieval guide to rhetoric drew attention to two speeches as examples worthy of emulation, in which those being addressed were the *patres conscripti*.[15] Its appearance in the *Historia Hierosolymitana*

---

[10] BD xi – xii.
[11] A modern editor might be able to untangle the complicated parallels with Guibert of Nogent's *Gesta Dei Per Francos* as well as point to the known sources for information used by Baldric that is not present in the *Gesta Francorum*. See below p. 124 for a possible use of Raymond of Aguilers.
[12] CA II, 4 – 5.
[13] BD 44, 44, 49, 49, 53, 99.
[14] See especially Marcus Tullius Cicero, *In Catilinam*, I.2, 4, 11, 12, 13; II.6; IV.1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10.
[15] Anon., *Principia Rhetorices*, *PL* 32, cols. 1439 - 1449.

is probably best understood as Baldric displaying his knowledge of classical oratory rather than it being used to convey information about the relationship of the leaders of the First Crusade to their followers.

A similar interpretation should probably be made of the phrase 'Consuls of the Lord' that appears in the opening remarks of a speech by Bohemond before leaving the Christian camp at the siege of Antioch to meet the relieving expedition of Rudwan, emir of Aleppo, and Suqman ibn Ortuq (9 February 1098). According to Baldric, Bohemond began by saying, *Domini consulares et illustres viri ...*[16] Although the term *consules* was evolving to have a contemporary technical meaning, especially in the Italian city states, for example featuring in Caffaro's *Annales Genuenses* for the year 1099,[17] the fact it was employed by Baldric in a rhetorical context indicates that it was more being used to provide a classical flourish to the speech than to indicate anything about the social status of those being addressed. By contrast, when, for example, Fulcher of Chartres reported that King Baldwin I of Jerusalem made an agreement with the *consules* of a Genoese fleet (25 April 1101), a precise social grouping was meant.[18]

For the social historian, on the other hand, Baldric's interpolations can be extremely valuable. Just as with the revisions of the *Gesta Francorum* by Robert the Monk and Guibert of Nogent, the fleshing out of simple statements into more colourful passages by someone with a much richer social vocabulary leads, at the very least, to an insight into the author's understanding of contemporary social relations.

Baldric's theological and social frameworks for his understanding of the importance of the First Crusade were intertwined. This is evidenced by a very interesting report of the speech of the envoys of Raymond of Toulouse at Clermont, shortly after the announcement that Adhémar, bishop of Le Puy, had volunteered to go. 'Behold! God be thanked, two men voluntarily offered to proceed with the Christians on their journey. Behold! Religious and secular power, the clerical *ordo* and the laity, harmonise in order to lead the army of God. Bishop and count, we imagine ourselves like another Moses and Aaron.'[19] This speech shows Baldric using the social framework of *ordo*, here not quite the famous tripartite division between those who pray, those who fight and those who work, but a bipartite version obtained by referring to the entire laity as one undifferentiated order. It also shows Baldric tentatively engaging with the theological issue of leadership. The reference to Moses and Aaron seems to refer to the Lucan and Gelasian doctrine of the 'two swords', that is, the idea that the world

---

[16] BD 46.
[17] Caffaro, 'Annales Ianuenses', ed. L.T. Belgrano, *Annali Genovesi di Caffaro e de' suoi continuatori* (Rome, 1890), I, 5.
[18] FC II, VIII, 2 (396 – 7).
[19] BD 16: *Ecce, Deo gratias, jam Christianis ituris, duo ultronei processere viri; ecce sacerdotium et regnum; clericalis ordo et laicalis ad exercitum Dei conducendum concordant. Episcopus et comes, Moysen et Aaron nobis reimaginantur.*

was properly run by two authorities: the sacred authority of the bishop over ecclesiastical matters and the secular authority of the prince over all other forms of government.[20] Baldric indicated here that Count Raymond's envoys were evoking, indirectly, the traditional view of authority. Some contemporary Gregorian reformers, however, who were in favour of a view that the clergy should be considered the 'masters of kings and princes'[21] would not have equated the roles of bishop and count in the manner of Baldric's formulation.[22] Nor, during the First Crusade, was such a division of authority between Bishop Adhémar and Count Raymond ever actually realised. Rather, Urban II and many of the participants saw the papal legate as the main figure of authority.[23] It cannot be ruled out that Baldric was accurately recalling the theme of the followers of Count Raymond. During the expedition the Count went to great lengths to portray himself as especially chosen for the enterprise, including his championing of the Holy Lance as an authentic relic and his willingness to undergo a special ritual of immersion in Jordan according to the instructions of the visionary Peter Bartholomew.[24]

Another key passage that intertwines a distinct theological perspective on the First Crusade with social information was Baldric's observation that 'in that expedition the *duces* themselves fought, the *duces* themselves took watches, so that you would not know a *dux* from a *miles*, or how a *miles* differed from a *dux*. In addition, there was such a community of all things, that hardly anyone designated anything individually to himself, but, just as in the primitive Church, nearly all those things were communal.'[25] Gregorian reformers made much of the notion of the *Ecclesia Primitiva*;[26] here Baldric's desire to portray the First Crusade in the spirit of an imagined age of harmony between the social orders almost certainly was distorting the historical information of the passage. The communal sharing of property was an exaggeration of reports by the eyewitnesses Fulcher of Chartres and Raymond of Aguilers that there did exist a concern to give property to its rightful owners.[27] The social information, however, that Baldric drew a distinction between *duces* and *milites* is of interest.

---

[20] Luke 22:38; Galasius I, *Epistola* 12 (*JK* 632) ed. A. Thiel, *Epistolae Romanorum pontifcum genuinae* I (Braunsberg, 1868), p. 350.
[21] Gregory VII, VIII.21 (15 March 1081), ed. E. Caspar, Gregory VII, *Registrum, Monumenta Germaniae Historica Epistolae selectae* 2, 553; see also I. S. Robinson, *Authority and resistance in the Investiture Contest* (Manchester, 1978).
[22] I. S. Robinson, *The Papacy 1073 – 1198* (Cambridge, 1990), pp. 296 – 300, 320.
[23] *Ibid*., pp. 322 – 3.
[24] RA 356 -7.
[25] BD 28: *In ista siquidem expeditione duces ipsi militabant, ipsi duces excubabant, ut nescires quid dux a milite, quid miles differret a duce. Praeterea ibi erat tanta omnium rerum communitas, ut vix aliquis aliquid sibi diceret proprium; sed, sicut in primitiva Ecclesia, ferme illis erant omnia communia.*
[26] G. Miccoli, 'Ecclesiae primitivae forma' *Studi Medievali*, II, 3a (1960), pp. 470 – 498.
[27] RA 73, FC I,XIII,5 (203). See above p. 56.

There is a speech attributed to Bohemond in the *Gesta Francorum*, shortly before the 'Lake battle' (9 February 1098), in which the anonymous author had Bohemond urge his fellow leaders of the First Crusade that while the footsoldiers should remain to guard the camp, the knights should ride out to meet the enemy (the relieving expedition of Rudwan, amir of Aleppo, and Suqman ibn Ortuq). In a key passage for the exposition of his social schema, Baldric of Dol wrote a considerable elaboration of the speech, including the lines: 'For until the *populus Dei* entrust themselves to us we will see many die. How does a *dominus* differ from a *servus*, a *nobilis* from a *plebeius*, *dives* from *pauper*, *miles* from *pedes*, if not that the counsel of us who rule over them should be useful, and our help should protect them?'[28] The sense of the speech is noteworthy, for its message is that good leadership is the best means by which those of the upper half of society can protect those of the lower. This was one of Baldric's major themes and his history utilised every opportunity to emphasise the mutual interest of rich and poor. Several times Baldric described the motive for action of the rich being concern for the poor.[29] This passage also indicates Baldric's awareness of basic bipartite distinctions in society: lord from servant, noble from commoner, rich from poor, knight from footsoldier. These divisions, as we shall repeatedly see, Baldric considered to be harmoniously reconciled in the Christian forces of the First Crusade.

Terms denoting social orders in the Historia Hierosolymitana

Deteriores, plebs, minores, pauperes, egentes

A literal, if unusual, depiction of the lower social orders by Baldric arose through his use of the adjective *deteriores* in his account of the speech of Pope Urban II at Clermont. Baldric, who from the tone of his report is generally considered to have been an eyewitness,[30] described Urban's lament at the state of affairs arising from the pagan subjugation of former Christian lands, where *nos abjectio plebis facti, et omnium deteriores.*[31] Urban, using the language of Psalm 21:7, was emphasising how far Christians had fallen by their having become as abject as *plebs* and all the *deteriores*. Baldric's use of the term *plebs* here is unusual but consistent with his list of bipartite divisions of society, in which he juxtaposed the *plebs* with the *nobiles*. In both cases Baldric, in contrast to the other early crusading historians

---

[28] BD 45 – 6: *Nam quoad populum Dei qui se nobis commisit, multum mori conspicabimur. Quid differt dominus a servo, nobilis a plebeio, dives a paupere, miles a pedite, nisi nostrum qui praesidemus eis prosit consilium, et patrocinetur auxilium?*
[29] See below pp. 116, 118, 125.
[30] F. Duncalf, 'The councils of Piacenza and Clermont', *A History of the Crusades*, ed. Setton, 1 (Madison, 1969), pp. 220-52; D. C. Munro, 'The speech of Pope Urban II at Clermont, 1095', *American Historical Review* 11 (1905-6), pp. 231-42; R. Somerville, 'The council of Clermont and the First Crusade', *Studia Gratiana* 20 (1976), 323-37.
[31] BD 14.

but in keeping with his classicising bent, was using the term *plebs* for commoners and not simply all of the laity, noble and common. The division of *nobiles* and *plebs* occurs in a number of other instances in the *Historia Hierosolimitana*. During the spring of 1098 the Christian forces outside of Antioch decided to build a castle at a mosque, which was subsequently garrisoned by the followers of Count Raymond. The *Gesta Francorum* simply has the report that this was a decision of the *maiores*.[32] In Baldric's version the motive for the decision was elaborated, he wrote that the nobility were mercifully concerned to look after the *plebs*.[33] The *plebs* appeared again as a grouping requiring the protection of the mighty (*proceres* and *optimates*) in a sermon given after the capture of Jerusalem. Baldric had the *maiores* deliberate on the need to elect a ruler in order to provide for the *plebs* that intended to remain. This ruler was to allocate the responsibility of protecting and taking care of the *plebs*.[34] Baldric again used the idea of a basic division between the noble and the commoners in an interesting passage in which Bohemond was given a speech reminding the leaders of the Christian forces of the hardship everyone was suffering. Speaking to the *optimates*, he drew to their attention the plight of the *plebeii homines*, only to acknowledge that it was unnecessary to do when even those of illustrious birth (*illustris sanguinis*) were starving.[35]

Other, less significant, passages are consistent with the view that Baldric considered the *plebs* to be commoners. Baldric reported the Norman prince and nephew of Bohemond, Tancred, hid among the *plebs* in order to avoid taking an oath to the Alexius I Comnenus, the Byzantine Emperor.[36] The account of the defeat of an expedition from Antioch led by the Provençal knight, Raymond Pilet (5 July 1098), included the report that many of the fainthearted and *gens plebeia* were killed.[37] This last example was an amendment of the *Gesta Francorum*'s highly unusual term *minuta gens*.[38] A further passage containing a description of the *gens plebeia* was a description of the reaction of the commoners to the preaching of the First Crusade. Baldric described how the *gens plebeia* displayed a cross that because of the presumption of certain foolish women they believed had been created from heaven.[39] He could well have been an eyewitness to such behaviour in the local population, which he considered to be credulous and erroneous. In all these instances the *plebs* were a lowly and somewhat shameful class. An interesting passage concerning the spirit of common leadership that Baldric imagined to have existed on the First Crusade also showed that Baldric's opinion of the *plebs* was not always a negative one. After commenting on the unheard of nature of the

---

[32] GF 39.
[33] BD 48.
[34] BD 104.
[35] BD 53 – 4.
[36] BD 25.
[37] BD 82.
[38] GF 74.
[39] BD 17.

Christian army, which was *sine rege, sine imperatore*, he praised the fact that everyone took responsibility for themselves, supported the common decision of the wise and praised the resolution of the *plebs*.[40] The passage echoed the Children of Israel in Hosea 3:4,[41] who were also *sine rege, sine principe*.

Shortly before Christmas 1097 the hardship experienced by the Christian forces before Antioch resulted in a decision to send out a detachment in search of supplies. Baldric's account of this period follows the *Gesta Francorum* very closely, but after he reported the announcement of the decision to send out foragers Baldric added the extra observation that naturally, with paternal affection, the *maiores* gave protection to the *minores*.[42] This was the only instance of Baldric's use of the couplet *maiores* and *minores* for the basic bipartite division of noble and commoner. Again the message of the passage was that during the First Crusade the mighty took particular concern for the lowly.

An important term for the poor in Baldric's work was *pauperes*. He used the term several times for those who were in need of assistance from the rich, although with less frequency than Raymond of Aguilers for whom the *pauperes* were not simply those experiencing poverty, but the people chosen by God.[43] In describing the journey of Bohemond's contingent through Greece the *Gesta Francorm* reported that Bohemond called a council to restrain his forces from engaging in plunder.[44] Baldric took the opportunity to compose a speech for Bohemond at this point, in which he gave important social commentary. 'You however, our *proceres*, our *familiares*, who are unencumbered, attend vigilantly to the *pedites*, that they do not falter on the road and wait for them. Go forward as soon as possible and pitch your tents in good time. And those of you who by the grace of God are *opulentiores*, pour out your resources as alms to the *pauperes*. Have God always present before your eyes.'[45] As *pauperes* were coupled with *opulentiores* by Baldric here the meaning of the term as the 'poor' is unambiguous, and a fundamentally bipartite division of society between rich and poor is indicated. Here also Baldric saw it as the responsibility of the wealthy to be charitable to the poor, if for no other reason than such action was meritorious in the eyes of God and would not pass unnoticed. This is a similar theme to that in the passage above, in which Baldric had Bohemond refer to the responsibility of the *dives* to the *pauperes* in a list of other bipartite ways of looking at society: *dominus* and *servus*; *nobilis* and *plebs*;

---

[40] BD 9.
[41] Hosea 3.4: ... *sine rege, sine principe.*
[42] BD 42.
[43] See above pp. 36 - 8.
[44] GN 8.
[45] BD 22 – 3: *Vos autem, proceres nostri, familiares nostri, qui expeditiores estis, de peditibus vigilantius procurate, et ne deficiant in via, eos exspectando maturius procedite, et tentoria vestra tempestive figite. Et quoniam, Deo gratias, opulentiores estis, opes vestras pro eleemosyna pauperibus effundite: Deum ante oculos praesentem semper habete.*

miles and *pedes*.[46] In this latter case, however, the responsibility was to give leadership rather than charity.

The anonymous author of the *Gesta Francorum* described a scene in which Kerbogha, the emir of Mosul and leader of a united Turkish army brought to challenge the Christian forces at Antioch, was brought a rusty sword, a bad bow and a useless spear, all recently stolen from the *pauperes peregrini*.[47] Baldric had a very similar passage, but said that the weapons were taken from certain of the Christian *pauperculi*.[48] The slight change of term does not, however, seem to indicate any difference in meaning. Baldric was willing to use the expression *pauperes peregrini*, he did so for those Christian poor who fell behind and died after Alexius met with Stephen of Blois (mid June, 1098) and turned back through Asia Minor.[49] In the *Gesta Francorum* the same people were described as the exhausted pilgrims (*peregrini languentes*).[50]

At the fall of Jerusalem (15 July 1099) there was a scramble for the goods of the former citizens. Baldric wrote that as the houses were discovered to have been filled with all good things there was a sufficient abundance that the wealth was shared with the *pauperiores*.[51] In this version of the sacking of the city the scene appears to be more harmonious than in other sources, which recount a more determined effort by all the Christian conquerors to seize property and mark it as taken and in which there is no mention of sharing.[52] A further appearance of the *pauperes* in the *Historia Hierosolymitana* occurs in a detail unreported by any other early crusading historian, but which has a note of authenticity about it. After the massacre in Jerusalem the Christian leaders attended to the bodies that needed to be carried out, seeing as the horror and stench was growing immensely. 'Therefore the living pagans were ordered to this work, and because there were not enough of them, the *pauperes Christiani*, having been given pay, engaged in the same work.'[53] The report in the *Gesta Francorum* agrees that the surviving Saracens dragged out the dead bodies, but has no mention of this being insufficient and the Christian poor being paid for the same work.[54] This is possibly an authentic historical detail, but even if it is an invention by Baldric, it indicates that he considered the *pauperes* on the expedition at this point to be free from compulsory labour; the princes had to offer pay for the work.

---

[46] BD 46. See above p. 114.
[47] GF 51.
[48] BD 61.
[49] BD 72.
[50] GF 65.
[51] BD 103.
[52] See below pp. 234 - 6.
[53] BD 103: ... *vivis ergo gentilibus illud opus mandaverunt, et quoniam non sufficiebant, pauperibus Christianis, dato pretio, idem negotium iterum commiserunt.*
[54] GF 92.

Upon the surrender of Nicea (19 June 1097), Emperor Alexius I Comnenus was described by Baldric as making a large donation to the *pauperes* of the Christian forces.[55] Baldric also described, however, expressions of discontent among the Christian forces that the city was not given over to plunder. In keeping with his theme of the sharing of resources among the Christian army, Baldric rather optimistically imagined that had this sacking of the city taken place the wealth would have become public property and so alleviated the poverty of the *egeni*, the 'destitute'.[56] The two terms *pauperes* and *egeni* were linked again when, at a council of the princes sometime after the defeat of Kerbogha (28 June 1098) they resolved, according to Baldric, to show compassion for the *pauperes*,[57] before going on to make an offer to take into service those *egeni* who were fit enough to leave Antioch. This was Baldric's version of an important passage in the *Gesta Francorum* in which the princes had it announced throughout the whole city that if there should be present someone *egens* who wished for gold or silver, the princes would be pleased to make an agreement for their services.[58] Baldric inherited the use of the term *egeni* for his own version of this offer, adding the detail that the princes said that 'if someone is *egenus* and is a vigorous person, he should join service with us, and we, having bestowed a stipend on each, shall give relief to all. The sick will be nourished at public expense until they get well.'[59] It is clear that for Baldric the offer of the princes was made for the well-being for the poor, with it being proposed that those who were able leave the city in the following of a prince. While this might well have been the actual content of the offer, the information provided by the *Gesta Francorum* is once again being used to illustrate Baldric's message that on the First Crusade the wealthy acted out of concern for the poor, rather than self-interest. Baldric used the adjective *egens* in a manner suggestive of the same grouping of destitute members of the Christian army in his account of the fall of Hisn al-Akrad (29 January 1099), later called Krak des Chevaliers. He wrote such a great abundance of corn, wine, flour, barley and oil was found that if anyone remained *egens* it was only out of their own idleness.[60]

The term *servi* appeared in Baldric's list of bipartite divisions of society in opposition to *domini*, but not thereafter in connection with the Christian forces. He did, however, write a major digression from the *Gesta Francorum* in which the culmination of the expedition was the occasion for the priests to give a major sermon before the Christian forces stormed the city of Jerusalem (15 July 1099). In the course of the long exhortation that Baldric attributed

---

[55] BD 30.
[56] BD 30.
[57] BD 80.
[58] GF 72-3.
[59] BD 80: *Si quis egenus est et corpore vegetus, jungatur nobis, et nos omnibus, datis unicuique stipendiis, subsidiabimur; infirmi publica stipe donec convaluerint, sustententur.*
[60] BD 91.

to the priests was a complex theological image, of the pagan inhabitants of the city being the flesh and blood manifestation of the Devil's *servi*.[61]

In general Baldric was clearly sympathetic to the position of the poor, who appear in much greater vividness in his work than that of his *fons formalis*. Typically, however, their appearance is as the lowly group to whom charity and concern is offered by their seniors. An implicit tension over property can perhaps still be deduced, especially in Baldric's account of the fall of Jerusalem, where the poor are portrayed in a more assertive manner: free from lordship and paid, rather than commanded, for their work.

Artifices, Lignarii

The manufacture of great siege towers was an important feature of the siege of Jerusalem. The *Gesta Francorum* simply reported that Duke Godfrey and Count Raymond had two siege towers made. Baldric, however, explained that 'they brought with the whole army skilful *lignarii*, with the craft of whom they were able to construct siege machines'[62] and that 'therefore the *artifices* pursued these works wisely.'[63] From the account of the building of the same siege towers by Raymond of Aguilers it can be determined that the craftsmen were independent paid labourers rather than servants.[64]

Pedites

As with the other crusading sources the term *pedites* was used in the *Historia Hierosolymitana* in a straightforward manner, to indicate footsoldiers. Very often the entire fighting forces of the Christian army were described as consisting of *pedites* and *milites*.[65] The division, *miles* and *pedes*, is one of the fundamental bipartite formulations given by Baldric.[66] The *pedites* are mentioned in a few other interesting passages. *Pedites* appear in the passage noted above in which Baldric echoed the description of the Children of Israel in Hosea 3:4,[67] in order to praise those setting out for Jerusalem. 'Who, indeed, hitherto has heard of so many *principes*, *duces*, *milites*, *pedites*, fighting without a king, without an emperor.'[68] Guibert of Nogent made the same connection between the Children of Israel and the Christian forces on the First Crusade, and in similar terms.[69] The relationship of Baldric's text to that of Guibert's deserves further exploration but their formulations are sufficiently

---

[61] BD 100 – 101.
[62] BD 99: *Acciti sunt de toto exercitu artifices lignarii, quorum artificio machinae compaginarentur.*
[63] BD 100: *Instabant igitur artifices illis operibus sagaciter.*
[64] RA 333. See above pp. 42 - 3.
[65] BD 27, 34, 35, 42, 80, 85, 101.
[66] See above p. 114.
[67] Hosea 3.4: ... *sine rege, sine principe.*
[68] BD 9: *Quis enim tot principes, tot duces, tot milites, tot pedites sine rege, sine imperatore dimicantes eatenus audivit?*
[69] See below p. 150.

different that it seems as though both monks, independently, saw the parallel. It is, after all, a central theme of Old Testament history. It might well have been the case that the theme of the army led by God was a popular one in Northern French sermons in the first decade of the twelfth century. In describing the hardship of the march, early in August 1097, en route to Iconium, Baldric repeated a terse report of the *Gesta Francorum*. The anonymous author wrote that a great number of horses died, so that many *milites* remained *pedites*.[70] Baldric's version was similar, reporting that with the death of horses and yoked asses many renowned *milites* were compelled to march as *pedites*.[71] The fact of Baldric's recognition that it was possible for a *miles* to fall to the status of a *pedes* is significant in showing that the idea that such a change was possible was not confined to the Italian participant of the First Crusade, but also a northern French Bishop some ten years later. Equally, Baldric accepted that Kerbogha could make an offer to Christian forces, to raise to *equites* all who were *pedites*.[72] The extent to which this indicates a fluidity of social class at the start of the twelfth century depends then on the extent to which Baldric understood the *miles* or *eques* to be noble, a knight, or simply a mounted soldier.

Familiares, satellites

An interesting theological use of the term *familia* appears in the *Historia Hierosolymitana* in a speech that Baldric attributed to the priests of the Christian army, in preparing everyone for the assault on Jerusalem (15 July 1099). The entire army, *milites et pedites* were addressed as *familia Christi*.[73] This was an unusual variation of the idea of the *miles Christi*. Grouping the combatants into a *familia* served Baldric's purpose by emphasising the unity of the Crusading army, which in fact was displaying distinct regional tensions at that point.[74] In other respects Baldric used the term *familiares* straightforwardly for the following of a prince. The one example of an individual being referred to directly as a *familiaris* was a person of relatively high status. The knight Raymond Pilet, who at one point led his own expeditionary force east of Antioch (17 July 1098), was described by Baldric, following the *Gesta Francorum*, as one of the *familiares* of Count Raymond of Toulouse.[75] Contemporaries, such as Raymond of Aguilers, saw Raymond Pilet as a *miles nobilissimus*.[76] The other appearances of the term *familiares* in the *Historia Hierosolymitana* are without significance, except perhaps Baldric's amendment to the statement in the *Gesta Francorum* that in the summer and autumn of 1098 the *seniores* left Antioch with an agreement to return

---

[70] GF 23.
[71] BD 37.
[72] BD 75.
[73] BD 101.
[74] J. France. *Victory in the East. A military history of the First Crusade* (Cambridge, 1984), pp. 331 - 2.
[75] BD 81.
[76] RA 253 – 4.

in November. Baldric made the alteration that it was the '*duces et familiae*' who thus dispersed throughout the neighbouring regions. His version of the same information chose to emphasise the presence of a household alongside the senior princes, suggesting that he understood it as natural that a noteworthy body of household troops would accompany a leading prince. Baldric used the term *satellites* in a similar sense to his use of *familiares* with perhaps a slight variation of meaning. The two instances in which he applied the term to Christian forces concern Tancred. Baldric wrote that having taken up the responsibility of garrisoning a castle South West of Antioch at St. George's monastery (5 April 1098), Tancred's *satellites* watched and blocked the way.[77] The second instance arose soon after the fall of Jerusalem (15 July 1099), when Tancred and Count Eustace of Boulogne took many *satellites* and *clientes* to Nablus.[78] It is possible that whereas Baldric thought it appropriate to use the term *familiares* for the members of the household of a very senior and long established prince, he preferred *satellites* for the status of those closely attached to Tancred, a knight still in the early stage of his career whose following was established during the course of the First Crusade. Orderic Vitalis, a contemporary and friend of Baldric, showed that *satellites* could be distinguished from *equites*. Orderic used the term *satellites* in a manner that suggested, in equipment at least, they were slightly inferior to *equites* when he wrote of *loricati equites ac spiculati satellites*.[79]

Milites, equites

Baldric shared with his source a belief in the importance of ownership of a horse in differentiating a *miles* from a *pedes*.[80] In this regard a further passage to those discussed under *pedites* is of interest. The anonymous author wrote that due to poverty at the siege of Antioch early in 1098 there were not a thousand *milites* who had kept their horses in good condition.[81] Baldric's version of the same report was that scarcely a thousand *milites* could be found in the whole army who still enjoyed the use of a mount.[82] Both versions suggest there were very many *milites* without mounts, but at the same time, in calculating the forces available to the Christian army the message seems clear. Only those with a mount counted. This tension, between the practical assignation of *milites* without mounts to the ranks of *pedites* but their theoretical retention of their former status was an important source of internal stress within the expedition.[83]

---

[77] BD 52.
[78] BD 105.
[79] OV 8,14.
[80] See above pp. 14 - 15.
[81] GF 34.
[82] BD 44.
[83] See below pp. 251 - 6.

Those individuals assigned the epithet *miles* by Baldric were Robert of Flanders, a *miles audacissimus* and in all respects a *miles expeditissimus*;[84] Duke Godfrey of Lotharingia, a *miles acerrimus*;[85] Robert fitz-Gerard, the constable to Bohemond, a *miles audacissimus*;[86] Raymond Pilet;[87] Tancred, a *princeps et miles strenuus* and a *miles acerrimus*;[88] Achard of Montemerle, twice referred to as a *miles audacissimus*[89] and Lethold of Tournai.[90] Senior leaders of the First Crusade were included in the category of *miles*, but in a very interesting passage about the divine nature of the Christian army Baldric made it clear that at the same time he retained a notion that in wider society the *duces* were a social grouping distinct from the *milites*. 'In that expedition the *duces* themselves fought, the *duces* themselves took watches, so that you would not know a *dux* from a *miles*, or how a *miles* differed from a *dux*. In addition, there was such a community of all things, that hardly anyone said that anything was his own, but, just as in the primitive Church, nearly all those things were common to them.'[91] The main point here is that Baldric saw the blurring of distinction between *miles* and *dux* as untypical of his day. The secondary point about property is an exaggeration that casts doubt on the information about the leaders standing watches. There is, however, a certain basis for Baldric's comment in the reports of both Fulcher of Chartres and Raymond of Aguilers, eyewitnesses, who observed that the movement was very attentive to the property rights of all and those who lost mules or other goods during the expedition had them returned upon identification.[92]

Baldric used the term *miles* in another passage with a curious division of the social groupings present at the siege of Antioch. When the knights departed from the Christian camp to fight the 'Lake Battle' (9 February 1098), Baldric wrote that everyone became anxious. 'No one was confident in himself, neither the priest, nor the woman, nor the *populus*, nor the *miles*.'[93] There is an echo here of the famous three orders based on function with the *populus* substituted for *laboratores*. Baldric, in a similar manner to those passages in which Albert of

---

[84] BD 28, 35.
[85] BD 34.
[86] BD 47. For Robert fitz-Gerard see J. Riley-Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 221.
[87] BD 81. For Raymond Pilet see J. Riley – Smith, *The First Crusaders*, p. 220.
[88] BD 33, 75, 108. For Tancred see R. L. Nicholson. *Tancred: a study of his career and work in their relation to the First Crusade and the Establishment of the Latin States in Syria and Palestine*, (Chicago, 1940).
[89] BD 99. For Achard of Montmerle see J. Riley – Smith, *The First Crusaders*, p. 197.
[90] BD 102. For Lethold of Tournai see J. Riley – Smith, *The First Crusaders*, p. 215.
[91] BD 28: *In ista siquidem expeditione duces ipsi militabant, ipsi duces excubabant, ut nescires quid dux a milite, quid miles differret a duce. Praeterea ibi erat tanta omnium rerum communitas, ut vix aliquis aliquid sibi diceret proprium; sed, sicut in primitiva Ecclesia, ferme illis erant omnia communia.*
[92] FC I, XIII, 5 (203), RA 73.
[93] BD 46: *Neuter de se confidebat, nec sacerdos, nec mulier; nec populus, nec miles.*

Aachen resorted to the same schema, found the distinct presence of women was sufficiently notable that they too merited mention as a distinct category.[94]

The phrase *milites Christi* occurs several times in the *Historia Hierosolymitana* and was clearly theologically laden, rather than a badge of identification.[95] This is most evident with regard to the speeches that Baldric attributed to Bohemond in which the Norman prince addressed his fellows as *milites Christi.* As the Italian contingent marched through Greece in the winter of 1096 they were warned by Bohemond not to plunder their fellow Christians, according to the report in the *Gesta Francorum*.[96] Baldric used the report to imagine the actual speech of Bohemond, in which he attributed to him the statement that 'we are pilgrims for God, we are *Christi milites*.'[97] Another speech by Bohemond, in Baldric's version of events, also addressed the *Christi milites* as did the *maiores* of the army on one further occasion.[98] These instances are clearly different from the *duo milites Christiani* who were killed by Turkish raiders from the castle of Harem early in the siege of Antioch. The *milites Christi* addressed in the speeches were 'pilgrims for God'; those killed in the raid were two from the Christian forces. The more theological, Gregorian, sense of the special relationship with God of the knight on crusade was present in Baldric's account of the election of Duke Godfrey to the rule of Jerusalem (23 July 1099), where the assembly told Godfrey 'you will be a *miles Dei*.'[99]

Finally, Baldric used the interesting lament of al-Afdal after defeat at Ascalon (12 August 1099) unchanged from its appearance in the *Gesta Francorum*. The vizier of Egypt cried that he will 'never again retain *milites* by compact.[100] Even though the statement was made by the vizier of Egypt concerning his own forces, Baldric and the author of the *Gesta* here used terms that they considered appropriate for the recruitment of a *miles* by a lord, which was evidently that it was a mutually agreed *conventio* resulting in the 'retention' of the *miles.*

Baldric used the term *equites* rather than *milites* several times in connection with the battle between the Christian forces and Kerbogha (28 June 1098) and subsequently only on other one other occasion. The account of the battle with Kerbogha was embellished by Baldric with many poetic details. A consciously literary context is probably the reason why Baldric preferred the classical term for an order of horsemen, *equites*, to *milites*, that used for the same scenes in the *Gesta Francorum*. The first appearance of the term *equites* occurred in

---

[94] See above p. 81 and below Chapter II. 4.
[95] See C. Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, trans. M. W. Baldwin and W. Goffart (Princeton, 1977), pp. 202 – 3, 340 – 2.
[96] GF 8.
[97] BD 22: *Peregrini pro Deo sumus, Christi milites sumus.*
[98] BD 34, 42.
[99] BD 105.
[100] GF 96: *... ulterius non retinebo milites conventione aliqua ...*

the offer of Kerbogha to make *equites* from *pedites* discussed above. If the sense of the offer was that the footsoldiers were to become nobles, it would be a very significant statement about Baldric's understanding of the possibility of significant changes in social status through the acquisition of wealth. The other three uses of the term *equites* by Baldric, however, are not decisive with regard to the issue of the social status of the *eques*; if anything they lean towards an understanding that for Baldric the term *equites* meant 'rider' rather than 'knight'. In describing how the Christian forces marched out of Antioch to fight Kerbogha, Baldric wrote that rain fell, which delighted the horses and *equites*, so that the horses, as if gladdened, began to neigh, and so raised the spirits of the *equites*.[101] This poetic passage is not in the *Gesta Francorum*; however the information that a light shower took place that revived the Christian forces as they left the city is present in the *Historia Francorum* of Raymond of Aguilers.[102] A further appearance of *equites* in the *Historia Hierosolymitana* was in a sentence written by Baldric to emphasise the intensity of a battle in which 'neither horses nor *equites* obtained any rest.'[103] Here the formulation looks as though Baldric was indicating horse and 'rider', rather than horse and 'knight'. This seems also to be the case for the final use of the term *equites* by Baldric, which occurred in his account of famine at Ma'arat-an-Numan (December 1098), which arose after all the plunder in the city had been devoured either by horses or *equites*.[104]

Optimates, seniores, proceres, maiores, nobiles, primores

Baldric's preferred term for the leading nobles of the First Crusade was *optimates*. It was applied not just to the leading princes but a broader group of magnates. Bohemond, for example, was described as crossing the Adriatic *cum optimatibus suis*.[105] Again, Bohemond was described as addressing his following as *optimates et commilitones nostri*.[106] At other times Baldric clearly meant only the most senior princes, as when he described the *optimates*, together with their armies, as entering the land of the Armenians.[107] Baldric imagined the citizens of Tarsus surrendering their city to Baldwin and Tancred, with the two Christian leaders being addressed as illustrious *optimates*.[108] The *Gesta Francorum* reported a speech of Bohemond to the other Christian princes as beginning: S*eniores et prudentissimi milites*.[109] Baldric adjusted the same speech to begin: *Optimates et domini*.[110] In general Baldric edited

---

[101] BD 76.
[102] RA 131.
[103] BD 78.
[104] BD 86.
[105] BD 21.
[106] BD 22.
[107] BD 38.
[108] BD 38.
[109] GF 30.
[110] BD 42.

out the term *seniores* which was common in the *Gesta Francorum. Seniores* appears just once in the *Historia Hierosolimitana*, surviving in the address of Bohemond to the other princes shortly before the capture of Antioch.[111] Baldric's preference for *optimates* over *seniores* almost certainly reflected a geographical difference between the terminology used for magnates in northern France and southern Italy.

Baldric commonly used another term for nobles, *proceres*, again sometimes in order to replace the term *seniores*. That *proceres* could also refer to magnates outside the ranks of the most senior princes is shown by another speech of Bohemond, given to his followers, in which he addressed his *proceres.*[112]

A less favoured term for senior nobles in the *Historia Hierosolymitana* was *maiores*. It was used three times for the leaders of the First Crusade and once for a wider body of nobles, when, in November 1098, *omnes maiores natu* assembled in Antioch.[113] The fact that here to be a *maior* was a condition of birth is worth noting.

In his account of the council of Clermont Baldric wrote that after Bishop Adhémar of Le Puy had been appointed the commander of the army of God 'the great multitude of *nobiles* offered their assent.'[114] The term *nobiles* therefore encompassed a broader category of nobles than simply the major princes. Consistent with this comment about Adhémar was Baldric's amendment of the eulogy to the legate in the *Gesta Francorum*, the description of Adhémar as having been counsellor of the *divites*[115] was changed to counsellor of the *nobiles*.[116] That the term *nobiles* was a social order that could encompass the entire upper layer of a bipartite division of society is evident from the key passage noted several times above, that listed several bipartite ways of dividing society, one of the couplets being *nobilis* and *plebs*.[117] This way of dividing society has also been noted above with regard to the decision in the spring of 1098 to build a castle at a mosque, which was subsequently garrisoned by the followers of Count Raymond. Baldric wrote that this was done by the nobility (*nobilitas*) out of concern for the *plebs*.[118] The fact that for Baldric 'the nobility' and the *optimates* could be synonymous was indicated in his account of the meeting that agreed to the departure of Bohemond and Robert of Flanders on a foraging expedition. Baldric described those who met together as 'the nobility' *nobilitas*, soon after terming them 'the aforementioned *optimates*.'[119]

---

[111] BD 54.
[112] BD 22.
[113] BD 83.
[114] BD 16*: ... praebuit assensum multitudo multa nobilium.*
[115] GF 74.
[116] BD 82.
[117] BD 46. See above p. 114.
[118] BD 48.
[119] BD 45.

Baldric used the term *primores* twice, both times as a substitute for the use of *seniores* in the *Gesta Francorum*. When Tancred offered to garrison a castle to assist with the siege of Antioch (5 April 1098), Baldric reported that the Norman prince made a pact with the *primores* of the Franks.[120] The Christian princes who gathered for the battle of Ascalon (12 August 1099) were described by Baldric as *primores*.[121]

Principes, domini

The term *principes* was used by Baldric for very senior figures. Several times he referred to the collective leadership of the First Crusade by the term, curiously in a cluster of usages towards the end of his work[122] In describing the conflict of Bohemond and Count Raymond of Toulouse over the ownership of Antioch during the winter of 1098, Baldric three times referred to the two protagonists as *principes*.[123] Tancred was twice termed a *princeps*,[124] as was Duke Godfrey on his becoming the ruler of Jerusalem.[125]

Dominus was coupled with *servus* in the list of several couplets that expressed a bipartite view of society. [126] That Baldric sometimes used the term in a social sense and not simply to express those exercising the function of lordship is shown by its appearance in other speeches, where the *domini* are being addressed as the leading princes. The priest and visionary, Stephen of Valence, is described as speaking to *fratres et domini mei ...*[127] Similarly, the priests of the Christian army addressed its leaders as *fratres et domini* before the storming of Jerusalem (15 July 1099).[128]

Baldric of Dol is a relatively neglected source for the First Crusade; his work lacks a modern edition and translation. Undoubtedly this is because the vast majority of actual historical material in the *Historia Hierosolymitana* came from the *Gesta Francorum*. Baldric's history, however, merits analysis in its own right for the theological and classical perspectives that Baldric offers on the First Crusade. As a source of information concerning the events of the expedition it is limited; as a source for how a senior member of the northern French clergy framed their understanding of the First Crusade some ten years later it is extremely rich. In the process of investigating Baldric's language of social class his major

---

[120] BD 52. See GF 43.
[121] BD 107. See GF 94.
[122] BD 89, 89, 98, 99, 104, 106, 107.
[123] BD 89, 89,87.
[124] BD 24, 76.
[125] BD 105.
[126] BD 46.
[127] BD 67.
[128] BD 100.

themes can be seen, namely the parallel between the Children of Israel and the participants of the First Crusade; their behaviour mirroring that of the primitive Church; the responsibility of the seniors to the poor and as a result the harmony that existed between the social classes.

I.6. The *Historia Iherosolimitana* of Robert the Monk

The text

Although the *Historia Iherosolimitana* was popular in the medieval period, with around a hundred surviving manuscripts, there is no modern edition. In large part this is because the vast majority of the historical information in the work was based on a rewriting of the *Gesta Francorum* and modern historians have naturally favoured the eyewitness account. Its fall from favour has been relatively recent. An edition of the *Historia Iherosolimitana* appeared as early at 1492 in Cologne, it was printed in Basle in 1533 and Frankfurt – am– Main in 1584.[1] It was included in Jacques Bongars' important 1611 collection of crusading accounts and was printed in the *Patrologia Latina* series in 1844 by J. P. Migne.[2] The most recent edition, however, was that published in the *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades* series in 1866.[3] This edition is not ideal, as it lists just twenty-four of nearly one hundred surviving manuscripts, nevertheless it is used here.[4] The manuscript used as the base text for the *RHC* edition was Paris, B. N. MS latin 5129, a twelfth century manuscript from Reims.[5]

The *Historia Iherosolimitana* was written by a monk, Robert, who, apart from his testimony that he was present at the Council of Clermont (18 – 28 November 1095),[6] was not an eyewitness to the events he described. He worked from a monastery in the episcopate of Reims. This might well have been the Benedictine abbey of St-Rémi in the city itself, given that the abbey was large institution with a high reputation in the twelfth century. Although some scholars have identified Robert the monk with an Abbot Robert of St-Rémi (d. 1122), the most recent study of the *Historia Iherosolimitana*, the English translation by Carol Sweetenham, points out that the abbot's chequered career, the basic style of the text and, particularly, the fact that Robert the historian says he was writing *per obedientiam* of his abbot, makes the connection unlikely.[7] There is no internal evidence in the text for even an approximate date of composition, but based on the probable use of Robert's work in the

---

[1] *RHC Oc.* 3, 719 – 20.
[2] J. Bongars, *Gesta Dei per Francos* (Hanover, 1611); J. P. Migne ed. *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series latina* (Paris, 1844), 155, 669 – 758.
[3] *RHC Oc.* 3, 717 – 882, hereafter RM.
[4] RM xlviii – l.
[5] RM l.
[6] RM 725.
[7] Robert the Monk, *History of the First Crusade*, trans. C. Sweetenham (Aldershot, 2005), p. 3 – 4.

Magdeburg Charter of 1107/8, a plausible suggestion is 1106.[8] This would place Robert's work in chronological proximity to that of the two other rewritings of the *Gesta Francorum* in northern France, those of Guibert, abbot of Nogent (c. 1109) and Baldric, bishop of Dol (c. 1107).[9] If A. C. Krey's conjecture that Bohemond's tour of France in 1105 led to an increase in the circulation of the *Gesta Francorum* was correct, then this would also fit with Robert having started his own version soon after.[10]

Robert was heavily dependent on the *Gesta Francorum* for the basic form of his history and for most of its content. His reworking of the *Gesta Francorum*, however, introduced new material and significant elaborations. Where the *Gesta Francorum* is some 20,000 words long, the *Historia Iherosolimitana* is around 35, 000. There is a certain amount of historical information in the text that is original to Robert. This might well be valuable eyewitness testimony from returning crusaders, but any such genuine material has to be reconstructed to free it from the distorting effect of the strong theological lens through which Robert viewed his *fons formalis*. Robert made his outlook clear in the prologue of the *Historia Iherosolimitana* when he wrote that just as Moses held the principal place among historians of the Old and New Testament due to his description of the beginning of the world, so the historian who embarked on writing about the journey to Jerusalem must be pleasing to God, for this, with the exception of the martyrdom of Christ, was the most miraculous undertaking since the creation of the world.[11] Throughout his work Robert therefore underlined both the heroic achievements of the Christian forces and that they were performing the work of God. The speeches that Robert gave to the leaders of the First Crusade were particularly adapted to this purpose. So, for example, Bohemond's negotiations with Firuz, the warden of three towers along the walls Antioch, which eventually led to the Christian forces being let into the city (3 June 1098), are considerably reworked from the account of the *Gesta Francorum*, through new passages of *oratio recta*. These additional speeches completely avoided mention of the offer by Bohemond to make Firuz rich,[12] but instead took the form of a theological debate during which Bohemond had to seek the assistance of his chaplain to explain certain miracles.[13]

---

[8] G. Constable, 'The Place of the Magdeburg Charter of 1107/08 in the History of Eastern Germany and of the Crusades,' *Vita Religiosa im Mittelalter. Festschrift für Kaspar Elm zum 70 Geburtstag* ed. F. J. Felten and N. Jaspert (Berlin 1999), pp. 283-300. See also *Robert the Monk*, trans. C. Sweetenham, p. 7.

[9] See above p. 109 (Baldric) and p. 148 (Guibert).

[10] A. C. Krey, 'A neglected passage in the Gesta and its bearing on the literature of the First Crusade', *The Crusades and other historical essays presented to Dana C. Munro*, ed. L. J. Paetow (New York, 1928), pp. 57 – 76.

[11] RM 723.

[12] GF 44.

[13] RM 796 – 8.

For a study of the social classes of the First Crusade Robert's reworking of the *Gesta Francorum* is of some value. Robert had a richer social vocabulary than the anonymous author and in revising what he felt to be a crudely written work, as part of his attempt to give more details and a greater theological meaning to the history, he gave descriptions of social textures that are lacking in his main source. Robert probably understood society through the schema of the 'three orders': *oratores*, *bellatores* and *laboratores*.[14] This is suggested by a speech he attributed to Bohemond in which the Norman prince addressed his audience both as '*bellatores Dei*' and '*ordo* of *milites*.'[15] While Robert was not an eyewitness to the events of the First Crusade, his social commentary can be taken as that of a contemporary. To illustrate the difference between the social and historical information available in the *Historia Iherosolimitana* it is helpful to take an example. The arrival of an embassy sent by al-Afdal, vizier of Egypt arrived at the crusader camp outside of Antioch in early spring, 1098. This was an opportunity for Robert to describe a vivid scene in which the *iuventus* displayed their riding prowess by exercising at quintain and other sports, while the elders sat together.[16] With Robert as the only source for this activity by the *iuventus* it cannot be relied upon as historical information. But the passage does show Robert's awareness of the *iuventus* as a social grouping with their own particular activities and characteristics.[17] It is in this latter sense that he can be treated as an important witness for the social dynamics of his era, and, with care, of the First Crusade.

Terms denoting social orders in the Historia Iherosolimitana

Servi, mediocres, humiles, inopes, minores, pauperes, egeni

In a useful passage that outlines how Robert understood the divisions in his society, he wrote about the assembling of people to Bohemond's contingent of the First Crusade. 'Therefore the *optimates* of Apulia, Calabria and Sicily hearing that Bohemond had taken up the cross of the journey of the Holy Sepulchre all gathered to him, and both the *mediocres* and the *potentes*, both the old and the young, both *servi* and *domini* pledged themselves to the way of the Holy Sepulchre.'[18] The couplets indicate a basic bipartite division of society, with equivalent terms: *potentes* and *domini*, *mediocres* and *servi*. Although the term *mediocres*

---

[14] For the 'three orders' see G. Duby, *The three orders, Feudal Society Imagined* (London, 1980).
[15] RM 747 – 8.
[16] RM 791.
[17] See below Chapter II.3.
[18] RM 742: *Audientes igitur optimates Apuliae, et Calabriae, et Siciliae, quod Boamundus crucem viae Sancti Sepulcri susceperat, omnes ad eum confluunt, et tam mediocres quam potentes, senes quam iuvenes, servi quam domini, viam Sancti Sepulcri promittunt.*

could be used for a middle class,[19] it also could be used for persons of lower means.[20] It is the latter sense that seems more appropriate here as the term is juxtaposed with the *potentes*. *Servi* was also a term that covered a wide range of social status, from slave through serf to a personal servant who could be of relatively high position. Here, the juxtaposition with *domini* and the association with *mediocres* suggests 'servants.'

Although Robert did not use the term *servi* for slaves, he did make reference to the practice of slavery during the First Crusade. On the fall of Jerusalem (15 July 1099) at the Temple of Solomon many of the young, both male and female, were spared so as to be sold into slavery.[21] The next day, those on the roof of the Temple were slaughtered. Again, Robert reported, many of them were spared to servitude.[22] Some of those on the roof preferred to meet with swift death than to die slowly from the wretched yoke of slavery.[23] This evidence from Robert contradicts some of the eyewitness reports of the total annihilation of the population, but, as modern historians have pointed out, claims that the entire non-Christian population of the city were killed were not in fact correct.[24] Several times Robert used the theologically conventional phrase *servus Dei* to indicate that he saw the entirety of the Christian forces as being *servi* of the Lord.[25]

Robert used the term *humiles* for the lowly in a very loose sense on one occasion. After his description of the battle of Dorylaeum (1 July 1097) Robert exulted in his report of the extent of captured booty, 'indeed those of His people desiring food He filled with good things, those *divites* not of His people He sent away empty. He has deposed *potentes* and elevated *humiles*. *Potentes* cast down, *humiles* gloriously restored.'[26] This passage was drawn from the *Magnificat* (Luke 1:52 – 3) and cast the entire crusading body in the position of the humble, who have overthrown the Turkish *potentes* and become elevated. It was more a theological point than a social one, showing Robert's conviction that the events of the First Crusade were a fulfilment of biblical prophecies. In this sense there are echoes in Robert's use of *humiles* of the similar way in which Raymond of Aguilers sometimes put the entire expedition into the category of *pauperes*. Robert achieved a similar effect through an unconventional use of the term *minores* in a passage in which he praised the success of the crusade in obtaining the submission of Arab towns. He wrote that since the *principes* who

---

[19] See below p. 158 - 9.
[20] J. F. Niermeyer, *Medival Latin Dictionary,* 1, 870.
[21] RM 868.
[22] RM 869.
[23] RM 869.
[24] S. D. Goitein, 'Contemporary Letters on the Capture of Jerusalem by the Crusaders', *The Journal Of Jewish Studies*, 3, No.4, 1952, pp. 162-177; D. Hay, 'Gender Bias and Religious Intolerance in Accounts of the "Massacres" of the First Crusade', in *Tolerance and Intolerance – Social Conflict in the Age of the Crusades*, ed. M. Gervers and J. M. Powell (New York, 2001), pp. 3 – 10; .J. France, *Victory in the East*, pp. 355 – 6. For a discussion of the massacre at Jerusalem see below pp. 234 - 7.
[25] RM 817, 821, 822, 868.
[26] RM 764.

normally directed the people were far away, the Lord began to overcome even the kings themselves through the *pauciores* and *minores*.[27] This is an unusual use of the term *minores* as it embraces the entirety of those present on the First Crusade rather than being the lesser part of a body of the bipartite division *maiores et minores*. Here, as with *humiles* above, Robert was portraying the entire expedition as being modest and humble enough that it should receive success through divine intervention rather than the support of kings.

Robert was an eyewitness to the Council of Clermont and his report on the speech of Urban II that launched the crusade is therefore one of the key accounts. Robert wrote that one of the points made by Urban was that 'the *ditiores* should give assistance to the *inopes*.'[28] The bipartite division between rich and poor is clear, what is inconclusive is whether the pope at the time of his speech anticipated a strong response from the *inopes* and made provision for them. A letter written later by Urban II as the momentum for the crusade was gathering strongly discouraged non–combatants from joining the expedition, suggesting that such was not his intention.[29] Robert may have rewritten the pope's speech in the light of his later knowledge that a large body of poor did in fact undertake the crusade.

Robert the Monk was more attentive to the presence of the *pauperes* on the First Crusade than was the anonymous author of his *fons formalis*. His descriptions of the *pauperes*, however, follow the *Gesta Francorum* in that they largely appear as a passive body of people requiring sustenance from the wealthy. After fall of Nicea, the Byzantine emperor, Alexius I Comnenus, instructed a payout of lavish alms to the *pauperes*.[30] As a result of the booty acquired at the battle of Dorylaeum those who were *pauperes* were made *divites*; those who were before semi-nude were being clothed in silk garments.[31] As an eyewitness to the setting forth of the crusade, Robert's description that some of the *pauperes* were semi-nude might have some value, even allowing for exaggeration in order to emphasise the impact of the captured booty for the expedition. In describing the effect of famine in the winter of 1097 while the crusade was besieging Antioch, Robert emphasised the hardship of the entirety of the Christian forces by saying that it was hardly surprising that those of poor and feeble spirits wavered when even the staunchest faltered.[32] When the herald of al-Afdal, vizier of Cairo, came to the camp of the crusaders at the siege of Antioch, Robert elaborated on the *Gesta Francorum* by reporting the details of the offer that the envoy is supposed to have made. The proposal was to allow the Christians to travel and worship at Jerusalem with great honour, provided that they travelled as unarmed pilgrims. Moreover, they would be endowed with rich

---

[27] RM 854-5.
[28] RM 729: *Ditiores inopibus subveniant.*
[29] Letter of pope Urban II to the people of Bologna, H. Hagenmeyer, *Die Kreuzzugsbriefe aus den Jahren 1088 – 1100* (Innsbruck, 1901), pp. 137 - 8.
[30] RM 758.
[31] RM 764.
[32] RM 781.

property so that from *pedites* they would be made *equites*. Those who were *pauperes* would be provided both for the journey and their return.[33] The important offer to make *equites* from *pedites* is discussed below under *equites*, but here the passage illustrates Robert's picture of the expedition: that there was a fundamental division between the combatants and the non – combatants. He also clearly believed that the latter, the *pauperes*, wished above all to be relieved from want. Robert slightly reworked the very important eulogy to Bishop Adhémar of Le Puy, the papal legate, in the *Gesta Francorum*. 'Everyone lamented [the death of Adhémar], rightly as was due, because he was the counsellor of the *divites*, comforter of the grieving, sustainer of the weak, treasurer of the needy, reconciler of the quarrelling. He was accustomed to say this to the *milites*: "If you wish to be triumphant and the friends of God, guard cleanliness of the body, and feel pity for the *pauperes*."'[34] Here Robert retained the idea that the *milites* could themselves earn the favour of God by assisting the *pauperes*, an idea that was changed in the version of the passage written by Peter Tudebode.[35] The day before the storming of Jerusalem, reported Robert, the Christian forces celebrated by fasting and distributed alms to the *pauperes*.[36] Finally, on the fall of Jerusalem (15 July 1099), 'Then [Jerusalem] enriched her *sons*, *coming from afar* [Isa 60:4], so that no one in her remained a *pauper*.'[37] This passage is more theological and literary than historical, although the information it does convey is consistent with other sources, which indicate that the *pauperes* gained considerable property on the fall of Jerusalem.[38] But its main message, echoing Chapter 60 of Isaiah, was that the journey of the *pauperes* had culminated in a glorious conclusion and that they had obtained their just reward. Again the fulfilment of biblical prophecy seems to have been uppermost in the historian's mind.

The *Gesta Francorum* contained a significant report that after the victory of the Christians over Kerbogha, emir of Mosul, (28 June 1098), the wealthy sought to take the poor into their service.[39] Robert's version of the same offer follows the language of the *Gesta Francorum* very closely. The leaders of the expedition had it announced that whoever was an *egenus* should remain in the city, make an agreement with those who were *detiriores* and serve them.[40]

---

[33] RM 791.
[34] RM 839: *Hunc omnes iure debito lacrymabantur, quia consilium erat divitum, consolator moerentium, sustentator debilium, thesaurus indigentium, reconciliator discordantium. His militibus dicere solitus erat: 'Si vultis esse triumphatores et amici Dei, munditiam corporum custodite, et pauperum miseremini.'*
[35] For Peter Tudebode's version see above pp. 26 -7.
[36] RM 866.
[37] RM 868: *Tunc quippe filios suos, de longe ad se venientes, ita ditavit quia nullus in ea pauper remansit.*
[38] For a discussion of the *pauperes* and the fall of Jerusalem see below pp. 234 - 7.
[39] GF 72 – 3; see above pp. 13 - 14.
[40] RM 837.

Plebs, multitudo

The term *plebs* occurs twice in the *Historia Iherosolimitana*, in both cases when Robert was writing in a lyrical mode and a theological context. After Jerusalem had fallen he wrote that the humble Christian *plebs* humbly worshiped Christ.[41] Before the battle of Ascalon the *plebs* marched out from the church and ran to arms and despite their fasting proceeded to the enemy.[42] The context suggests that Robert was using the term *plebs* to indicate the entirety of the Christian people, intentionally emphasising unanimity, rather than for just the commoners.

The term for multitudes was widely used by all medieval writers for any large gathering of persons, regardless of their social status. *Multitudo* therefore does not usually warrant further study from the point of view of an investigation of social structure. In the *Historia Iherosolimitana*, however, a few instances occur where Robert's employment of the term *multitudo* offers valuable social information.

When reporting that the Turkish forces annihilated the People's Crusade at Civitote (21 October 1096), Robert wrote that 'there the *multitudo* overcame rashness, not rashness the *multitudo*.'[43] Robert, although engaging in wordplay in which he personified the People's Crusade as *audacia*, here conveyed a message that was consistent with the other sources: it was the indiscipline of the People's Crusade that brought about their defeat.

During a period of great suffering, the winter of 1097 at the siege of Antioch, Robert reported that 'as is accustomed to happen whenever a *multitudo* gathers, there was no lack of murmuring voices, nor is it strange if human frailty murmurs being pressed by so many hardships.'[44] In the vocabulary of a Benedictine monk the verb *murmurare* had strong overtones of rebellion, as 'murmuring' was considered a major infringement of the well known 'rule' of St Benedict.[45]

In his account of the finding of the Holy Lance, Robert wrote that once it had been unearthed all swore that they would not give up on the journey and so all the *plebeia multitudo* rejoiced, that the *maiores* had sworn this oath.[46] This oath taking by the princes is attested to by other sources but described as arising from the vision of Stephen of Valence rather than the discovery of the Holy Lance.[47] Robert's version of events did, however,

---

[41] RM 869.
[42] RM 873.
[43] RM 735: *Ibi multitudo audaciam, non audacia multitudinem superavit.*
[44] RM 777: *Sicut solet contingere in multitudine congregatorum, vox non deficiebat murmurantium; nec mirum erat si humana fragilitas sub tot tormentis pressa murmurabat.*
[45] *Benedicta Regula*, 34, 6: *Ante omnia, ne murmurationis malum pro qualicumque causa in aliquo qualicumque verbo vel significatione appareat.*
[46] RM 823.
[47] For a discussion of the princes' oath see below pp. 209 - 210.

convey a tension between the upper and lower social orders over the question of flight from Antioch, as well as contain the interesting phrase for the lower class, the *plebeia multitudo*.

Pedites

There are very many usages of the term *pedites* in the *Historia Iherosolimitana*, which, despite a legitimate note of caution by Sweetenham, are straightforwardly for footsoldiers.[48] The more complex passages all concern the relationship between *pedites* and horses. Following the *Gesta Francorum*, Robert's account of a battle during the foraging expedition of Bohemond and Robert of Flanders (31 December 1097) reported a more favourable outcome for the Christians than can be deduced from the other, earlier, sources.[49] Robert described a rout of the forces of Duqaq, ruler of Damascus, in which all the Christian forces joined the chase 'since those who had come as *pedites* were turned into riders.'[50] It is unusual to have a report of *pedites* mounting horses. It could be that Robert was reflecting the fact that at this stage of the expedition many knights had been reduced to the ranks of the footsoldiers through the loss of their mounts and thus were remounting at the earliest opportunity. Alternatively, given that Robert's description of the battle was an implausible elaboration of the short and problematic account in the *Gesta Francorum*, this incident could simply be an invention on the part of the historian. There was a reverse of this incident, when, during the difficult crossing of the Anti-Taurus range of mountains, '*milites* and *armigeri* carried their arms from their necks, all equally *pedites* because none of them were riding.'[51] The implication of these two passages is that for Robert a person could move very easily from being a *pedes* to a *miles* or the reverse, depending on whether they were mounted or not. The other passage in Robert that is related to this question, the offer of the embassy of al-Afdal to make *pedites* into *equites* is discussed under *equites* below, but it is consistent with this view.

Clientes, armgieri, familiares

Soon after the Christian forces arrived at Antioch (21 October 1097) they attempted to draw out the Turkish garrison of the nearby castle of Harem. Robert gave an interesting and credible variation on the *Gesta Francorum* when he described the tactics of the Christian forces, which was to use squires to try to draw them into an ambush. He wrote that they sent ahead a thousand *armigeri*, followed by Bohemond and the Count of Flanders together with their chosen *milites*.[52] As we have seen under *pedites* Robert reported that the *armigeri*

---

[48] C. Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk*, p. 71.
[49] For a discussion of the 'Foraging Battle' see J. France, *Victory in the East*, pp. 237 – 41.
[50] RM 779: ... *quoniam qui pedites venerant, ascensores equorum efficiebantur.*
[51] RM 770: *Milites et armigeri collo suo arma dependentia gestabant, omnes aequaliter pedites, quia nulli eorum equitabant.*
[52] RM 776.

became footsoldiers as a result of the difficulty of the journey through the Anti-Taurus range of mountains.

Robert used the term *clientes* once, in a passage concerning the fighting that flared up between the forces of Duke Godfrey and Alexius I Comnenus, the Byzantine emperor at the end of May 1097. When Godfrey began to send his *clientes* to acquire necessary provisions the Emperor commanded his Turcopoles and Patzinaks to attack them.[53] As can be seen from the other early crusading histories, *clientes* was a term that could cover a wide variety of meanings, from relatively senior vassals, footsoldiers or lowly servants.[54] Given the relatively lowly nature of the task and that the *Gesta Francorum* described the same people as squires (*armigeri*), it is clear that Robert was employing the term in the latter sense.[55]

Robert identified the members of a household of a prince by the term *familiares* only on two occasions, both with regard to Bohemond. In preparing for the capture of Antioch, Bohemond entrusted certain of his *familiares* with the plan, along with Hugh the Great, Duke Godfrey, the bishop of Le Puy and Count Raymond.[56] Guy, the half brother of Bohemond, was described as having come to notice from the many *familiares* of Bohemond.[57]

Milites

In the introduction to her English translation Carol Sweetenham noted that 'Robert's use of the term *miles* is fluid; in this he mirrors his contemporaries such as Fulcher. *Miles* can mean variously a soldier, a vassal, a Christian soldier or a knight.' Robert did use the term *milites* in different ways, but these seem to be fairly consistent once the context is understood. So epithets that use the term appear always to refer to knights. On the other hand those passages in the *Historia* in which Robert makes a theological point tend to use the term *milites* for soldiers in a broad sense rather than knights in particular. Formulations like *milites Christi* and *milites Dei*, having a Biblical resonance, echoing St Paul's second letter to Timothy, could certainly be rendered soldier of Christ or God rather than knight.[58] A very interesting passage in this regard occurs in Robert's report of a speech of Bohemond at Constantinople, a speech that is not in the *Gesta Francorum*. Bohemond was described as being tearful with delight that so many *consules*, *duces* and *optimates* were at the city to meet him. He opened his address to these senior nobles by calling them '*bellatores Dei*.'[59] Later he declaimed, 'O *ordo* of *milites*, now three and four times blessed! You who up to these times

---

[53] RM 743.
[54] See above pp. 27 – 8, 63 – 5, see below 150 - 1.
[55] GF 6.
[56] RM 799.
[57] RM 816. For Guy of Hauteville see J. Riley-Smith, *The First Crusaders* (Cambridge, 1997), p. 210.
[58] 2 Tim 2.3: *labora sicut bonus miles Christi Iesu*. For *miles Christi* see C. Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, trans. M. W. Baldwin and W. Goffart (Princeton, 1977), pp. 202 – 3, 340 – 2.
[59] RM 747.

were polluted by the blood of murder, are now through the sweat of the saints equal to the martyrs.'[60] Much like Guibert of Nogent, although in more metaphorical language, Robert was making the point that the expedition to Jerusalem gave a *miles* the opportunity to earn a heavenly reward through the same activity that formerly condemned him.[61] The occurrence of *bellatores* and *ordo* in the same passage suggests that Robert was writing within the framework of the 'three orders.' His theological message aimed at the broad category of 'those who fight'. Because of this context it would probably be inaccurate to narrow down those *milites* being addressed to the category of knights.[62]

There were several individuals given the epithet *miles* by Robert the Monk. Walter Sanzavohir, a leader of one of the contingents of the People's Crusade was a *miles egregius*;[63] Duke Robert of Normandy a *miles animosus* and *miles interritus*;[64] Fulcher of Chartres, first on to the walls of Antioch a *miles*;[65] Roger of Barneville a *miles inclytus*;[66] Guy of Hauteville, half brother of Bohemond, a *miles*,[67] Bohemond himself, *miles* and *animosus miles*;[68] Raymond Pilet a *miles*;[69] Gouffier of Lastours, *miles honestus*[70] and Letold of Tournai, a *miles*.[71] Robert did not name a certain Armenian lord, who was appointed ruler of a castle between Mamistra and Caesarea, although the *Gesta Francorum* referred to him as Symeon. While the author of the *Gesta Francorum* simply called Symeon 'a man', Robert described him as a *miles fortis et strenuus*.[72] Peter of Aups was described as a *miles* by both the *Gesta Francorum* and Robert.[73] The Byzantine envoy Tatikios together with William Carpenter was called a *miles* and *dives*.[74] With the one exception of Raymond Pilet, Carol Sweetenham has preferred to translate all these terms as 'soldier.' This seems to be overly cautious, as all of those described as *miles*, with the possible exceptions of the Armenian Symeon and Byzantine Tatikios, clearly were knights. To use the general term 'soldier' in these cases risks losing information concerning knights.

There is little doubt that the phrase *milites et pedites* referred to knights and footsoldiers. Robert used it a number of times. Duke Godfrey was described as taking the

---

[60] RM 748: *O ordo militum, nunc terque quaterque beatus! Qui huc usque fuisti homicidii sanguine deturpatus, nunc sanctorum sudoribus compar martyrum.*
[61] For Guibert of Nogent on this point see below p. 152.
[62] C. Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk*, p. 98.
[63] RM 735. For Walter Sanzavohir see J. Riley-Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 224.
[64] RM 760, 875.
[65] RM 799. For Fulcher of Chartres, see A.V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem* (Oxford, 2000), p. 197
[66] RM 809. For other references to Roger of Barneville see J. Riley-Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 221.
[67] RM 816. For Guy of Hauteville see n. 57.
[68] RM 817, 741.
[69] RM 838, 844. For Raymond Pilet see J. Riley-Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 220.
[70] RM 847. For Gouffier of Lastours see J. Riley-Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 209.
[71] RM 867. For Letold of Tournai see J. Riley-Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 215.
[72] RM 768. GF 25.
[73] RM 769. GF 25. For Peter of Aups see C. Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk*, p. 117 n. 52.
[74] RM 782. For William Carpenter see J. Riley-Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 226.

road through Hungary with a great band of *milites et pedites*.[75] When he learned of the crusade, Bohemond was described as addressing everyone, whether *milites* or *pedites*. In preparation for the storming of Antioch (3 June 1098) the leaders of the fighters assembled huge battalions of *milites* and even more troops of *pedites*.[76] In November 1098 the crusading forces that had scattered from Antioch while plague raged there returned and from many parts of the world many distinguished *milites et pedites* followed the example of those who had left earlier.[77] When Raymond Pilet led a newly recruited force out of Antioch in July 1098, he bound to himself a multitude of *milites et pedites*.[78] Godfrey, as ruler of Jerusalem, sent to the people of Nablus, his brother Eustace, Tancred and a great band of *milites et pedites*.[79] At the battle of Ascalon (11 August 1099) the *pedites* were lined up in front of the *milites*.[80]

There are two significant passages in the *Historia Iherosolimitana* concerning *milites* and riding in which the passage loses its sense unless the term *milites* is understood to be referring specifically to knights. As considered under *pedites*, Robert reported that while crossing the Anti-Taurus range of mountains 'on this uneven path the *milites* and *armigeri* carried their arms from their necks as did the *pedites* because none of them were riding.'[81] For the battle against Kerbogha (28 June 1098) 'Bohemond formed a sixth [squadron] with those *pedites* who were lightly armed for war, and *milites*, who had been compelled by necessity to sell their horses.'[82] The relegation of *milites* to a contingent of *pedites* is discussed in full below.[83] Here Robert was clear that even though the *miles* was having to fight from foot, he was still a knight, a point which is similarly evident in the description of those *milites* and *armigeri* required to walk like *pedites* due to the difficulty of the mountain terrain.

There are a group of references to *milites* by Robert that should probably be understood to refer to the activity of knights rather than soldiers in general. After victory over Kerbogha, Robert reported a speech of the papal legate, Bishop Adhémar of Le Puy, to the victorious Christian forces, which claimed that never had such *milites* existed, since none had fought so many successful battles in so short a time.[84] Robert described the Lotharingian prince as a 'Duke of Dukes, a *miles* of *milites*.'[85] He was also described as so gentle to the

---

[75] RM 732.
[76] RM 799.
[77] RM 843.
[78] RM 838.
[79] RM 871.
[80] RM 874.
[81] RM 770 *hac inaequali semita milites et armigeri collo suo arma dependentia gestabant, omnes aequaliter pedites, quia nulli eorum equitabant.*
[82] RM 828: *Boamundi fuit sexta, cum quo expeditiores ad bellum pedites fuerunt, et milites qui equos suos, necessitate compulsi, vendiderant.*
[83] See below pp. 251 - 6.
[84] RM 834.
[85] RM 855: *... dux ducum et miles militum.*

meek that he seemed more a monk than a *miles*.[86] In a further passage concerning Duke Godfrey, Robert wrote that 'God guarded his *miles*.'[87] During the battle with Kerbogha, Robert, closely following the *Gesta Francorum* claimed that a countless army of *milites* clothed in white was seen to come down the mountain, whose standard bearers and leaders were said to be SS George, Mauricius, Mercurius and Demetrius.[88] On another occasion Robert referred to Saint George as *invictus miles*.[89]

Robert used the term *equites* as often as he did *milites*. Peter the Hermit was described as gathering no small multitude of *equites* and *pedites*.[90] Two thousand of the *equites* followed Tancred into battle against the Petcheneg troops of the Byzantine Emperor in February 1096.[91] When Bohemond and Robert decided to lead a foraging expedition around Christmas 1097, they picked out thirty thousand *equites* and *pedites*.[92] The *Gesta Francorum* referred to twenty thousand *milites et pedites* for the same expedition.[93] Making an observation about the battle arising from the same expedition, Robert wrote that those experienced in war know that through attrition *pedites* kill more than *equites*.[94] A Turkish sortie from Antioch against a force led by Bohemond and Count Raymond (6 March 1098) put to flight those who were *equites*; the *pedites*, who were unable to flee, suffered cruel death.[95] The Christians in the camps outside Antioch soon rushed to the assistance of those who had been ambushed and, reported Robert, after the *pedites* and *equites* had united the Turkish forces were soon overcome.[96] The celestial army witnessed among Christian forces at the battle of Antioch, described above as white clad *milites*, were also referred to as *equites*.[97] Robert's report of the outcome of the battle with Kerbogha was that 100, 000 Turkish *equites* were killed that day, along with an uncountable number of *pedites*.[98]

As with *milites*, Robert wrote passages that indicated the significance of mounts to *equites*. In his account of the journey through the desert after the battle of Dorylaeum (1 July 1097) Robert wrote that 'there died the greater part of our horses, and many who previously had been *equites* became *pedites*.'[99] The *Gesta Francorum* had a near identical account, but

---

[86] RM 731.
[87] RM 787: *Deus militem suum custodviti.*
[88] RM 832.
[89] RM 834.
[90] RM 731.
[91] RM 746.
[92] RM 778.
[93] GF 30.
[94] RM 778.
[95] RM 785.
[96] RM 785.
[97] RM 835.
[98] RM 833.
[99] RM 766: *Ibi mortua fuit major pars equorum, et multi qui prius equites* [*milites* in three Ms. variations] *exstiterant pedites effecti sunt.*

described *milites* remaining *pedites*.[100] This, as with the description of the celestial army, shows Robert interchanging the terms *equites* and *milites*. Robert elaborated on the *Gesta Francorum* by reporting the details of the offer that the herald of al-Afdal, vizier of Egypt is supposed to have made to the Christians early in spring 1098. The proposal has been noted above with regard to *pauperes*.[101] Here it is relevant to draw attention to the envoy's offer that through being endowed with rich property *pedites* would be made *equites*.[102] Whether or not the envoy actually made this offer, it is clear that Robert imagined it to have been a key one. Robert wished to emphasise the legitimate pride of the Christians in rejecting the offer, so it suited his purpose to imagine the most tempting possible offer from the ruler of Cairo. Robert's awareness of the importance of the issue is shown again in his report of the discussion between the Christian army and Kerbogha shortly before battle. According to Robert Kerbogha said that if the Franks were willing to renounce Christ he would give them land and 'make *equites* from everyone.'[103] The anonymous author of the *Gesta Francorum* imagined a very similar speech where Kerbogha stated that he would enrich the Christian forces with land and castles 'so that none of you shall remain a *pedes*, but you shall all be *milites* as we are.'[104] Again Robert replaced *milites* with *equites*, but he also introduced a change of meaning. For the author of the *Gesta Francorum* the offer was being made to restore the knightly status of those who had been forced to remain footsoldiers, whereas in Robert's exaggerated version the offer was to make *equites* from everyone. Again, for Robert, the point was to make it all the more impressive that the Christian army refused to renounce Christ. Even in the eyewitness account of the *Gesta Francorum* this passage is unreliable with regard to the historical information of what terms, if any, Kerbogha actually did offer during negotiations with the crusaders. At times the *Gesta Francorum* echoes the style of a *chanson de geste*, particularly in its invention of speeches for Kerbogha. What both Robert and the anonymous author testify to, however, is that they considered such an offer to be plausible and tempting. Both refer to the ownership of land as the key to the promotion of someone to the rank of *milites* (*equites* in Robert), showing that the offer was not simply a matter of making riders from those on foot. In his repetition and exaggeration of this incident, Robert provided useful corroborating evidence that at the beginning of the twelfth century the condition of being a *miles* was still sufficiently fluid that it could be obtained by *pedites* on their acquisition of land.

Robert offered very little information on the related subject of whether *milites* were necessarily noble. Only one passage has a bearing on the topic. At the end of his work Robert

---

[100] GF 23.
[101] See above pp. 132 - 3.
[102] RM 791.
[103] RM 826: ... *de omnibus equites faciemus.*
[104] GF 67: ... *quod nemo vestrorum remanebit pedes, sed erunt omnes milites sicut et nos sumus.*

wrote that if Duke Godfrey as *rex* [sic] of Jerusalem were to be compared with all the kings of the earth, he would be judged the foremost due to his merit of his 'knightly probity' (*equestris probitas*) and 'noble ways' (*nobiles mores*).[105] Godfrey was an exceptionally senior, almost legendary, figure in the *Historia Iherosolimitana* and this passage therefore says nothing about a typical *miles* in Robert's day. It does, however, show that Robert considered there to have been an association between the uprightness appropriate to a knight chosen to do God's work and his noble manners.

Iuvenes

Robert was clearly very aware of the class of knights, often young in age but not necessarily so, who had yet to establish themselves as heads of independent households and were termed *iuvenes*.[106] The first description of the *iuventus* in Robert's history occurred shortly after a victory for the crusading army against a sortie from the city during the siege of Antioch (6 March 1098). The following day, reported Robert, the Turks left the city at dawn and buried those bodies they could find. On hearing this the *iuvenes* of the Christian army hastened to the cemetery where they dug up the bodies and cut the heads off.[107] Whether Robert or another later scribe wrote the heading for his version of the chapter, disapproval was evident: 'Chapter XXII. Concerning the grave of the Turks being disgracefully destroyed by the Christians.'[108]

Not long after this event an embassy sent by al-Afdal, vizier of Egypt, arrived at the crusader camp. This was another occasion for Robert to describe the actions of the *iuventus*. After the tents of the camp were decorated, shields were attached to stakes in the ground for the knight's game of quintain to be played. The *iuventus* engaged in games of dice, chess and made rapid, warlike, charges of their horses, turning in a circle with taut reins, brandishing their lances, thus demonstrating their bravery. By contrast those who were elder and experienced sat together as one and discussed the matter with good sense and prudence.[109] The contrast between the activities of the *iuvenes* and the more experienced crusader is explicit and clear, as is Robert's approval of the latter.

Antioch fell on the morning of 3 June 1098, the breakthrough achieved when sixty *homines* climbed up a ladder and on to the wall, says the *Gesta Francorum*. Robert's version is slightly more specific including a name for the first knight onto the walls, Fulcher, and

---

[105] RM 870.
[106] For a full discussion of the category *iuvenes* and their role on the First Crusade see below Chapter II.3.
[107] RM 788.
[108] RM 788: *De sepultura Turcorum a Christianis turpiter destructa.*
[109] RM 791. For the exercise of quintain see below pp. 259.

describing his company as sixty armed *iuvenes*.[110] The *iuvenes* next appeared in the battle against Kerbogha, when Robert praised the illustrious *iuventus* for their famous feats, in comment that was not in the *Gesta Francorum*.[111] In the same battle Robert identified a particular grouping of *iuvenes* in the contingent of Hugh the Great, count of Vermandois: Everard III of Le Puiset, Payen of Beauvais, Drogo of Nesle, Thomas of Marle and Clarembald of Vendeuil.[112] Those here identified as *iuvenes* were significant nobles with something of a career behind them already, thus indicating Robert was not using *iuvenes* to make a statement about the age of these men. Rather he was indicating that they were not independent heads of households.

The occasion for Robert's next mention of the *iuventus* was when the expedition stormed the city of Ma'arrat-an-Nu'man (11 December 1098). Gouffier I, of Las Tours, was the first to climb a ladder on to the walls of the town. Robert described how the *iuventus* was spurred to action by witnessing Gouffier fighting on top of the walls of the city with only a few companions.[113]

The last reference to the *iuvenes* by Robert occurred in his description of the bitter conflict between Bohemond and Count Raymond of Toulouse over the ownership of Antioch Christmas 1098. As a result of the fact that the expedition seemed to have stalled, a mutiny took place that saw the *pauperes* dismantle the walls of the recently captured Ma'arrat, making it defenceless and obliging Count Raymond to continue the expedition.[114] The *Gesta Francorum* and Robert the Monk skip the events at Ma'arrat, and follow the perspective not of the *pauperes* but of those knights and princes who met at Chastel-Rouge, probably on 4 January 1099, and were unable to resolve their differences, the news of this failure triggering the revolt at Ma'arrat. Robert made an observation not derived from the *Gesta Francorum*, that remaining at Chastel-Rouge with Count Raymond were not only his own men, but also many *iuvenes*, who were on fire to complete the journey.[115] In Robert's eyes the *iuvenes* were a social grouping that were among the most fervent in wishing to press on to Jerusalem. All these passages are very significant and an important contribution to reconstructing the role of a distinct group of knights on the First Crusade, a group to which, from Robert's perspective, it was appropriate to apply the term *iuvenes*.

---

[110] RM 800. For Fulcher of Chartres see above, n. 65.
[111] RM 831-2.
[112] RM 833. For these knights see J. Riley-Smith, *First Crusaders,* p. 205 (Everard III Le Puiset); p. 216 (Payen of Beauvais); p. 223 (Thomas of Marle); p. 203 (Clarembald of Vendueil). For Drogo of Nesle see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom*, p. 191. See also below pp. 260 - 1.
[113] RM 847. For other references to Gouffier of Lastours see J. Riley-Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 209.
[114] RA 40-41. See below p. 225.
[115] RM 837.

Consules, ditiores, divites, principes, domini, maiores, optimates, potentes, seniores, proceres

Consules was a term with a wide range of meanings by the time of the First Crusade, its classical meaning evoking the powerful image of a consul of the Roman Republic, through to the relatively recent evolution of the term that had occurred through its adoption by the leaders of communes of Italian cities.[116] Fortunately Robert gave a definition of emir in the *Historia Iherosolimitana* that also conveyed something of his meaning of the term *consules*. 'And those who they call emirs are kings, who are in charge of the provinces of the regions. A province is that which has a metropolitan, twelve *consules* and one king.'[117] This seems to indicate Robert used it for senior nobles, akin perhaps to counts, another possible meaning of the term. They also seem to be appointees, which was consistent with both the classical and contemporary use of the term. When Robert described the departure of the contingent of Robert of Normandy and Robert of Flanders he wrote of *optimates* and '*consules* of lesser repute' joining with them, from France, Britain and Brittany.[118] The consul then, for Robert, was of a lower social status than the *optimas*. In emphasising the impressive numbers of nobles on the expedition, Robert described Bohemond as being greeted in Constantinople by a great many *consules*, *duces*, and *optimates*.[119]

Robert's report of the speech of Urban II at Clermont included the statement that the *ditiores* should give assistance to the *inopes*.[120] Robert used 'the rich' as a label for the upper rank of a simple bipartite division of society into rich and poor four other times. *Ditiores* were contrasted with the *egeni* in the offer of the princes to take into service those in need after the victory over Kerbogha (28 June 1098).[121] Robert, as has been noted above under *pauperes*, described the *pauperes* as becoming *divites* from the booty taken at the battle of Dorylaeum.[122] He referred to the *divites* again in his eulogy to Adhémar.[123] After describing the desertion of Tatikios and William Carpenter, Robert then explained that he had reported this, so that it should be learned how such a great need existed in the camp, that even the *divites* were compelled to flee and to perjure themselves.[124]

Principes, as in all the sources for the First Crusade, was a very common term for nobles in the *Historia Iherosolimitana*. It was Robert's standard term for the leaders of the

---

[116] J. F. Niermeyer, *Medival Latin Dictionary,* 1, 342 – 3.
[117] RM 788: *Et quos admiraldos vocant, reges sunt, qui provinciis regionum praesunt. Provincia quidem est, quae unum habet metropolitanum, duodecim consules et unum regem.*
[118] RM 739: ... *minoris famae consules* ...
[119] RM 747.
[120] RM 729.
[121] RM 837. See above p. 133.
[122] RM 764. See above p. 132.
[123] RM 839. See above p. 133.
[124] RM 782.

First Crusade.[125] There is one passage in which the term *principes* appears that is worth noting. Robert wrote that it was because those participating in the People's Crusade did not have a wise *princeps* who ruled over them, they performed reprehensible deeds.[126] This indicates that Robert had a sense of order, one that was offended by the conduct of the People's Crusade and the impropriety of their not having a recognised *princeps* at the head of the movement.

Robert used the term *domini* straightforwardly for lords. Those who joined with Bohemond for the expedition included *domini* and *servi*.[127] While in Apulia Bohemond received the report that an army was coming the *duces* and *domini* of which were Hugh of Vermandois, Robert of Normandy, Robert of Flanders, Stephen of Blois, Count Raymond of Toulouse and the Bishop of Le Puy.[128] In rejecting the idea that all the Christian princes should share the rule of Antioch, Robert had Bohemond exclaim, 'pity the city which is subject to so many *domini*!'[129] Bishop Adhémar of Le Puy was described as the *dominus* of those who had remained in Antioch after its capture and the victory over Kerbogha.[130] Robert had Raymond of Toulouse address the other crusading princes as 'courageous brothers and *domini*.'[131]

Robert was not given to using *maiores* to indicate the higher social orders. He used the term once to contrast with the *plebeia multitudo*, who as we have seen above, rejoiced that the *maiores* swore not to abandon Antioch.[132] The only other use of the term as a social order occurred in Robert's description of an invented letter from Kerbogha, which was addressed to the caliph, the king and the *maiores proceres* of the kingdom of Persia.[133]

When it came to writing about the senior nobility, Robert tended to prefer the term *optimates*. As was clear from the passage noted under *consules*, in which Robert wrote of *optimates* and *consules* of lesser repute, the *optimates* were placed above *consules* in the social vocabulary of the historian.[134] For his report of the gathering of Bohemond's forces for the expedition Robert similarly used the term *optimates* to emphasise the seniority of those joining the Norman prince in the key passage that has been examined both with regard to *servi* and *mediocres* above.[135] A useful passage indicating that Robert understood the *optimates* to be a grouping of the *principes* was that in which he wrote that accompanying

---

[125] RM 732, 736, 740, 743, 747, 749, 755, 756, 768, 775, 776, 779, 782, 783, 785, 787, 791, 792, 794, 798, 799, 806, 815, 822, 827, 835, 837, 850, 854, 855.
[126] RM 732.
[127] RM 742. See above p. 130.
[128] RM 740.
[129] RM 798: *Vae civitati quae tot dominis subjecta erit*!
[130] RM 839.
[131] RM 850: *Viri fratres et domini.*
[132] RM 823. See above p. 134 - 5.
[133] RM 811.
[134] RM 739. See above p. 143.
[135] RM 742. See above pp. 130 - 1.

Bohemond were *nobilissimi principes*, namely Tancred, Richard of the Principate, count of Salerno, and all the *optimates* of Apulia.[136] Robert reported that Bohemond was greeted at Constantinople by a great number of *consules*, *duces* and *optimates*.[137] At one point Robert seems to indicate that the *optimates* of the crusade were those who were involved in decision making alongside the senior princes. As a result of attacks on the camp of the besiegers at Antioch around Christmas 1097, the *principes* of the army and the *optimates* decided to build a castle, subsequently called Mount Malregard.[138] The *Gesta Francorum* used the term *maiores* for those who made the decision to build the castle.[139] After the fall of Albara to the Christian forces led by Count Raymond in October 1098, it was decided to appoint a Latin bishop for the city. The body that initially chose the candidate was Count Raymond with his *optimates*.[140]

As we have seen with regard to *humiles*, the *potentes* were contrasted to the humble by Robert in his description of those overthrown at the battle of Dorylaeum. Robert's vocabulary at this point was taken from the *Magnificat* (Luke 1: 52 – 3).[141] He only used the term in one other instance: *potentes* were among those listed as joining Bohemond's contingent, this time contrasted with *mediocres*.[142]

A favoured term for the senior figures of the First Crusade in the *Gesta Francorum* was *seniores*. Robert was clearly uncomfortable with the term and consistently replaced it, probably indicating a difference in vocabulary between the northern French monk and the southern Italian crusader. Robert did have a limited use for the term; he twice referred to the leadership of the First Crusade as *seniores*.[143] Other than those examples, the term appeared just once in the *Historia Iherosolimitana*, for those leaders of Kerbogha's forces who lost heart after a meteor appeared to fall from the sky into their camp.[144] All three examples are clustered very closely together, suggesting a temporary, unconscious, adoption of the vocabulary of his *fons formalis*.

Another, more common, term used by Robert for the higher nobility was *proceres*. Robert first used the term in a line of poetry, setting the scene for the siege of Antioch when he depicted the *proceres* of the city along with their troops responding swiftly to the arrival of

---

[136] RM 744. For Tancred see R. L. Nicholson, *Tancred: A study of his career and work in their relation to the First Crusade and the Establishment of the Latin States in Syria and Palestine* (Chicago, 1940), for Richard of the Principate, count of Salerno see J. Riley-Smith, *The First Crusaders*, p. 220.
[137] RM 747.
[138] RM 776.
[139] GF 30.
[140] RM 840.
[141] RM 764. See above p. 131.
[142] RM 742. See above p. 130 - 1.
[143] RM 824, 825.
[144] RM 824.

the Christian army.[145] When Bohemond and Count Raymond were ambushed on their return from St Symeon (6 March 1098), the report of the slaughter reached the camp and shook all the *principes* and *proceres*.[146] Robert used the term *proceres* to include the senior princes in his reports of the decision-making leadership of the crusade. Shortly before the 'Lake Battle' (9 February 1098), the *proceres* of the army took council and decided that a part of the Christian forces should go out to battle against the coming enemy.[147] Worried by raids against them from the city of Antioch, in February 1098, the *proceres* decided to build a castle near a certain Mosque.[148] In April 1098, the *proceres* chose the best men and swiftest horses for a raid.[149] On the 5 April 1098, during the siege, a fort was built opposite the Gate of St. George; it was sited on some old ruins that, reported Robert, the *proceres* were pleased to surround and rebuild with strong fortifications.[150] Peter the Hermit's embassy to Kerbogha (27 June 1098) addressed the emir, according to Robert, in the name of the *proceres* of the Franks.[151] Robert wrote that it was the *proceres* who established a long lasting peace with the emir of Tripoli.[152] Again, it was the *proceres* who had timber brought from a long way to make siege equipment for the storming of Jerusalem.[153] Finally, in a short by very significant comment, Robert wrote that the wife of Walo II of Chaumont-en-Vexin, had been 'born with the blood of *proceres*.'[154] This is very clear evidence for Robert's adherence to the belief that high social rank was inherited.

Robert the Monk's most important contribution to an understanding of the social dynamics of the First Crusade was almost certainly his descriptions of the activities of the *iuvenes*. From the raw material provided by the *Gesta Francorum* he identified a distinct layer of knights, to whom he attributed characteristics, such as playing the game of quintain, which must have existed in society around him. In other respects his departures from his *fons formalis* seem to be exaggerations to suit a theological purpose, namely to portray the First Crusade as the greatest event since creation. In his acceptance of the reports in the *Gesta Francorum* that *miles* fell to the state of *pedes* and that *pedes* could be promoted to *miles* he did, however, provide corroboration for the relative fluidity of those boundaries.

---

[145] RM 775.
[146] RM 785.
[147] RM 783.
[148] RM 785.
[149] RM 793.
[150] RM 793.
[151] RM 825.
[152] RM 857.
[153] RM 866.
[154] RM 795: *Procerum sanguine procreata*. For Walo II of Chaumont-en-Vexin see J. Riley-Smith, *The First Crusaders*, p. 224.

I.7. Guibert of Nogent's *Gesta Dei per Francos*

The text

Guibert, abbot of Nogent, is the best known of the early crusading historians, largely because he wrote an autobiography so vivid that it has drawn a great deal of attention from those interested in the psychology of the Middle Ages.[1] Born near Beauvais around the year 1060, to parents of whose nobility he never ceased to be proud, Guibert entered the abbey of St. Germer de Fly, where he obtained a relatively sophisticated education and was attracted to the *verba dulcia* of Ovid and Virgil.[2] In 1104 he obtained the position of abbot at the Benedictine monastery of Nogent-sous-Coucy that he held until his death in 1124.

He was a prolific writer, many of whose works have survived, most focused on theological issues.[3] To a large extent Guibert's history of the First Crusade can be seen as being shaped by religious concerns.[4] In common with Robert the Monk and Baldric of Dol, Guibert wrote the *Gesta Dei per Francos* based on a reworking of the material in the *Gesta Francorum*. Written with the intention of providing many edifying passages for the reader, however, the work has many commentaries, observations, reports of visions and miracles which means that, unlike the works of Robert and Baldric, it diverges considerably in structure and in content from the *Gesta Francorum*. Guibert also incorporated more historical material into the work than either of the other two northern French historians, both concerning the departure of the expedition, to which he was an eyewitness, and from the testimony of those who had returned from the expedition.

---

[1] Guibert of Nogent, *Monodiae*, ed. E. – R. Labande (Paris, 1981); J. Benton, *Self and Society in Medieval France: The Memoirs of Abbot Guibert of Nogent (1064-c.1125)* (New York, 1970); J. Benton, 'The personality of Guibert of Nogent,' *Pyschoanalytical Review*, 57, 4 (1970), pp. 563 – 86; C. Morris, *The Discovery of the Individual 1050-1200* (London, 1972), pp. 83 - 5; M. D. Coupe, 'The personality of Guibert of Nogent Reconsidered,' *Journal of Medieval History*, 9 (1983), pp. 317-29; Jay Rubenstein, *Guibert of Nogent: Portrait of a Medieval Mind* (New York, 2002).

[2] Guibert of Nogent, *Monodiae*, I. 17.

[3] *Quo ordine sermo fieri debeat*, ed. R. B. C. Huygens, *CC* 127, 47 - 63; *Moralium Geneseos libri decem*, *PL* 156, cols. 032 – 337; *Tropologiae in prophetas Osee, Amos ac Lamentationes Jeremiae*, *PL* 156, cols. 337 – 488; *Tractatus de Incarnatione contra Judaeos*, *PL* 156, cols. 489 – 528; *Epistola de buccella Judae data et de veritate dominici Corporis*, ed. R. B. C. Huygens, *CC* 127, 65 – 77; *De laude sanctae Mariae liber*, *PL* 156, cols. 537 – 578; *De virginitate opusculum*, *PL* 156, cols. 579 – 608; *De pignoribus sanctorum libri quatuor*, ed. R. B. C. Huygens, *CC* 127, 79 – 175.

[4] J. Charaud, 'La conception de l'histoire de Guibert de Nogent', *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale*, 8 (1965), pp. 381 – 95; J. G. Schenk, *The Use of Rhetoric, Biblical Exegesis and Polemic in Guibert of Nogent's 'Gesta Dei per Francos'* (unpublished Masters thesis: TCD, 2001).

There are five editions of the *Gesta Dei per Francos*, the most recent being the exemplary modern edition by R. B. C. Huygens (1976), which is used here.[5] The Huygens edition is a modern reconstruction of the text on the basis of eight surviving full manuscripts and other manuscripts that contain extracts from the *Gesta Dei per Francos*.[6] Huygens recognised that the manuscript traditions of the work divided into two branches and that there was a need for a modern edition given that the edition for the series *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades* was based on the branch that was further away from the archetype.[7] From the references in the text to a number of individuals and our knowledge of their careers from other sources, Huygens argued that the date of composition of the archetype was probably 1109.[8] The strongest evidence in this regard is that Guibert wrote that the death of Gervase of Bazoches, who was killed in May 1108, took place 'last year.'[9]

The fact that Guibert held strong opinions and enjoyed polemics makes him a valuable source of social history. Guibert interrupted his narrative to engage in theological debate and commentary more than any other early source for the First Crusade. This resulted in passages full of social information; such as his report that after the death of Bishop Adhémar of Le Puy, the papal legate (1 August 1098):

> There began to arise amongst the *principes* quite frequent arguments and insolent behaviour, and especially among the *mediocres* and *vulgares* licentiousness, which it was by no means fitting that it should take place. … Therefore while they obeyed no one single ruler and all things were regarded as equal among them and very often while the desire of the people (*libido vulgi*) prevailed, judgments that were inappropriate were made among them.[10]

This passage not only reveals Guibert's aristocratic disdain for the lower social orders, but an interesting social schema. Guibert had a tripartite view of society, but not the famous division of the 'three orders': the *bellatores*, *oratores* and *laboratores*.[11] For Guibert

---

[5] J. Bongars, *Gesta Dei per Francos* (Hanover, 1611); Dom. L. D'Achery, *Venerabilis Guiberti abbatis B. Mariae de Novigento opera ominia* (Paris, 1651), pp. 367 – 453; PL 156 (Paris, 1853), cols. 679B – 834A; *RHC Oc.* 4, 117 – 260; Guibert of Nogent, *Gesta Dei per Francos*, ed. R. B. C. Huygens, CC LXXVIIa, (Turnhout, 1996), hereafter GN. For a discussion of these editions see GN 18 – 23.
[6] GN 24.
[7] GN 24 – 5.
[8] GN 51 – 56.
[9] GN 349 – 50. For Gervase of Bazoches, lord of Tiberias see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem* (Oxford, 2000), p. 201.
[10] GN 262: *Cepere inter principes simultates aliquotiens ac insolentiae oboriri, apud mediocres preterea et vulgares licentiae quas non omnino deceret haberi... Dum ergo nemini singulariter parent et universa inter eos estimantur equalia, fiebant sepius, dum vulgi libido prevalet, apud ipsos minus apta iudicia.* For a discussion of this passage see below p. 152.
[11] See G. Duby, *The three orders, Feudal Society Imagined* (London, 1980).

the divisions of society were hierarchical, not functional: *principes*, *mediocres*, *minores*. This schema was made clear by a speech by Bohemond to other leaders during the siege of Antioch (May, 1098), Guibert had the Norman prince refer to 'all of our people, *magni*, *minores*, and *mediocres*.'[12] It is Guibert's use of the term *mediocres* that is distinctive here. The notion of the 'middle rank', the *mediocres*, was not a common one in the early twelfth century. It was not used in the Vulgate and nor did it fit comfortably with the division of society into three orders based on their profession. The Church Fathers, Bishop Ambrose of Milan and Augustine of Hippo, spread the use of *mediocres* as a social term in the fourth century and while it was subsequently part of the vocabulary of medieval writers, it was not used with any great popularity, except by Rabanus Maurus, abbot of Fulda and the leading scholar of the early ninth century.[13]

The richness of Guibert's social vocabulary led to his coining new phrases. In explaining that the desire to take up the cross reached to the very bottom of the social structure, Guibert devised the unique phrase *homines extremae vulgaritatis*. So, for example, he noted that 'the men of the furthest level of the *vulgus*' were taking up the crusade.[14] In his description of the praiseworthy behaviour of King Baldwin I, who would not have a prisoner wounded in order to study the treatment of his own condition, Guibert had Baldwin declare that he would not be the cause of the death of any man, not even a man of the lowest condition of all (*hominum deterrimae omnium conditionis*).[15] When the *Gesta Francorum* reported that Roger I of Sicily lost his army at Amalfi because most of the *milites* there joined with Bohemond, Guibert wrote instead that Roger lost 'people of all sorts,' (*omnimodi gentium*). Other rare terms for types of person in the *Gesta Dei per Francos* include *personae dignitatis*;[16] *personae opulentes*;[17] and *personae spectabiles*;[18] persons of dignity, wealth and importance.

Guibert had a strong sense of *ordo*. He reported that many of the 'illustrious orders' (*inclyti ordines*) departed on the crusade.[19] In praising his friend, an *eques*, Matthew, Guibert wrote that 'of all his *ordo*' (*pre omnibus suae ordinis*) he had the most impressive moral conduct.[20] In his eulogy of Adhémar Guibert wrote that everyone, of whatever *ordo*, mourned

---

[12] GN 201: *Cunctisque personis magnorum, minorum atque mediocrum ....*
[13] A conclusion reached by examining the pattern of usage of the term by the authors in the *Patrologia Latina* database. For Rabanus Maurus' use of *minores*, *mediocres*, *summi vires* see *PL* 112, col. 961D. For Guibert's use of *mediocres* see below pp. 158 - 9.
[14] GN 300.
[15] GN 287.
[16] GN 312.
[17] GN 225.
[18] GN 111.
[19] GN 133.
[20] GN 198. For Matthew see J. Riley-Smith, *The First Crusaders*, p. 215.

him[21] and in his description of the entourage of Count Stephen of Blois at Constantinople in 1101 Guibert reported that there were many worthies of all *ordines*.[22] Three times Guibert wrote of the 'knightly order' (*ordo equestris*).[23] As the abbot of a monastery Guibert also used the term *ordo* not in its social sense but with respect to the need for proper order within the monastic discipline. In describing how Peter the Hermit attempted to abandon the expedition at Antioch, early in 1098, Guibert directly addresses Peter, pointing out that his behaviour did not comply with the monastic *ordo*.[24] At times, however, Guibert's sense that the First Crusade was an important event that echoed the journey of the children of Israel, led him to portray it as an occasion where harmony overcame social tension. At one point Guibert wrote that in the army of the *iter Dei*,[25] 'no *servus* had to look up to the *dominus*, nor the *dominus* claim anything from the *famulus* except brotherhood.'[26] In the same theme Guibert wrote that on the expedition, *without prince*, *without king*, (Hosea 3:4) under God only, both the *parvus* and the *magnus* learned to carry the yoke.[27] This was his one use of the couplet *parvus et magnus* to represent a basic bipartite division of the whole people. In a passage rich with the kinds of classical and biblical references that Guibert delighted in, he again indicated a similar outlook. Guibert drew attention to the fact that Stephen of Blois, who had been granted leadership of the holy army and Hugh the Great, 'a man of royal name', had both abandoned the crusade.[28] Therefore, *when shades of a great name* (Lucan I.135) were rejected it was the *pusillus grex* who remained, relying now on God's aid only. When decisions were made not according to birth, but by God's choice, *the unexpected one wore the crown* (Ecc. 11:5).[29] In the course of making the point that the First Crusade was not led by those of the highest birth, as might have been expected, Guibert here also displayed an ability to adapt Scriptural terms to his social schema. In Luke's account of Christ's words to a multitude, the *pusillus grex* were told not to fear, for they had been promised a kingdom,[30] Guibert invoked Luke's image of the destitute crowd, the *pusillus grex*, for the lower social orders, knowing that his readers would themselves make the connection between the heavenly kingdom promised by God and the crusaders' actual establishment of a kingdom after the capture of Jerusalem.

Guibert's confidence as a writer, his broad vocabulary and willingness to coin new phrases rather than repeat the language of the *Gesta Francorum*, make his rewriting of that

---

[21] GN 246.
[22] GN 314.
[23] GN 87, 323, 344.
[24] GN 180.
[25] GN 118.
[26] GN 312: *... ut non respectaret servus ad dominum, nec dominus nisi fraternitatem usurparet in famulum.*
[27] GN 312.
[28] GN 328: *Hugo Magnus ... homo regii nominis.*
[29] GN 328.
[30] Luke 12.32.

text extremely valuable from the point of view of gathering information about social structure in the early twelfth century.

Terms denoting social orders in the Gesta Dei per Francos

Mancipia

Guibert is a useful source for the fact that the enslavement of Christians was not practised in northern France around 1100. He expressed outrage at the practice of the Byzantines who bought and sold Christians like brute animals and, even worse, sent them to be sold as *mancipia* to pagans.[31] The practice of Christians enslaving pagans, however, was clearly in another category, as Guibert reported without comment the capture of the inhabitants of Ma'arat-an-Numan for sale in the slave market of Antioch.[32] He also noted the reverse. Those Christians captured after the defeat of the section of the People's Crusade led by the Italian lord, Rainald, (7 October 1096), faced dismal servitude at the hands of cruel *domini*.[33] Those taken to Antioch also experienced wretched slavery.[34] Turks fleeing from the defeat at Dorylaeum (1 July 1097) looted the cities that they passed before abandoning them taking the sons of Christians as *mancipia*.[35]

Greges inopum, grex pusillus, infimi, vulgus, pauperes, manus egena, egeni, minores, plebecula, turba, tafur

In describing those who set out from France on the Crusade of 1101, Guibert wrote of a great crowd of the *summum*, *mediocre* and *infimum genus*.[36] His polemic against the followers of Mohamed accused them of intolerable crimes against the *mediocres* and the *infimi*.[37] In both these instances, the only appearances of the term *infimi* in the *Gesta Dei per Francos*, it was used to indicate a social order below that of a middle rank.

When Guibert wished to comment on the lower social orders in a pejorative context he tended to use the term *vulgus*.[38] Two passages in the *Gesta Dei per Francos* contain not only this negative sense to his use of the term *vulgus* but important additional social commentary. After reporting the death of Bishop Adhémar of Le Puy, Guibert wrote the

---

[31] GN 93.
[32] GN 117.
[33] GN 126. For Rainald see J. Riley – Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 218.
[34] GN 126.
[35] GN 160.
[36] GN 313.
[37] GN 102.
[38] See also Guibert of Nogent, *Monodiae*, III. 8: *vulgus insolens*; *Tropologiae in prophetas, PL* 156 col. 373D, II.7.3: *ineptum vulgus*; col. 393C III.10.5: *vulgus ineptum*; col. 454A, V.1.7: *vulgus lasciviens*; *Tractatus de Incarnatione contra Judaeos, PL* 156 col. 511C, III: *profanum et pertinax vulgus*.

significant passage discussed above, in which he wrote that with the loss of the authority of the legate, the *principes* began to argue leading to a collapse in authority in which the desire of the *vulgus* now prevailed: they were insolent and made inappropriate decisions.[39] This comment provides a valuable observation from Guibert that it was division amongst the leadership of the First Crusade that created the conditions under which the lower social orders began to successfully assert themselves. Guibert wrote another equally important passage concerning the *vulgus* as part of a commentary on the value of the *iter Dei* as a way of earning heaven for the participants. 'God ordained holy wars in our time, so that the knightly order (*ordo equestris*) and the erring *vulgus*, who, like their ancient pagan models, were engaged in mutual slaughter, might find a new way of earning salvation.'[40] Again attached to the term *vulgus* is a pejorative adjective, but here Guibert also imparted the information that he saw the crusade as important in preventing a violent social conflict between the knightly and the common order that he considered to be part of society since ancient times.

The use of the term *vulgus* in both these commentaries was consistent with many other examples in which Guibert clearly considered the body of people referred to as *vulgus* to be ignorant and gullible. The *vulgus* were reported as attaching themselves to Peter the Hermit with no concern for the future, in contrast to the princes who were preparing like careful administrators.[41] In his description of the enthusiasm of the crowds for Peter the Hermit, Guibert wrote that *vulgus*, with their love of novelty, even tore out the hairs of the mule as if they were relics.[42] This passage has echoes of the classical commonplace, that the people were always 'avid for new things.'[43] A passage with an even stronger connection to the same idea was written about the credulity of the *vulgus* in response to various claims of divine intervention during the period in which the crusade was being preached; here Guibert referred to the *vulgus* as *indocile et novarum rerum cupidum*.[44] His report of the People's Crusade in Hungary depicted the *vulgus indocile* as 'being run completely wild' (*debacchari*).[45] Peter the Hermit was described as being unable to control the *indisciplinatum vulgus*.[46] To denigrate their enemies at the battle of Dorylaeum, the Christian leaders termed them *vilissimum vulgus*.[47] In his account of the ordeal by fire of Peter Bartholomew (8 April

---

[39] GN 262. See above 148.
[40] GN 87: *Instituit nostro tempore praelia sancta deus, ut ordo equestris et vulgus oberrans, qui vetustae paganitatis exemplo in mutuas versabantur cedes, novum repperirent salutis promerendae genus.*
[41] GN 120 -1.
[42] GN 121.
[43] For example, Caesar, *De Bello Gallico*, 1.18; Tacitus, *Historiae*, 2.8, 3.4, 3.12 (specifically the *vulgus*); Tacticus, *Annales*, 3.13, 5.3, 5.46.
[44] GN 88.
[45] GN 121.
[46] GN 123.
[47] GN 156.

1099), Guibert wrote that the *vulgus* surrounded the visionary to seize his clothes like relics.[48] Moreover the outcome of the trial led to a division among the unreliable and fickle *vulgus*.[49] Guibert condemned the *vulgus* for their part in the failure of the Crusade of 1101, writing that the *vulgus* foolishly moved forward without supplies.[50] In Guibert's polemic describing the origins of Islam, the infinite multitude who were described as foolishly joining with Mohammed were termed a *vulgus*.[51]

Guibert's other uses of the term *vulgus* were more neutral. In condemning those *potentiores* who stored food during a year of famine he wrote that they considered the anguish of the starving *vulgus* to be of little importance.[52] The diverse crowd of Greeks who offered merchandise to Bohemond's contingent outside of Rusa [Ruskujan], were termed *promiscuum vulgus*.[53] During the winter of 1097 at the siege of Antioch, the *vulgus*, consumed by all kinds of poverty, wandered through various provinces.[54] Guibert claimed that the same Firuz who betrayed Antioch to the Christians later deceived a great number of Christians with the offer of land in a distant province; an uncountable *vulgus* were inspired with this hope.[55]

When Guibert wished to refer to the lower social order in a less pejorative sense he preferred to use the term *pauperes*. In a very interesting aside with regard to William Carpenter, one of the knights active in the People's Crusade who eventually abandoned the expedition shortly before the battle with Kerbogha, Guibert reported that William Carpenter, when he set out for Jerusalem, first plundered from the *pauperes* near to him to obtain his provisions.[56] He also wrote about other unnamed knights from France, who before departing on the expedition had been fighting unjustly and were making *pauperes* by their criminal plunder.[57] This awareness of social conflict between rich and poor pervades the *Gesta Dei per Francos*, although Guibert's sympathy for the *pauperes* in these cases is not typical of the work as a whole.

Guibert's account of the departure of *pauperes* on the expedition was that of an eyewitness and is therefore especially valuable. He wrote that after the Council of Clermont (18 – 28 November 1095), the spirit of the *pauperes* was so inflamed with desire for the expedition that none of them took into account their small wealth, or properly saw to the sale

---

[48] GN 262.
[49] GN 262.
[50] GN 314.
[51] GN 97
[52] GN 118.
[53] GN 141.
[54] GN 185
[55] GN 251.
[56] GN 178 – 9. For William Carpenter see J. Riley-Smith, *The First Crusaders 1095-1131* (Cambridge, 1997), p. 226.
[57] GN 179.

of homes, vineyards and fields.[58] In this instance the *pauperes* were depicted as property owning farmers. Guibert's description of the departure of the *pauperes* confirms this and invokes a certain amount of pathos. He wrote of *pauperes*, whose oxen had been fitted to a two-wheel cart and armed as though they were horses, carrying in the cart their few possessions together with small children.[59] Guibert was also an eyewitness to the preaching of Peter the Hermit, who, he observed, was very generous to the *pauperes* with the gifts he was given.[60]

According to Guibert, Emperor Alexius I Comnenus included in the offer that helped persuade Duke Godfrey to cross the Arm of Saint George the promise that he would give alms to the *pauperes* of the Lotharingian contingent.[61] Guibert also indicated that he considered there to have been a sizeable presence of *pauperes* in the contingent of Bohemond as it marched through Greece (5 April 1097), when he reported that as a result of a shortage of markets Bohemond diverted from the public way and entered a valley abundantly supplied with different kinds of food in order to look out for the *pauperes*.[62]

Guibert's first mention of *pauperes* among the united forces of the First Crusade occurred in a passage that was more lyrical than factual. He wrote that the battle arising from the foraging expedition of Bohemond and Robert of Flanders during the siege of Antioch (31 December 1097) was such a success for the Christians that he who was naked now had clothing, those who were *pedites* now had *vehicula*, and the *pauper* had money.[63] Not only do other sources indicate that this expedition came back with very little,[64] but the image of *pedes* obtaining *vehicula* suggests that Guibert was writing in a classical mode in this passage rather than offering a description of events that was intended to be taken literally. Another poetic passage in the *Gesta Dei per Francos* that mentions the *pauperes* was Guibert's version of the speech in the *Gesta Francorum* in which Kerbogha's mother asked her son why he would bother to shed the blood of such *pauperes homines*.[65]

Other passages seem to contain genuine historical information. In his description of the situation inside of Antioch after the arrival of Kerbogha trapped the Christians in the city, Guibert wrote that the extraordinary lack of food particularly weakened the courage of everyone of poorer means (*pauperior*).[66] He continued by reporting that wealthy persons ate

---

[58] GN 119.
[59] GN 120.
[60] GN 121.
[61] GN 130 – 1.
[62] GN 141.
[63] GN 175.
[64] See J. France, *Victory in the East*, pp. 238 – 40.
[65] GN 213.
[66] GN 225.

the meat of animals, but the poorer (*pauperiores*) had only the remaining dried skins.[67] After the victory over Kerbogha, Guibert wrote that if a *pauper* took something that he wanted, no wealthier man (*ditior*) tried to take it from him by force, but each permitted the other to take what he wanted without a fight.'[68] The suggestion that rich and poor in other circumstances could come to blows is consistent with Guibert's description of the plundering of *pauperes* by knights in France. The description of the distribution of booty here is significant and agrees with other sources, which indicate that after the siege of Nicea the Christians adopted a policy that seems to have been that the first to obtain booty was entitled to keep it, regardless of their social status.[69] The same sentiment reappeared in Guibert's description of the sacking of Jerusalem in which he reported an equality in the distribution of plunder in the Lord's army, such that even the poorest (*pauperrimi*) kept thereafter whatever good things came to them, without doubt or challenge, whatever the rank (*conditio*) of the man into whose hand it had first fallen.[70]

Two other appearances of the term *pauperes* in the *Gesta Dei per Francos* are straightforward. Guibert reported that after the death of Adhémar (1 August 1098) alms were immediately distributed to the *pauperes*.[71] Finally, when the castellan Achard of Montmerle left the siege of Jerusalem to contact six Christian vessels that had arrived in Jaffa on 17 June 1099, he was intercepted by some Arab soldiers and killed along with some of the most respected among the *pauperes* and the *pedites*.[72] This seems to be a clarification of the *Gesta Francorum*, in which the same incident is reported as involving the death of Achard of Montmerle and the *pauperes homines pedites*.[73] The latter is a slightly ambiguous term that should probably be understood as meaning poor footsoldiers, although Guibert's separation of *pauperes* and *pedites* is a plausible amendment.

In his description of the building of the castle Malregard, soon after 17 November 1097, Guibert made a remark consistent with his view that the crusade saw a lull in a state of affairs that more usually saw the rich prey upon the poor. He wrote that no *egena manus* was able to complain that it had to endure service inflicted upon him by the power of *maiores*, since they too worked hard to bring the work to completion.[74] Again a basic bipartite division of the expedition, this time between *principes* and *minores*, was indicated by Guibert's description of a meeting of the *principes* (10 June 1098), which resulted in the swearing of oaths that they would not abandon the enterprise. When the oath-taking had been learnt of by

---

[67] GN 225.
[68] GN 243.
[69] See below pp. 208, 216 – 17, 224, 234 – 7.
[70] GN 281.
[71] GN 246.
[72] GN 273. For Achard of Montmerle see J. Riley – Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 197.
[73] GF 89.
[74] GN 172.

the *minores* they took heart.[75] The adjective *minora* also appeared as a term for the lowest of a tripartite division of the whole people. In the speech by Bohemond noted above, Guibert had the Norman prince refer to the equal suffering of *magni*, *minores*, and *mediocres*.[76]

The speech addressed to the rich by Adhémar concerning their relationship to the poor is one of the few social passages in the *Gesta Francorum*. It reads: 'none of you can be saved unless he does honour to the *pauperes* and assists them; you cannot be saved without them, and they cannot live without you.'[77] Guibert's version was so ornate as to be almost untranslateable: *Nisi enim minoribus vestris, tamen naturae consortio comparandis, humanitatis sinum prestiteritis ea quae, quae vobis et illis non dispariter a deo creata, a vobis tamen inequaliter correpta noscuntur, non eis communicaveritis, divinae proculdubio vobis ostium misericordiae percludetis*.[78] This much more florid elaboration on the passage of the *Gesta Francorum* provides yet another example of Guibert's perspective that it was natural, if not desirable, for the rich to attempt to obtain property at the expense of the poor.

The body of people who demanded that the visionary Peter Bartholomew test the legitimacy of the Holy Lance were termed *plebeculae* by Guibert. He wrote that a *murmur* began to circulate that the discovery of the relic had been staged and that it was merely any old lance, therefore an enormous *plebeculae* began to mutter (*mussitare*).[79] To 'mutter' was a very serious offence against the rules of St Benedict and therefore has an extremely pejorative sense in the work of an abbot of a Benedictine monastery.[80] Guibert was a supporter of the legitimacy of the Holy Lance and consequently there is a negative connotation attached to the term *plebeculae* for those who by doubting the Holy Lance damaged the faith of others. Although not strictly a social term there is a similarly negative connotation in Guibert's use of *turba*, which in the *Gesta Dei per Francos* was consistently employed in the sense of a 'mob.' Examples of its appearances include for the credulous crowd who follow Mohamed; the People's Crusade in general; those of the Peoples Crusade at Exorogorgum [Eski-Kaled] and Civitote; the potentially seditious people of Edessa under Baldwin's recently established rule and those who rushed to loot the city of Ma'arrat on its fall.[81]

---

[75] GN 221.
[76] GN 201. See above p. 149.
[77] GF 74: *Nemo ex vobis saluari potest nisi honorificet pauperes et reficiat, vosque non potestis saluari sine illis, ipsique vivere nequent sine vobis.*
[78] GN 246 – 7..
[79] GN 262.
[80] See also above p. 134 and below p. 206, 229.
[81] GN 98, 124, 127, 165, 254.

Plebs, populus

Guibert's use of *plebs* was consistent with its appearances in the Vulgate as being a broad term for the people or the laity. Echoing Romans 9:25, Guibert had Kerbogha's mother remind her son that by the mouth of God it was said that those who had not been his *plebs* were now his *plebs*.[82] He referred once to the 'Catholic *plebs*.'[83] Before the final assault on Jerusalem (15 July 1099) Guibert wrote that the bishops and priests directed the *plebs*, who were their subjects, to sing litanies, undertake fasts, pray and give alms.[84] The other examples of Guibert's use of the term are equally straightforward; although it is perhaps worth noting that he reported that those Christians who urged the *principes* to resume the march to Jerusalem after they expedition had rested over five months in Antioch were the *plebs*.[85] In this instance the *plebs* were distinct from the *princes* within the whole laity.

Populus is such a broad term for the people that most instances of its appearance in the *Gesta Dei per Francos* carry little social information. A possible exception worth noting arose when Guibert came to write of the challenge to the veracity of the visions of Peter Bartholomew. He wrote that a pile of timber was heaped up by many of the *populus*, eager for novelty.[86] The desire of the people for new things was a classical image used also by Guibert in connection with the *vulgus*.[87] *Populus* in this instance stood for a general body of people whose actions Guibert disapproved of. He wrote that the *populus* greeted the visionary as he emerged from the flames and inadvertently killed him from the tumult of pushing and tearing.[88] In the same spirit he referred to the *populus* of King Tafur and the foolish *populus* who followed a goose.[89] However this slightly pejorative use of the term is not a consistent feature of the *Gesta Dei per Francos*. Guibert equally readily referred to the *populus* whom Jesus delivered from Egypt and the Christian *populus*.[90]

Guibert is the only one of the early crusading historians to mention the *tafurs*, a distinct body of the poor.[91] They were provided with a lengthy description in the *Gesta Dei per Francos*. According to Guibert the *tafur* marched barefoot, carried no arms, and was not permitted to have any quantity of money. Naked, needy and altogether filthy, the *tafurs* went ahead of everyone, living on the roots of herbs and on any worthless growth. Their leader was

---

[82] GN 214.
[83] GN 341.
[84] GN 276.
[85] GN 250.
[86] GN 262.
[87] See above p. 152.
[88] GN 263.
[89] Goose, GN 331. For King Tafur see below p. 157 - 8.
[90] GN 277 – 8, 304, 318.
[91] For *tafurs* see CA and *La Chanson de Jérusalem*, ed. Nigel R. Thorpe, (Tuscaloosa, 1991), *passim*; L. A. M. Sumberg, 'The 'Tafurs' and the First Crusade', *Mediaeval Studies,* 21 (1951), pp. 224 - 246; N. Cohn, *The Pursuit of the Millennium* (London, 1970), pp. 65 – 7, 72, 89, 283; N. Daniel, *The Arabs and Mediaeval Europe* (London, 1979), pp. 133 – 4.

a certain well-born man originating from Normandy, who, having become a *pedes* from an *eques*, saw these impoverished people going astray. Casting aside his arms he declared his wish to become their king and thus he was called King Tafur.[92]

Both of the vernacular epics, the *Chanson d'Antioche* and the *Chanson de Jérusalem* give descriptions of the *tafurs*. Although there is continuing debate over the value of the *Chanson d'Antioche* as a source, the consensus of modern historians is that it does contain eyewitness material.[93] The *Chanson de Jérusalem* is, however, clearly not historical and both epics are likely to have exaggerated those aspects of the *tafurs* that would have appeared comical for the sake of entertainment. Nevertheless, as Norman Daniel has argued, the kinds of behaviour they ascribe to the *tafurs* was likely to have been a reflection of a social reality, even if their specific actions and speeches were fictitious.[94] The *tafurs* were portrayed in these epics as being near to starvation, resorting to cannibalism and being so wild that even the Christian princes did not dare to approach them.[95] As Guibert might well have been exposed to epic material concerning the First Crusade before writing the *Gesta Dei per Francos* around the year 1109, he cannot be considered an independent source for the actions of the *tafurs* or the existence of King Tafur. However his comment that the king of the Tafurs was an *eques* who had become a *pedes* is crucial evidence that for Guibert and his readers such a change in status was readily conceivable under the difficult circumstances of the First Crusade.

Mediocres

Guibert used the notion of a middle rank in a more polished form than any author before William of Tyre's *Chronicon* (1184). That Guibert used the term *mediocres* for a middle rank is made clear from its appearance in a tripartite division of the entire people, noted above, in a speech by Bohemond who referred to 'all of our people, *magni*, *minores*, and *mediocres*.'[96] In describing those who set out from France on the Crusade of 1101, Guibert used the same schema when he wrote of a great crowd of the *summe*, *mediocris* and *infimi generis*.[97]

Guibert wrote an important passage on the disintegration of the leadership of the First Crusade after the death of Adhémar, discussed above, in which he described unfitting licentiousness taking place among the *mediocres* and the *vulgus*.[98] In his polemic against

---

[92] GN 310.
[93] S. B. Edgington, 'The First Crusade: Reviewing the Evidence', *The First Crusade, Origins and Impact*, ed. J. Phillips (Manchester, 1997), pp. 55 – 77, p. 62.
[94] N. Daniel, *The Arabs and Medieval Europe*, p. 133.
[95] CA II, 4 – 9.
[96] GN 201. See above p. 149.
[97] GN 313.
[98] GN 262. See above pp. 148, 152.

Mohamed, Guibert accused the followers of Mohamed of intolerable crimes against the *mediocres* and the lowest people.[99] After the fall of Nicea (19 June 1097) Alexius I Comnenus, the Byzantine emperor rewarded the princes and the very poor of the Christian army. According to Guibert envy and enmity towards the *principes* grew among the *mediocres exercitus personae* of the army, whom his generosity had overlooked.[100] This is important evidence of serious social tension at the outset of the First Crusade, focused on the issue of plunder.

Pedites

Pedites in the *Gesta Dei per Francos* were straightforwardly footsoldiers. Minor variations from the otherwise unambiguous use of the term included the formulation *pauper pedes* for the poor footsoldier from whom Kerbogha obtained the rusty arms that encouraged him to be over confident.[101] The description of the same incident in the *Gesta Francorum* had Kerbogha examine the arms of *pauperes peregrini*.[102] As we have seen, Guibert tended to use the term *pauperes* for farmers or those on the First Crusade who had formerly been farmers. He did not ever use the term for a combatant, so for consistency in this instance he wrote of a poor *pedes*. Guibert's belief that on this journey of God it was proper for the rich to look after the poor was reflected in his relish in retelling stories concerning Duke Godfrey and his brother Baldwin, in which they came to the aid of someone of lowly status at the risk of their lives. Guibert reported two instances of Baldwin receiving serious wounds in battle in order to defend one of his *pedites*.[103]

A key passage in the *Gesta Dei per Francos* in regard to the possible change in status between an *eques* and a *pedes* was the speech that Guibert wrote for Kerbogha in his reply to the embassy of Peter the Hermit (27 June 1098). In Guibert's version Kerbogha offered the Christians castles and cities so that none would be allowed to be *pedites* but universally all would be *equites*.[104] This was a very close rendering of the same speech in the *Gesta Francorum*, which had Kerbogha offer land with cities and castles, so that none should remain a *pedes*, but all would be *milites*.[105] Other examples of the same theme in the *Gesta Dei per Francos* occur with regard to *tafur*, above, and *equestres*, below. Guibert used a less common term for footsoldier, *pedestres*, on three occasions, none of which differentiate the term from his use of *pedites*.[106]

---

[99] GN 102.
[100] GN 153.
[101] GN 211.
[102] GF 51.
[103] GN 287, 318.
[104] GN 236.
[105] GF 67.
[106] GN 147, 170, 312.

Armigeri

Guibert gave little attention to squires. He reported that at the end of March 1096, in Constantinople, Duke Godfrey and each of his men sent their own *armigeri* to get straw and other necessaries for their horses.[107] Guibert's account of King Baldwin I's dismissal of Gervase of Bazoches from the rulership of Tiberias (1106 – 1108) was similarly clear-cut: Gervase fled the city, taking with him as his retinue two *equites* and two *armigeri*.[108]

Famuli, clientes, domestici, satellites

The household followers of the senior princes were referred to in the *Gesta Dei per Francos* by a number of broad terms that covered both combatants and non-combatants. Guibert wrote that after Baldwin of Boulogne had been made ruler of Edessa (10 March 1097) he brought in Frankish *milites* and *famuli* for his own protection.[109] The fact that these followers were subsequently described as performing military duties indicates that the term *famuli* was not being used here simply for domestic servants. Bohemond's herald before the assault on Antioch (3 June 1098) was termed both a *cliens* and a *famulus*.[110] In the *Gesta Francorum* the same person was named as 'Bad-crown' a *serviens*, a term that for the anonymous author might have been equivalent to *iuvenis*.[111] Guibert termed the Lombard soldier who descended from the walls of Antioch to arouse the main body of Christian troops to action a *famulus*.[112] A different, non-military, sense of the term arose in the passage discussed above, in which Guibert claimed that in the army of God 'the *servus* did not serve the *dominus*, nor did the *dominus* claim anything other than brotherhood from the *famulus*.'[113] Here the association of *famulus* with *servus* seems to indicate Guibert had in mind non-military 'servants.'

When Tancred agreed to garrison a castle at the siege of Antioch (5 April 1098), Guibert reported that he took charge of the castle with *equites* and *clientes*, who attached themselves to his *familia*.[114] These *clientes* were evidently military followers. When Tancred offered to garrison the fort Guibert ascribed to him a speech in which the Norman prince used another broad term for the same members of his household who would help him block the activities of the enemy: *domestici*.[115] *Clientes*, however, do not seem to be consistently military followers, Guibert wrote a passage in which he referred to the tasks that *clientes* and

---

[107] GN 130.
[108] GN 348. For Gervase of Bazoches, lord of Tiberias see n. 9.
[109] GN 163.
[110] GN 203.
[111] GF: 45- 6. See above pp. 15 - 16.
[112] GN 204.
[113] GN 312: ... *ut non respectaret servus ad dominum, nec dominus nisi fraternitatem usurparet in famulum.*
[114] GN 195.
[115] GN 194.

mancipia provided for soldiers.[116] A variation on these terms that occurred once, towards the end of the *Gesta Dei per Francos*, was *satellites*. Guibert reported that there was a period when King Baldwin I suffered so severely from a lack of money that his *satellites* and *milites* considered leaving him.[117]

Equites, milites, equestres

Guibert shared with his fellow historians Baldric of Dol and Robert the Monk the notion that a typical body of fighting men consisted of *equites* and *pedites*. Very many straightforward instances of the coupling of *equites* and *pedites* in this manner occur in the *Gesta Dei per Francos*.[118] One particularly important passage was the speech of Kerbogha, discussed above, in which the emir of Mosul offered to make *equites* from those who were *pedites* through the grant of castles and cities.[119] This example serves to show the term *equites* being used not merely for mounted soldiers but as people whose status was determined by the ownership of property, namely a castle or a city. It is also an example of Guibert substituting the term *equites* for *milites* in the *Gesta Francorum*. Three examples within the text of the *Gesta Dei per Francos* itself show that Guibert considered *equites* and *milites* to be synonymous. In mid June, 1098, Alexius I Comnenus, the Byzantine emperor, turned back from his march towards Antioch having been brought the news, by Stephen of Blois amongst others, that the rest of the expedition was doomed. Alexius ordered the retreat, reported Guibert, and the *milites* hastened to follow their orders, while the *pedites* followed the army. But the *pedites* could not keep up with the swift *equites*.[120] The second example of the interchange of *milites* and *equites* appeared in a passage concerning the expedition to Jaffa of Raymond Pilet during the siege of Jerusalem, mid June 1099. Raymond Pilet, together with two other *proceres*, took 100 *equites* from the army of his lord, Count Raymond of Toulouse, and set out for the port. Thirty of these *milites* then separated from the main group.[121] Thirdly, Gervase of Bazoches was referred to as both an *eques* and a *miles*.[122]

Guibert used the term *equites* both for very large numbers of knights, such as the five hundred *equites* sent ahead, early in October 1097, by Count Raymond in the hope of capturing Antioch unprepared,[123] and very small numbers, such as the fourteen *equites* from the Christian army fighting at Tripoli (March 1099) who came together to find food.[124] This

---

[116] GN 147.
[117] GN 348.
[118] GN 135; 137; 164; 171; 185; 231 – 2; 239; 293 – 4; 336; 345.
[119] GN 67, see above p. 159.
[120] GN 231 – 2.
[121] GN 272 – 3. For Raymond Pilet see J. Riley-Smith, *The First Crusaders*, p. 220.
[122] GN 347, 349 (*miles*); 350 (*eques*).
[123] GN 168.
[124] GN 258.

latter example indicates that Guibert thought it quite possible for *equites* to form an association independent of any senior prince.

Of the individuals termed *eques* by Guibert, easily the most interesting was Robert Guiscard, Duke of Apulia and Calabria, father of Bohemond, whom Guibert introduced as someone who was 'born in a lowly enough station',[125] In Guibert's account, Robert was sent away a *pedes* from Normandy, perhaps banished, to Apulia, where he earned horses and arms to become a *eques*.[126] This is an extraordinary statement. Factually it is dubious, in that no other source mentions banishment and while Tancred, Robert's father, was a poor lord with twelve sons, of whom Robert was the sixth, it seems unlikely he would have been so impoverished as to journey to Italy as a footsoldier.[127] Guibert's report does, however, testify to contemporary experience of the fluidity of social classes. In his comments on Robert Guiscard's early career Guibert seems to be repeating the belief, shown again in his report of Kerbogha's offer, discussed above, that a knight impoverished to the point of being a *pedes* could restore his status as an *eques* by regaining a mount and arms. Guibert continued his account of the career of Robert Guiscard by reporting that the Norman *eques* took over certain castles, laid siege to wealthy cities and, in short, this new man (*novus homo*) extended his territory of domination.[128] This idea of the creation of a 'new man' was sustained in Guibert's comment that Bohemond had obliterated the lowliness of his ancestors through his marriage (April 1106) to the daughter of Philip, King of France.[129] Guibert's use of the idea of the *novus homo* derives from Cicero and echoes the manner in which, very rarely, a man of political or military ability could thrust himself into the ranks of the Roman elite.[130]

Individuals termed *eques* by Guibert were: Tancred, an *eques optimus*; Peter of Alifa; Lethold of Tournai and Guibert's friend Matthew. Gervase of Bazoches was an *eques* 'of famous descent' (*nobiliter oriundus*). Gervase was related to the lords of Milly in the Beauvaisis, was a senior member of the entourage of Baldwin I and was made lord of Tiberias in 1106.[131] Finally it is worth drawing attention to the story in the *Gesta Dei per Francos* of the devil who appeared to a man of the *ordo* of *equestres*. Guibert's description of the devil portrayed him as an *eques*, holding a sparrow-hawk in his hand, wearing a orange-yellow

---

[125] GN 137: ... *tenui satis loco natus.*
[126] GN 137.
[127] G. A. Loud, *The Age of Robert Guiscard: Southern Italy and the Norman Conquest* (Harlow, 2000), p. 2.
[128] GN 137.
[129] GN 138.
[130] For the classical '*novus homo*' see R. Syme, *The Roman Revolution*, (Oxford, 1939), p. 11.
[131] GN 195 (Tancred); 167 (Peter); 278 (Lietuad); 198 (Matthew); 350 (Gervase). For Tancred see R. L. Nicholson, *Tancred: A study of his career and work in their relation to the First Crusade and the Establishment of the Latin States in Syria and Palestine* (Chicago, 1940). For these knights see J. Riley-Smith, *The First Crusaders*, p. 217 (Peter of Alifa); p. 215 (Lethold of Tournai). For Matthew see n. 20; for Gervase of Bazoches see n. 9.

tunic.[132] The hunting bird as an accoutrement of the *eques* is important here. As Albert of Aachen noted, such birds were beloved of the highest *nobiles*.[133] Although Guibert's story was the report of a vision it did provide evidence linking the term *eques* to a noble social culture and therefore its standing for something more than a mounted soldier.

There are three instances where Guibert interchanged *milites* and *equites*, discussed above, indicating that at times he considered the terms to be synonyms, not separate terms representing a distinction between 'soldier', 'rider' or 'knight'. Guibert nevertheless preferred by far the term *equites*, perhaps because of its greater classical connotation. Noteworthy passages in the *Gesta Dei per Francos* that used the term *milites* are few. Guibert gave an interesting assessment of Duke Godfrey and Peter the Hermit's leadership over their respective contingents when he wrote that Godfrey was in possession of what Peter was unable to obtain: control over his *milites*.[134] Guibert attributed the fact that women brought water to the *milites* at the battle of Dorylaeum (1 July 1098) to the presence of God.[135] Twice Guibert indicated that around Bohemond was a body of chosen *milites*: towards the end of September 1097 Bohemond took only his *milites* in search of an army of Danishmend Turks;[136] secondly Guibert reported that at the siege of Antioch, Bohemond, having brought together 4000 of his *lectissimi milites*, undertook to oppose the gate of the city.[137]

Guibert attributed two speeches to Bohemond that opened with the Norman prince addressing those present as *milites*. The first took place in December 1097 and was directed at an assembly of the *proceres* whom Bohemond addressed as *strenui milites*.[138] The second was an exhortation before the 'Lake Battle' (8 February 1098), where the Christian troops were entirely made up of knights, all others having been left behind at the camp. Bohemond hailed those present as *optimi milites*.[139] The clearest example that Guibert was willing to employ the term *miles* to refer to someone of senior status was his comment that Hugh the Great, whose lineage Guibert valued highly, died with the reputation of an *optimus miles*.[140] The only other individuals singled out as *miles* were Tancred, a *miles acerrimus*,[141] Gervase of Bazoches,[142] and a certain Hugh, 'the mad', one of the household of Geoffrey of Montescaglioso.[143]

---

[132] GN 324.
[133] AA 200.
[134] GN 129.
[135] GN 154.
[136] GN 167.
[137] GN 170.
[138] GN 173.
[139] GN 185.
[140] GN 243.
[141] GN 156. For Tancred see n. 131.
[142] GN 349. For Gervase of Bazoches see n. 9.
[143] GN 194. For Hugh Lo Forsenet see J. Riley-Smith, *The First Crusaders*, p. 212. For Geoffrey of Mountescaglioso see J. Riley-Smith, *The First Crusaders*, p. 207.

In order to make a particular point, Guibert used the significant phrase *gregarii milites*. In the hands of William of Tyre, some seventy years later, this would be a term for mercenary knights,[144] For Guibert, however, it seems to have been used in its classical sense of 'common soldiers.' The phrase arose in a passage relating to the victory of the Christian forces at Dorylaeum (1 July 1097); Guibert anticipated criticism of his praise from those who might describe the Turkish forces as merely bands of *rustici* and *gregarii milites*.[145] In other words, they were not worthy opponents, not 'knights', but commoners banded together as soldiers.

Guibert occasionally used the term *equestres* for knights rather than *equites* or *milites*. The fact that he was referring to a distinct social class and not simply mounted soldiers is evident from the three appearances of the phrase *ordo equestris* in the *Gesta Dei per Francos*.[146] Again the term *equestres* had a social content in Guibert's description of the forces that accompanied Bohemond from Apulia that included many *equestres* of the highest probity.[147] Similarly in Guibert's report of the departure of the Crusade of 1101 he noted the presence of battalions of *equestres* of considerable reputation.[148] The two individuals termed *equestres* by Guibert were also praised as noble. One was his friend Matthew, who was also described as being of noble birth (*genere nobilis*);[149] the other was Raymond Pilet a *vir equestris ordinis* among the *primores* of Count Raymond.[150]

The phrase *equestres viri* was substituted for *milites* in a passage that echoed the description in the *Gesta Francorum* of the harsh passage of the First Crusade through the desert terrain of Anatolia in July 1097. Guibert reported that many 'men of the equestrian dignity' (*equestres viri*) died there, and from a severe lack of horses and carts they rounded up and saddled oxen, goats, rams, and, something quite remarkable, dogs.[151] The equivalent passage in the *Gesta Francorum* contained the observation that from the deaths of horses many *milites* remained *pedites*, with oxen serving in place of mounts, goats, sheep and dogs for carrying things.[152] Guibert used the important information about knights becoming footsoldiers for his description of a later part of the difficult journey through Anatolia. After the expedition had passed through Coxon in October 1097, hardship and famine converted

---

[144] See above pp. 183 - 4.
[145] GN 158.
[146] GN 87, 244, 323.
[147] GN 138.
[148] GN 312.
[149] GN 198. For Matthew see n. 20.
[150] GN 244. For Raymond Pilet see n. 121.
[151] GN 161.
[152] GF 23.

equestres into *pedites*.[153] The accounts are not inconsistent as the subsequent difficult mountain crossing exacerbated the loss of mounts in the desert.

In his dispute with the chaplain and historian Fulcher of Chartres over the numbers that participated on the First Crusade, Guibert wrote that some 100,000 fully equipped *equestres* were said to have been present when all the various contingents united at Nicea (3 June 1097).[154] Guibert had earlier indicated that stratification could exist among the category of *equestres* with his use of the highly original phrase, *mediocritas equestrium virorum*, the 'middle rank of equestrian men'. The context of this improvisation by Guibert was his account of the Council of Clermont, after which counts palatine and the middle ranks of *equestres* besides were enthused to join the expedition.[155] The distinction made here indicated that Guibert considered that senior nobles were part of the order of *equestres*, but so too were *equestres* of more modest means. To emphasise how the whole of that order, great and lesser, desired to join the expedition he coined a unique phrase.

Iuvenes

In the early twelfth century, as we have seen, particularly in the work of Robert the Monk, the term *iuvenes* could have a technical meaning, for a knight who was not necessarily a 'youth' but was yet to have formed his own household, or to have had children.[156] Guibert wrote a key passage in which he not only used the term in this sense but also indicated that *iuvenes* was the fighting key forces of the First Crusade. A body of non-combatants setting out on the journey were described as speaking to the fighters and saying that while the *iuvenes* used their swords, they (the non-combatants) would deserve Christ by offering support.[157] Guibert gave a more nuanced description of the setting forth of knights on crusade when he set out a three-fold hierarchy in the Lotharingian army on their departure with Duke Godfrey of Lotharingia (15 August 1096): the senior princes, knights and the *iuventus*.[158] Similarly at the end of his account, in describing the Christian forces who went out to do battle at Ascalon (12 August 1099) against al-Afdal, Shah an-Shah, vizier of Egypt again Guibert drew a tripartite picture of the crusader fighting forces, youths (Guibert used the collective noun *iuventa*), *milites* and princes.[159]

---

[153] GN 168.
[154] GN 344.
[155] GN 118. For *comites Palatinorum* see below p. 171.
[156] See Georges Duby, *The Chivalrous Society*, trans. C. Postan, University of California Press (Berkely, 1977) p. 120 originally published as 'Les "jeunes" dans la société aristocratique dans la France du Nord-Ouest au XII[e] siècle,' *Annales: Economies, Sociétés, Civilisations* 19; 5 (1964), pp. 835-846. See also below Chapter II. 3.
[157] GN 120.
[158] GN 129.
[159] GN 299.

Guibert next returned to the term in writing about Tancred, who had earned and deserved the title of most sagacious *iuvenis*.[160] It might seem inconsistent with the technical understanding of the term *iuvenis* that a senior prince of the First Crusade should be given this epithet, not just by Guibert but also by Albert of Aachen and Ralph of Caen.[161] But until his establishment of a principality in Galilee (late 1099), Tancred was an unmarried knight still in search of his fortune and position, acting largely under the direction of Bohemond, the brother-in-law of his mother Emma.[162] A similar case is that of Walo II of Chaumont-en-Vexin, about whom Guibert wrote that during the siege of Antioch, around May 1098, an excellent *iuvenis* had been lost.[163] Walo II of Chaumont-en-Vexin was married to Humberge, the sister of another key crusader and *iuvenis*, Everard III le Puiset.[164] Unlike the case of Tancred, Walo was married and already had a notable role, of constable, at the French court. But he and Humberge, who accompanied him on the expedition, were without children. This, together with his leaving of a settled position at the court of the Phillip I of France, and Walo's association through his brother-in-law with the troublesome band of *iuvenes*,[165] seems to have led Guibert to describe Walo as a *iuvenis* rather than a *miles* or *nobilis*.

In his account of the storming of Jerusalem Guibert wrote: 'Several of the Frankish *iuvenes*, whom pious audacity had already made more pre-eminent, threw themselves forward ... and together they climbed to the top of the wall. I would identify them by name on this page, if I had not known that after their return they incurred the infamy of such great evils and crimes.'[166] A clue to the identity of the unnameable persons is to be found in Guibert of Nogent's autobiography. Here Thomas of Marle looms large as a rebellious and sadistic lord in the 1110s, making it likely that he and his troublesome associates were among those indicated by Guibert's use of the term *iuvenes* at this point.[167] Finally, Guibert gave the *iuvenes* a role in the vanguard of the army in the storming of Caesarea by Baldwin I (17 May 1101), where the king, supported by the choicest of his *iuventus*, fiercely attacked the inhabitants.[168]

---

[160] GN 194.
[161] AA 208, RC 688.
[162] R. L. Nicholson, *Tancred: A Study of His Career and Work in Relation to the First Crusade and the Establishment of the Latin States in Syria and Palestine*, (Chicago, 1940), pp. 3-15.
[163] GN 332: *Ibi quemdam nostri egregiae indolis iuvenem qui apud regem Francorum comes stabuli fuerat, nomine Walonem, amittunt.*
[164] For further references to Walo II of Chaumont-en-Vexin see J. Riley-Smith, *The First Crusaders*, p. 224. For Everard III Le Puiset see J. Riley-Smith, *The First Crusaders*, p. 205.
[165] See below pp. 266.
[166] GN 278: *Quique iuvenum Francicorum, quos pia jam dudum reddiderat illustriores audacia, sese proripiunt ... murorum pariter suprema conscendunt. Quos etiam nominatim huic insererem paginae, nisi scirem post reditum tantorum eos flagitiorum ac scelerum infamiam incurrisse.*
[167] See below pp. 266 - 7.
[168] GN 347.

The term *iuniores* is commonly used as a noun for subordinates or inferiors. It can, however, appear as a comparative of *iuvenes* and it is worth noting two passages in the *Gesta Dei per Francos* in which the term *iuniores* seems to be used in that sense. When, around Christmas 1097, Bohemond offered to lead a foraging expedition from the siege of Antioch, the offer was accepted gratefully by the *iuniores*, since they were worn out by greater thirst and more urgent need for food.[169] In this case the *iuniores* were clearly part of a fighting force. In March 1098, during the siege of Antioch, the *maiores* of the army decided to build a castle at the site of a certain mosque. Guibert reported that all of the *iuniores* assented to this plan.[170] They are thus depicted as having a consultative voice on the decisions of the *maiores*. While Guibert could have intended the term to mean a broad category of 'inferiors' such as, for example, footsoldiers, this does not seem to fit the information in the two passages. Given Guibert's other descriptions of the activities of a body of *iuvenes* on the First Crusade it is probably correct to read *iuniores* as equivalent to *iuvenes* in both these cases.

Nobiles, maiores, optimates, principes, primores, potentes, seniores, comites, proceres, domini

Guibert was disturbed by accounts of the shortages of food and water among the Christians at the siege of Jerusalem. Having explained that the water had to be brought six miles in the rotten skins of makeshift hide bags, he gave vent to his sympathy for the nobles undergoing such an experience. The roughness of the bread must have worn away the jaws and throats of the *viri nobiles*; their elegant stomachs must have been twisted by the bitterness of the putrid liquid. They doubtless remembered with suffering the pleasures of their former lives.[171] This is vivid sociological evidence for the lifestyle of the nobility, although it does not define those termed *nobiles* with any precision. Slightly more helpful in this regard is the comment noted under *equestres* above, that the knight Matthew, was of noble birth (*genere nobilis*).[172] Matthew was not a particularly senior *equester* as Guibert wrote that his parents were vassals of Guibert's family.[173] This suggests that Guibert considered nobility to extend down the social scale as far as *milites* and *equites*.

Guibert's description of the building of the castle Malregard, soon after 17 November 1097, has been noted under *egena manus* above. He considered that the bands of poor had no grounds for complaint at the work inflicted upon them as the *maiores* also took up the work.[174] It is unclear from this example how far down the social scale the term *maiores* was

---

[169] GN 173.
[170] GN 190.
[171] GN 274.
[172] GN 198. See above p. 164. For Matthew see n. 20.
[173] GN 198.
[174] GN 172. See above p. 155.

intended to reach. But in his account of the decision to build a fort at the site of a certain mosque in March 1098, during the siege of Antioch, Guibert refers to the leaders involved as *maiores*.[175] Other examples of the use of the term in the *Gesta Dei per Francos* suggest that Guibert tended to see the term as a relative one for betters rather than specifically for the senior princes. He had a touching passage concerning the fact that young boys were present in large numbers on the expedition and reported that their ability to endure want was not inferior to that of the *maiores*.[176] Here *maiores* is best understood simply as the adults in general; certainly the term could not at this point be employed in the narrow sense of magnates.

Guibert used the term *optimates* only once in the *Gesta Dei per Francos*. He described the arrival of Arab ambassadors at the camp of the Christians during the siege of Antioch, early in March 1098. These envoys dismissed the Christians as possible allies against the Turks, after they had learned that the *optimates*, through lack of horses, had now become *pedites*.[177] Other than the fact that *optimates* here were evidently knights the precise meaning of the term for Guibert cannot be established. In his *Five books of Tropologiae on Hosea, Amos and the Lamentations*, Guibert discussed Amos 6:1 in which the term *optimates* was defined as the 'heads of the people' (*capita populorum*).[178] It is likely therefore that Guibert employed the term *optimates* in that sense and it might not have been an exaggeration to depict the leaders of the Christian forces on the First Crusade as having lost their mounts. There was a desperate shortage of horses at that time and even Duke Godfrey of Lotharingia and Robert of Flanders had to borrow horses from Count Raymond of Toulouse for the battle against Kerbogha (28 June 1098).[179]

The most common term for leaders of troops and for those in the upper part of society in the *Gesta Dei per Francos* was *principes*. Very often it was the term used for the leaders of the First Crusade. In one of the few passages in which the leaders were named Guibert wrote that the *principes*, Duke Godfrey, Count Raymond of Toulouse, Bohemond, Count Robert of Flanders and all the others, held a council together.[180] It is clear, however, that Guibert used the term to indicate 'leaders' without necessarily meaning persons of noble status. In his account of the behaviour of young boys who had come on crusade Guibert was struck by the fact that they formed themselves into an army of children with *principes* of their own named after the senior princes: Hugh the Great, Bohemond, Flanders, Normandy.[181]

In a passage on the high price of food during a period of famine at the siege of Antioch, during the winter of 1097, Guibert observed that when even the *principes* began to

---

[175] GN 190.
[176] GN 309.
[177] GN 271.
[178] *PL* 156, col. 436A.
[179] AA 372. See also J. France, *Victory in the East* (Cambridge, 1994), p. 122 – 42.
[180] GN 243.
[181] GN 309.

experience a contraction of their wealth, hardship must have been severe on those whose wealth had been used up.[182] The point seems to be that Guibert thought that the resources of all but the *principes* were exhausted by the costs of obtaining food at that time.

A major theme of the *Gesta Dei per Francos*, indicated in the very title of the history, is that the First Crusade was the work of God. In particular Guibert marvelled that no king or overall commander directed the expedition. He made this point on three different occasions by echoing the situation of the children of Israel in Hosea 3: 4. Guibert wrote that it was unheard of that such an army should be *sine domino, sine principe*;[183] he also had a very similar formula, *sine rege, sine principe* for the same point, which he used twice.[184] Since Guibert very often described the presence of *principes* on the expedition the apparent contradiction with these statements has to be resolved by assuming that *sine principe* was meant to convey the sense of the biblical passage, that is, without an overall leader.

In describing the different social orders who participated in the First Crusade, Guibert wrote a very important passage in which he identified a sub-stratum of the *principes*, the *mediocres principes* and gave a very specific definition of the group. They were nobles who were lords of between one and four towns. He described how along with those from the illustrious orders (*inclyti ordines*), a multitude of the *mediocres principes* marched forth who could not be counted, because who could enumerate the lords of one, two, three or four towns?[185] An examination of the *Patrologia Latina* shows that the phrase *mediocres principes* was unique to the *Gesta Dei per Francos*. It indicated that Guibert held a pyramid-like image for hierarchy of knights on the First Crusade and helps define the layers. At the top were the handful of senior princes, below them a large number of others also encompassed by the term *principes*, but of more modest means, being the lords of between one and four towns. Below these were immense numbers of *equites*, owners of their armour and a horse.

One of Guibert's favoured terms for the collective leadership of the senior princes of First Crusade was *primores*. His use of the term for the senior princes is unproblematic in all instances.[186] The leaders of the Crusade of 1101 were also termed *primores*.[187] Guibert also used the term for a slightly broader grouping of princes than the most senior leaders. Early in October 1097, soon after leaving the town of Coxon, Count Raymond of Toulouse decided to send some of his men ahead in the hope of catching the defenders of Antioch by surprise. According to Guibert, Count Raymond therefore chose four men from among the *primores* of his own army, one of whom was William VI of Montpellier. Raymond assigned to them 500

---

[182] GN 176 – 7.
[183] GN 86.
[184] GN 266, 312.
[185] GN 133.
[186] GN 142, 153, 155, 234, 267.
[187] GN 314.

equites.[188] Here the *primores* were leaders among a particular contingent rather than the whole army. The same sense of the term was present in the description of Raymond Pilet as being one 'of the *primores* of Count Raymond.'[189]

When Guibert wrote that the *egena manus* could not complain about the *maiores* who were sharing the work of building castle Malregard, soon after 17 November 1097, he did so after having made the comment that the *primores* helped with the carrying of rocks.[190] Here then, it seems that he considered *maiores* and *primores* to be interchangeable.

Other examples of *primores* in the *Gesta Dei per Francos* do not apply to Christian forces, but they do show the term being used consistently for relatively senior figures, all of whom had leadership responsibilities. Those who surrendered the town of Tarsus to Tancred and Baldwin, a few days after 15 September 1097, were the *primores* of the city.[191] Similarly the leaders of the city of Edessa were termed *primores*.[192] Firuz, the officer who betrayed Antioch to the Christians, was described as one of the *primores* of the city.[193] A sortie from the garrison of Antioch against the Christians (6 March 1098) resulted in heavy losses for the Turkish forces and Guibert reported that twelve of their *primores* were killed.[194] Finally, during the storming of Ma'arat-an-Numan (11 December 1098), Bohemond sent an interpreter to the Saracen *primores*, in order to negotiate their surrender to him.[195]

Potentes was an uncommon term for senior nobles in the *Gesta Dei per Francos*. It did occur, however, in an important passage concerning an offer of the *seniores* of the Christian army after the defeat of Kerbogha (28 June 1098), that insofar as there was anyone who needed a gift of money, they should adhere to the *potentes* through a pact.[196] This was Guibert's version of the passage in the *Gesta Francorum* in which the princes offered to make a compact with the *egentes* within the city of Antioch and retain them.[197] It indicates that Guibert understood the term *potentes* as synonymous with *seniores*, that is, a term for the leading nobles of the First Crusade. He also used the term for the leaders of the Crusade of 1101, referring to Count Stephen of Blois and many other *potentes*.[198] In one further example Guibert provided a comment on the depth of the famine that preceded the departure of the

---

[188] GN 168. For William VI of Montpellier see J. Riley-Smith, *The First Crusaders*, p. 226.
[189] GN 244: ... *de primoribus comitis Sancti Egidii.* For Raymond Pilet see n. 121.
[190] GN 172. See also above pp. 155, 167.
[191] GN 162.
[192] GN 165.
[193] GN 200.
[194] GN 192.
[195] GN 253.
[196] GN 244.
[197] GF 72-3.
[198] GN 315.

First Crusade, saying that the extent of the hardship was threatening even to the *potentes*.[199] In other words, as Guibert himself put it, the time of famine reduced the wealth of all.[200]

Seniores was a term that can simply refer to elderly men, but in addition to this, more typical, usage, Guibert on a number of occasions used the term *seniores* to indicate the senior princes directing the First Crusade, such as in the example above in which the term was interchanged with *potentes*.[201] Bohemond was termed a *senior* by Guibert; the only other person thus designated was Thoros, the ruler of Edessa before Count Baldwin of Boulogne.[202] The *seniores* were distinct from the rest of the Christian forces in Guibert's report that during the siege of Jerusalem not only the *seniores* but also the people implored heavenly aid.[203]

Although Guibert generally used *comes* as a title for an individual 'count', he also once commented on a social grouping, the *comites Palatinorum*, in the passage discussed under *equestres* above. He wrote that as a result of the speech of Pope Urban II, the enthusiasm of *comites Palatinorum* was aroused and also that of the middle ranks of *equestres*.[204] In the earliest Merovingian times the title *comes palatii* was a technical one for the assessor who prepared cases for presentation to the king. Thereafter it evolved to becoming a title given to senior figures at the royal court who had no particular office and in the Germanic Empire a territorial prince.[205] Guibert's use of the phrase might have been intended as a reference to those senior nobles around the court of King Philip I of France who joined the First Crusade, figures such as his brother, Hugh the Great, count of Vermandois and Walo II of Chaumont-en-Vexin, constable to the king.[206]

Another common term for the senior nobles and leaders of the First Crusade in the *Dei Gesta per Francos* was *proceres*. Guibert wrote after that the Byzantine emperor, Alexius I Comnenus, saw *proceres* of such great dignity gathering he envied the size of their forces and their wisdom.[207] In his account of the departure of the various contingents of the expedition Guibert wrote of the *proceres* of central France.[208] These leaders were the papal legate, Bishop Adhémar of Le Puy, Hugh the Great, Count Stephen of Blois, Duke Robert of Normandy and Count Raymond of Toulouse. On many other occasions Guibert used the term *proceres* for the Christian princes who led the expedition.

As with *principes*, *potentes* and *primores*, Guibert did not confine his use of the term to the most senior leaders of the First Crusade. He described how 'certain *proceres* were

---

[199] GN 118.
[200] GN 119.
[201] GN 181, 201, 244, 272 with *potentes* 244.
[202] Bohemond, GN 180; Thoros, GN 164.
[203] GN 277.
[204] GN 118. For *equestres* see above p. 165.
[205] J. Niermeyer, *Medival Latin Dictionary*, I, 268 –9.
[206] For Walo II of Chaumont-en-Vexin see above n. 164.
[207] GN 105.
[208] GN 131.

supported by [Hugh the Great] and if the pagans had been justly driven out through war, and they obtained that which they strove for, they planned to make him their king.'[209] Geoffrey of Montescaglioso, and William Marchius, brother of Tancred were termed *proceres*.[210]

Guibert only rarely placed the term *proceres* in relationship to another social grouping. In a passage noted under *equites* above, he described Raymond Pilet and two other *proceres*, as leading 100 *equites* from the army of his lord, Count Raymond of Toulouse.[211] This not only indicated that *proceres* were higher up the social pyramid than *equites* but it is also perhaps a rough indication of their relative proportions, with three *proceres* leading the 100 *equites*. The other passage of interest with regard to *proceres* referred to a procession in 1101, where the king, the *proceres*, and the *populus* escorted the clergy.[212] Here Guibert indicated a tripartite social hierarchy of king, noble and the common laity, outside of which stood the clergy.

One of the major themes of the *Gesta Dei per Francos* was that the conventional relationships of lordship did not operate during the First Crusade. As discussed above, Guibert wrote that 'no *servus* had to look up to the *dominus*, nor the *dominus* claim anything from the *famulus* except brotherhood'[213] and that the army was remarkable in being *sine domino, sine principe*.[214] In the same spirit was Guibert's report that not a single reluctant man was compelled to join the expedition by any *dominus*.[215] Guibert often used the term *dominus* to convey a relationship that did not shed any light on the social status of the lord; such as his scathing report of the mistress (*domina*) who followed her goose to find the path to Jerusalem.[216] A very similar, slightly mocking, use of the term occured where Guibert wrote about the death of Mohammed through the bites of the pig to which he was *dominus*.[217] Many other examples in the *Gesta Dei per Francos* of the use of *domini* were those concerning people who had the function of lordship with respect to slaves, towers, castles and towns, without the term defining a social grouping.[218]

An interesting use of the term *dominus* arose after Guibert had described how the *maiores* had shared the work of building the castle called Malregard (7 November 1097), during the siege of Antioch.[219] He then quoted Sallust: 'If you lead without harshness, but

---

[209] GN 131: *Huic quidam procerum innitebantur et, si quid bellorum iure, evictis gentilibus, eos obtinere contingeret, ipsum sibi regem preficere meditabantur.*
[210] GN 158. For Geoffrey of Montescaglioso see n. 143. For William Marchius see J. Riley-Smith, *The First Crusaders*, p. 225.
[211] GN 272 – 3. For Raymond Pilet see n. 121.
[212] GN 342.
[213] GN 312. See above p. 150.
[214] GN 266, 312. See above pp. 150, 169.
[215] GN 266.
[216] GN 331.
[217] GN 100.
[218] GN 126, 126, 213, 131, 210, 256.
[219] See above p. 155.

compel the army with authority, this is to be a '*dominus*' rather than a general' (Sallust, *Jugurtha*, 85).[220] The point being that lordship should involve the lord having the respect of his followers, not simply their obedience. In a number of instances Guibert used *domini* to indicate leaders of the First Crusade. He attributed the phrase 'brothers and *domini*' to Count Raymond in the opening of his speech to a council of the princes directing the Christian army.[221] At one point Guibert referred to the entire Christian forces as awaiting Bohemond, their *dominus*.[222] In the passage noted under *proceres* above, in which Raymond Pilet was described as gathering together 100 *equites*, Guibert wrote that the Raymond Pilet took these knights from his *dominus*, Count Raymond of Toulouse.[223] Lastly, Anselm II of Ribemont was described as the *dominus* of a castle and other great wealth.[224]

From the point of view of drawing out the nuances of social differentiation that are barely present in the *Gesta Francorum*, Guibert of Nogent's work is by far the most important. His rich vocabulary and sense of social order led him to write a history full of social texture. His awareness of 'middle ranks', both in society as a whole, but also within the nobility was perhaps his most important contribution, not only to the history of the First Crusade but to sociological writing generally. Not until William of Tyre's work of around 1184 was such a sophisticated social schema seen again.

---

[220] GN 172: *Si tu te, inquit, molliter agas, exercitum autem imperio cogas, hoc est dominum non imperatorem esse.*
[221] GN 249.
[222] GN 169.
[223] GN 272 – 3. For Raymond Pilet see n. 121.
[224] GN 264. For Anselm II of Ribemont see J. Riley-Smith, *The First Crusaders*, p. 199.

I.8. William of Tyre's *Chronicon*

The text

R. B. C. Huygens provided a modern, scholarly, edition of the *Chronicon* of William of Tyre for the *Corpus Christianorum* series (1986).[1] On the basis of seven surviving manuscripts and a fragment of the work, Huygens was able to formulate an edition based on an understanding of the relative proximity of the manuscripts to a hypothesised archetype.[2] In doing so he was significantly improving on the earlier editions. An early modern edition from Bâle (1549), reprinted (1564), was based on a reading of just one manuscript.[3] A much more scientific approach was taken by Jacque Bongars in his *Gesta Dei per Francos* (1611), but he had just three manuscripts available to him. Bongars's edition was used for volume 201 of the *Patrologia Latina* (1855).[4] The edition for the first volume of the *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades* (1844) by Beugnot and Le Prévost was not a significant improvement on Bongars, as although the editors knew of the existence of other manuscripts, they dismissed them as being similar to those available to them in Paris.[5] Huygens therefore produced a much superior edition, not least because it contained a chapter (19.12) missing from the Bongars – *RHC* tradition in which William gave a great deal of autobiographical information, with a particular focus on his education.[6]

William was born in Jerusalem in or around the year 1130; between the years 1146 and 1165 he was in Europe obtaining a very thorough education from the masters of the schools of Paris and Bologna.[7] He returned to the kingdom of Jerusalem in 1165, where he became Chancellor (1174) and archbishop of Tyre (1175). The *Chronicon* was commissioned by King Amalric of Jerusalem in 1167 and took its final form after redrafting by William in 1184, shortly before his death. William's history forms a part of this study principally as a commentary on the First Crusade, particularly where he seems to be drawing on the earlier crusading sources that have been discussed in the preceding chapters. In order to ascertain the

---

[1] William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, ed. R. B. C. Huygens, CC 63 (Turnhout, 1986), hereafter WT.
[2] WT 3.
[3] WT 87 – 8.
[4] J. Bongars, *Gesta Dei per Francos* (Hanover, 1611); J. P. Migne ed. *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series latina* (Paris, 1855), 201, 209 – 892.
[5] *RHC Oc.* 1, xxi, n. 3.
[6] WT 19.12 (879 – 82), see also R.B. C. Huygens, 'Guillaume de Tyre étudiant. Un chapitre (xix.12) de son *Histoire* retrouvé', *Latomus* xxi (1962), pp. 811 – 829.
[7] WT 19.12 (879 – 80).

meaning of William's social vocabulary in some instances examples have been drawn from later periods of the *Chronicon*.

The writing of William of Tyre represents something of a leap forward in the language of social order. This is most evident in the fact that William actually used the term *classis* to mean a social category of person. Current scholarship in history, sociology and political theory would consider it anachronistic to talk about 'class' in the twelfth century. Indeed, the use of *classis* as a term for social category must have been extremely rare, as even such eminent lexicographers as Charles Dufresne Du Cange and Jan Frederik Niermeyer did not note it. When William described the character of King Baldwin III of Jerusalem he wrote that Baldwin acquired so great favour from the commoners and the greater people that 'he was more popular with both *classes* than his predecessors.'[8] Or when describing the origins of the Hospital of St John, William explained that in past, dangerous, times, there flocked to Jerusalem *nobiles* and the *secunde classis homines*.[9] This particular phrase for the 'second class of person' was an innovatory one. The phenomenon that it was applied to, a middle class of person, had been evident to writers much closer to the events of the First Crusade, in particular, Guibert of Nogent who utilised the term *mediocres* to indicate the same social grouping.[10] For example, Guibert explained that the *mediocres exercitus personae* of the Christian forces were discontented after the fall of Nicea (19 June 1097) because while Alexius I Comnenus, the Byzantine emperor, had rewarded the princes and the very poor of the Christian army, they had received nothing.[11] When he came to write about the same incident, William of Tyre wrote of the unhappiness of the *secunde manus homines*. By the time that William was writing he was much more explicit that the middle ranks of society were a distinct class. He applied the phrase *secunde classis* to them on six other occasions.[12] The existence and activity of a middle class of person as subjects of his history required William to use similar phrases throughout his work such as *medie manus hominum, secunde manus homines* and *inferioris manus homines*.[13] Interestingly, Albert of Aachen, one of William's main written sources used the term *manus* in the sense of a social class, not simply a band.[14] So too, although on fewer occasions, did Guibert of Nogent.[15]

---

[8] WT 16.2 (716): ... *ut predecessorum suorum quolibet amplius utrique classi haberetur acceptus.*
[9] WT 18.5 (816).
[10] See above pp. 158 - 9.
[11] GN 153.
[12] WT 3.13 (211); 3.24 (227); 13.13 (601); 15.17 (698); 16.19 (742); 20.19 (936).
[13] WT 3.23 (226); 6.7 (316); 14.23 (661). See below pp. 181 - 2.
[14] See above pp. 80, 86, 155.
[15] See above xxx. For the written sources of the First Crusade known to have been used by William of Tyre see WT 93 – 4. For similarities between the account of the First Crusade in William of Tyre and Guibert of Nogent, see below p. 189.

William's use of *classis* for social classes was untypical of the entire medieval period, but it was not without precedent in classical writing. It is highly likely that he derived his use of the term *classis* from Livy. Of all the Roman writers, it was Livy who used the term *classis* to the greatest extent and gave it a very specific definition. Livy wrote that Servius Tullius (king of Rome 578-534 BC) instituted the census in order to raise funds for the Roman army from people of differing social status according to their means. 'Then he assigned *classes* and centuries and this *ordo* from the census.'[16] Each of the categories created by Servius Tullius was described by Livy as a class. For example, those who were rated with the value of 100,000 bronze coins or more were all named the first *classis*.[17] The second *classis* had between a 100,000 and 75,000 bronze coins, the third *classis* 50,000 and so on.[18] It seems that William inherited Livy's vocabulary for the different social orders. In their biographical study of William of Tyre, Edbury and Rowe suggest that the historian did not make a special study of Livy,[19] but quite apart from William's own testimony that he had read Livy,[20] it can be demonstrated that he obtained some of his own vocabulary and imagery from the Roman historian.[21]

William certainly held a strong sense that the totality of society consisted of several *ordines*. The clearest example of this arose in his account of the state of society before the preaching of the great pilgrimage by Pope Urban II, where all the *ordines* were thrown into confusion and the world seemed to wish to return to its ancient chaos.[22] Similarly the prowess in battle of Anselm II of Ribemont drew to him the favour of all the *ordines*.[23] On the capture of Edessa by Nur ed-Din (2 November 1146), a great multitude from all the *ordines* were described as assembling into order to try to rush out of the gate.[24] The idea that while the past had been chaotic, society now was organised into several *ordines*, was not far removed from the sentiment of a letter of Pope Innocent II to the bishops of the patriarchate of Jerusalem (17 January 1139), a copy of which was available to William and was included in the *Chronicon*.[25] In it the pope wrote that the Holy Fathers had desired there to be different *ordines* and *gradus* in the Church, so that from the submission and reverence of the inferiors to their superiors, unity could result from diversity. William, perhaps as befitted the

---

[16] Livy, *Ab Urbe Condita, Tome I and II*, ed. B. O. Foster, (Cambridge, Mass., 1976) 1.42.5: ... *tum classes centuriasque et hunc ordinem ex censu discripsit.*
[17] *Ibid.*, 1.43
[18] *Ibid.*, 1.42.
[19] P. W. Edbury and J. G. Rowe ed. *William of Tyre, Historian of the Latin East* (Cambridge, 1988), p. 37.
[20] WT 23. Preface (1061 – 2).
[21] C. Kostick, 'William of Tyre, Livy, and the Vocabulary of Class,' *Journal of History of Ideas*, 65, 3 (2004), pp. 353 - 368.
[22] WT 1.8 (118). For 'ancient chaos' see Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 3,2,299 and *Fasti* 6,1,103.
[23] WT 6.18 (332). For Anselm II of Ribemont see J. Riley-Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 199.
[24] WT 16.16 (737).
[25] WT 14.13 (648). See also P. Jaffé ed., *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum* (Leipzig, 1885) I, 883.

chancellor of a kingdom, had a similar understanding for secular society, that from its ancient chaotic past it now consisted of several *ordines* or *classes*.

Terms denoting social orders in the Chronicon

Minores, pauperes, populares, tenuiores homines, vulgus

When William wished to indicate a fundamental bipartite division in society he referred to the *maiores* and the *minores*. Whether *maiores* or *minores*, all avidly received the words of Urban II as a command from God.[26] At Antioch in the famine month of June 1098, *maiores* and *minores*, having been equally caught up in the same disaster, could extend no acts of comfort to each other.[27] All at that time, from the *maior* to the *minor*, agreed action was needed to end the crisis.[28] Everyone, from the *maior* to the *minor*, was now filled with desire for the battle with Kerbogha (28 June 1098). Within the following of Count Raymond of Toulouse, at Ma'arat-an-Numan during Christmas 1098 a longing to continue the journey towards Jerusalem filled both the *maiores* and the *minores*.[29] At the ordeal of Peter Bartholomew (8 April 1099) everyone assembled from the *maior* to the *minor*.[30] Again, everyone from the *maior* to the *minor* made preparations for an assault on Jerusalem (13 June 1099) and all, from the *maior* to the *minor* gained from the wealth of the city when it fell (15 July 1099).[31] The *minores* appeared only once in the *Chronicon* other than in association with the *maiores*. As the result of a raid by Duke Godfrey near Constantinople (March 1097) great loot was obtained, so that even the *minores* were satiated.[32]

The more common term used by William in his accounts of the lowest social class was *pauperes*. He described Peter the Hermit as preaching to the *pauperes* and *abjectissimi personae*.[33] In the terrible times before the pilgrimage, the great princes exposed the property of the *pauperes* to the plunder of their godless hangers on.[34] After defeat at Nish (4 July 1096), Peter the Hermit lost the treasure that was needed for the support of the *pauperes et egeni*.[35] A raid led by Count Raymond on or about 25 September 1098 was undertaken with a great number of *pauperes*.[36] At the siege of Jerusalem (7 June – 15 July 1099) whether *dives*

---

[26] WT 1.16 (136).
[27] WT 6.13 (324).
[28] WT 6. 15 (326).
[29] WT 7.12 (358).
[30] WT 7.18 (366).
[31] WT 8.6 (392), 8.24 (417).
[32] WT 2.6 (168).
[33] WT 1.13 (129).
[34] WT 1.8 (118).
[35] WT 1.21 (147).
[36] WT 7.8 (352).

or *pauper*, all worked alike, the inequality of their *conditio* not being thought of.[37] After the fall of the city, the *pauperes* were offered a daily payment to take the bodies of the dead outside the walls.[38] This last piece of information was in no other written source than Baldric of Dol, suggesting that William had read the *Historia Hierosolymitana* or else that it was part of the oral tradition of the city.[39] Two instances of the adjective *paupertas* suggest that William was influenced by the vocabulary of another of his written sources, Raymond of Aguilers. As has been discussed, Raymond of Aguilers considered that the whole of the Christian forces of the First Crusade could be cast in the role of *pauperes* who brought down mighty pagan princes through the power of God.[40] This seems to be echoed in two descriptions of Count Raymond of Toulouse by William. The count and his followers were described as voluntarily embracing *paupertas* at the outset of the journey.[41] After the fall of Jerusalem Count Raymond did not return home as some of his followers urged, but voluntarily pursued *paupertas*.[42] Of all the senior princes of the First Crusade, Count Raymond was the wealthiest but also the most affected by religious ideas. William's sense therefore has theological overtones as well as literally meaning that Raymond became poorer. Both aspects were present in William's comment that when Count Raymond chose to follow Christ in this manner, he gave up his relations, friends and extensive ancestral estates.[43]

Another, less common, term in the *Chronicon* for the lowest social class was *populares*. In describing the deserters from Antioch during June 1098, William wrote that not only the *populares* and the *plebeii* fled, but so too did *viri nobiles*.[44] The *populares* soon after, however, were the body of the Christian forces trapped in Antioch that criticised the sloth of the princes and protested that battle with Kerbogha was being delayed.[45] The *populares* of Peter the Hermit's army were not able to bear the pressure of the Bulgarian forces from Nish (4 July 1096) and were defeated by them.[46]

When describing a Christian settlement of the kingdom of Jerusalem near Daron, William wrote that 'certain cultivators of the fields from the neighbouring places had gathered together and certain of them ... had built there a suburb and a church near the fortress [of Daron], having become inhabitants of the place, where the men of less substance could

---

[37] W T 8.6 393).
[38] WT 8.24 (417).
[39] See above p. 117. H. E. Mayer includes Baldric of Dol among those written sources known to have been used by William, see WT 93 – 4.
[40] See above pp. 36 - 8.
[41] WT 2.17 (183).
[42] WT 9.2 (423).
[43] WT 2. 17 (183).
[44] WT 6.5 (312).
[45] WT 6.15 (326).
[46] WT 1.21 (147).

prosper more easily than in the city.'[47] The social terms used were *agrorum cultores* for those who initially gathered together and *tenuiores homines* for the class of people who prospered more easily. Both were unusual terms. The former occurred more times in William's work than in all the writers of the *Patrologia Latina* put together; the latter was unique to his *Chronicon*. Why did William not use the more conventional terms of *rusticus* say, or *agricola*? Almost certainly because the situation he was describing was itself unconventional. The colonists were described as gathering and erecting a church and dwellings on their own initiative. So whilst they were clearly of the lower, labouring, social orders, they seem to have been free from lordship and indeed prospering as a result.

In a manner similar to that of Guibert of Nogent, the archbishop tended to use the term *vulgus* when he was describing the lowest social class in a pejorative sense. Those followers of Peter the Hermit who were attacked outside Nish were the *vulgus indocile*.[48] Guibert used the same phrase for Peter the Hermit's followers.[49] In describing a raid by Baldwin II into the territory of Damascus in the spring of 1147, William wrote that the *plebs indiscreta* demanded they all advance, creating a tumult in which the *sententia* of the *vulgus* prevailed.[50] This was a very similar formulation to that used by Guibert in his comment that after the death of the papal legate, Bishop Adhémar of Le Puy (1 August 1098), the *libido* of the *vulgus* prevailed.[51] The *vulgus* was incited to support the election of Arnulf of Chocques as Patriarch shortly after the fall of Jerusalem,[52] an action that William thought rash and ill advised.[53] The Byzantine emperor, John II Comnenus, arrived at Antioch (September 1137), placing the Latin nobility of the city in a difficult position. Caught between a desire for independence and their need for an alliance with the emperor, the nobles skilfully manipulated the *plebs* into anger against Greek rule before turning to the emperor and warning him of an impending riot should he continue his plans for the direct rule of the city. By this means they drove the emperor from the city without having to openly become his enemies. An envoy from the Latin nobility pointed out to John II Comnenus that crowds always require restraint; he then observed that if it were otherwise the *conditio* of the *vulgus* would be much better than that of the *nobiles*.[54] In all these instances the *vulgus* was

---

[47] WT 20.19 (937): *Convenerant autem aliqui ex locis finitimis agrorum cultores et ... edificaverant ibi suburbium et ecclesiam non longe a presidio, facti loci illius habitatores: erat enim locus commodus et ubi tenuiores homines facilius proficerent quam in urbibus.*
[48] WT 1.21 (147).
[49] GN 121.
[50] WT 16.9 (726).
[51] GN 262.
[52] WT 9.4 (425). For Arnulf of Chocques see R. Foreville, 'Un chef de la première croisade: Arnulf Malecouronne,' *Bulletin Philologique et Historique du Comité des Travaux Historiques et Scientifiques* (1953 –4), pp. 377 – 90. See also B. Hamilton, *The Latin Church in the Crusader States* (London, 1980), pp. 12 – 13.
[53] WT 9.15 (440).
[54] WT 15.5 (680 – 1).

portrayed as a turbulent social force, which if unrestrained by proper leadership would make foolish and inappropriate decisions. In a few instances William also used the term in a more neutral sense, for non-combatant commoners.[55]

Plebs, populus

Plebs was an extremely frequent term in the social vocabulary of medieval writers, including William. He made it clear that, for him, the term included a variety of types of person when he wrote that an army led by Eustace I Grenier, lord of Sidon and Caesarea, against the Egyptians, c.1123, contained *plebs omnimoda*.[56] The kinds of distinction to which William referred can be seen in context. *Plebs* was used for (Muslim) farmers, at the fall of Sidon (19 December 1111), as the terms of the surrender of the city permitted the *plebs* to devote themselves to agriculture under good conditions.[57] But it also covered a crowd of fierce pilgrims, such as the *plebs indomita* on the First Crusade who unbidden by the lords, crept into the undefended city of Ma'arat-an-Numan (11 December 1098).[58] There was so much booty available after the fall of Jerusalem (15 July 1099) that the *plebs inferior* had all they needed in abundance.[59] The *plebs* could also be an urban class of commoner, with potentially dangerous political aspirations. In his account of the events at Antioch in September 1135 discussed above, William interchanged *plebs* with *vulgus* for the crowds who were threatening to riot at the presence of the Byzantine emperor.[60]

An even broader term whose nuances can easily be overlooked is *populus*, the people. Very often it was the term used by William to cover the entire people. So for example for the trial by fire of the peasant visionary Peter Bartholomew (8 April 1099) the entire *populus* assembled, from the *maior* to the *minor*.[61] Similarly in May 1104 King Baldwin I summoned all his *populus*, from the *maior* to the *minor*, to besiege Acre.[62] But this wide usage can obscure a more technical, legal, use of the term which seems to denote those citizens who in addition to the nobility are entitled to a say in public affairs. They are a category of persons listed in the great assembly at Nablus, late in 1166, to raise an emergency tax: present were bishops, prelates, *principes* and the *populus*.[63] Those witnessing the raising of the status of the church of Bethlehem to that of a cathedral were the rejoicing clergy, the *principes* and the *populus*.[64] When the term *populus* was used to include the lower social orders, William often

---

[55] WT 4.1 (234); 5.4 (275); 7.21 (371); 8.5 (390).
[56] WT 12.21 (572). For Eustace I Grenier see J. Riley-Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 228.
[57] WT 11.14 (519).
[58] WT 7.9 (355); cf. the *plebs indiscreta*, WT 16.9 (726) above p. 179 n. 50.
[59] WT 8.24 (417).
[60] WT 15.5 (680 – 1).
[61] WT 7.18 (366).
[62] WT 10.27 (513).
[63] WT 19.13 (882).
[64] WT 11.12 (514).

qualified it with an adjective. For example the crowds whose threats dispersed the clergy during the disputed election of Ralph, archbishop of Mamistra (from Castle Domfront on the confines of the dioceses of Normandy and Maine), as Patriarch of Antioch (1135) were described as *furens et vociferans populus*, 'furious and noisy.'[65] The same incident showed that the term *populus* could have a specifically secular meaning since Ralph was elected by the *populus* alone without the knowledge of the brethren and the bishops.[66]

Inferiores manus homines, secundae classis homines, secundae manus homines, mediae manus homines

When William reported that Peter the Hermit did not preach only to princes but also to the *inferioris manus homines*, it seems that he was using the phrase for the lowest social order.[67] William also used the truncated form *inferior manus* that makes it clear that he considered the term *manus* as equivalent to *ordo* or his own *classis*. The connection between the *inferior manus* and *pauperes* was explicit in William's account of the poor of Edessa who fled the city following its capture by Nur ed-Din (2 November 1146). William used the two terms interchangeably.[68] Elsewhere, however, William used the phrase *inferioris manus homines* for a lower class of combatants, probably footsoldiers. During an expedition against Damascus led by King Baldwin II (1130) the *inferioris manus homines* separated from the main army in search of provisions and were ambushed.[69] In reporting a raid led by Baldwin IV near Banyas (1179) William wrote that many of the *inferior manus* were killed. When Baldwin of Boulogne occupied Tarsus and refused to allow Norman soldiers, followers of Tancred, into the city (c.20 September 1097), the *inferioris manus homines* of Baldwin's army protested against the decision.[70] Shortly afterward, for stylistic purposes (so William could avoid repetition), the term *inferioris manus homines* was exchanged for *secunde classis homines*.[71]

The phrase *secunde classis homines* was another that William utilised both for the commoners and for footsoldiers, depending on whether the context was civilian or military. In referring to early pilgrimages, William wrote that in the past there flocked to Jerusalem both *nobiles* and the *secunde classis homines*.[72] Ralph of Domfront, who contested the patriarchate of Tyre in or around the year 1135 was described as being popular both with military men and

---

[65] WT 14.10 (642).
[66] WT 14.10 (642).
[67] WT 1.13 (129).
[68] WT 11.7 (506).
[69] WT 13.26 (621).
[70] WT 3.23 (226).
[71] WT 3.24 (227).
[72] WT 18.5 (816).

with the *secunde classis homines*.[73] After the fall of Nicea (19 June 1097) the people and the *secunde manus homines* were discontented that they could not recoup the losses of their property with the many types of wealth found within the city.[74] When Tyre surrendered to King Baldwin II (7 July 1124) the *secunde classis homines* in the army were angry that they were not allowed to plunder the city.[75] The army of king Louis VII France setting out on the Second Crusade (1146) consisted of 70,000 men in breastplates, not counting those of the *secunde classis*.[76]

A phrase with a very similar meaning was *medie manus homines*. William indicated a three-fold division of the Christian forces of the First Crusade when he wrote that famine in Antioch (June 1098) enveloped not only the *plebeii* and the *medie manus homines* but also the *principes*. At the battle of the Mount of Pilgrims where Baswaj of Damascus defeated Count Pons of Tripoli (March 1137), the great majority of the slain were from the *medie manus homines* rather than the *nobiles* of the city.[77]

Domestici, familiares

In his account of the First Crusade, William used the terms *domestici* and *familiares* for the military households of the princes. Hartmann I, count of Dillingen and Kyburg and Henry of Esch were described as being assisted by their *domestici* and *familiares* as they pressed the siege of Nicea (April – 19 June 1097).[78] The *domestici* of Count Raymond of Toulouse, were no longer worried about loss of horses once a fund of 500 marks of silver was put in place to cover replacements.[79] When Stephen of Blois abandoned the crusade (2 June 1098), he did so along with his *domestici* and *familiares*.[80] The negotiations between Bohemond and Firuz, the warden of a section of the walls of Antioch, were secret, even to their *domestici*.[81] The *domestici* of all the senior princes were made ready once the capture of Antioch was under way (3 June 1098).[82] *Domestici* and *familiares* of Bohemond guarded the interior of Antioch against the Turkish forces remaining in the citadel.[83] Even the *domestici* and *familiares* of Count Raymond wanted to abandon the siege of Arqa (13 May 1099).[84] The

---

[73] WT 15.17 (698).
[74] WT 3.13 (211).
[75] WT 13.13 (601).
[76] WT 16.19 (742).
[77] WT 14.23 (661).
[78] WT 3.7 (203). For Hartmann I, count of Dillingen and Kyburg see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem, A Dynastic History 1099-1125* (Oxford, 2000), p. 208 – 9. For Henry of Esch see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom*, p. 209.
[79] WT 5.7 (281).
[80] WT 5.10 (284).
[81] WT 5.11 (287).
[82] WT 5.21 (298).
[83] WT 6.5 (312).
[84] WT 7.17 (366).

domestici of Duke Godfrey were interviewed to test his worthiness as a candidate for the rule of Jerusalem.[85] Only one later use of the term *domestici* showed William using the term in a manner inconsistent with this sense of a body of close military followers. In 1113 a raid by Mawdud of Mosul around Jordan was given assistance and information from the Saracen dwellers of the suburbs (*casalia*) and also *domestici*.[86] Here it seems that William intended domestic servants, possibly slaves, certainly a servile population who were willing to assist the enemy of their masters.

Gregarii, milites, equestres, equites, nobiles

By the time that William was writing, a clear distinction seems to have emerged between paid, mercenary, knights and nobles. That seems to be the conclusion from William's use of the term *gregarii*. The classical use of the term was for the rank and file soldier, and William did sometimes use the term in that sense. In his report of the hardship experienced by the Christian forces during the siege of Antioch (early in 1098), William observed that not only the *gregarii* but even *nobiles* like Hartmann I, count of Dillingen and Kyburg and Henry of Esch were compelled to beg for food.[87] But much more frequently William applied *gregarii* in a more technical sense, for knights serving in an army for pay. He wrote that Baldwin of Boulogne was offended by the offer of payment from Thoros of Edessa, insisting instead on a measure of lordship (February 1098). Baldwin complained that he would not take pay like a mere *gregarius*.[88] A key example, although a late one, for William's meaning of the term is that of Reynald of Châtillon, who was described as *miles quasi gregarius*[89] on his being the surprising selection of Lady Constance of Antioch for her husband. Reynald de Châtillon was a prominent noble in the kingdom of Jerusalem and an important military leader at the capture of Ascalon (23 November 1152).[90] William seems consistently to have downplayed Reynald's importance within the kingdom[91] and here drew attention to the fact that he was not of the highest status, since he was a merely a paid knight. William twice made it clear that Reynald was a *stipendiarius miles*: to explain the popular amazement at his fortune in marrying the heiress and to provide a qualification to Reynald's name appearing among a group of prominent knights given credit for the fall of Ascalon.[92] Seeing the *gregarii milites* as *stipendiarii milites*, that is, knights who might be quite senior,

---

[85] WT 9.2 (423).
[86] WT 11.19 (524).
[87] WT 6.22 (338). For Hartmann I, count of Dillingen and Kyburg and Henry of Esch see n. 78.
[88] WT 4.3 (236).
[89] WT 17.26 (796).
[90] For Reynald of Châtillon see B. Hamilton, 'The Elephant of Christ: Reynald of Châtillon', *Studies in Church History* 15 (Oxford, 1978), pp. 97 – 108.
[91] B. Hamilton, *The Leper King and His Heirs* (Cambridge, 2000), p.5.
[92] WT 17.21 (790); 17.26 (796).

but who were paid for their services, makes sense of an incident of 1160, when Najim al-Din of Damascus prevented a raid by Baldwin III with the offer of 4,000 pieces of gold and the release of six *gregarii milites*. The point of the incident was to show the wisdom of Najim al-Din and the lengths he was willing to go to in order to achieve peace at a time of weakness for Damascus. If William was using the term in its classical sense, it did not really suit the purpose, as the release of six footsoldiers would not have been particularly noteworthy. It was far more likely that the *gregarii* here were paid knights, perhaps even of the status of Reynald of Châtillon before his marriage.[93] Again it does not quite make sense directly to substitute 'rank and file soldier' in the case of a certain Rohard of Jaffa, about whom William reported that whilst he was a man with the splendid title of guardian of the citadel at Jerusalem, in fact he was a *gregarius homo*.[94] Rohard was not a prince, but he was far from being an ordinary soldier. He was a senior enough figure that he appeared as an important witness on several royal charters.[95] Again it seems plausible that, with hostile intention, William was drawing attention to the fact that Rohard's services were stipendiary rather than based on lordship.

The technical sense of William's use of *gregarii* draws attention to the existence by the mid-twelfth century of a layer of lesser, paid, knights. It is worth noting in this connection that the lack of royal demesne in the kingdom of Jerusalem meant that as a matter of policy the monarchy preferred to hire forces for pay rather than levy troops on the basis of the ownership of fiefs. Baldwin of Bourcq, as count of Edessa (1100 – 1118) had many *equites*, but lacked the money to pay them stipends for their military service and duties they had faithfully performed.[96] As King Baldwin II, he was attracted to the idea of marriage to Adelaide of Sicily for her dowry, as his own means scarcely sufficed for his needs and the payment of his *equites*.[97]

William very rarely used the term *milites*, preferring to indicate a body of knights in an army with the term *equites*. Among the few instances in which William did use the term *milites* are examples that indicate that for the historian the term *miles* carried with it the connotation of being a social status as well as military function. King Amalric I was described as having been made a *miles* and assuming arms.[98] Reinhard of Hemmersbach was a *miles* with *sanguis clarissimus*.[99] King Baldwin I had entered the church as a youth, but *deposito clerici habitu, miles effectus est*.[100] Robert the Burgundian (of Craon), master of the Knights

---

[93] WT 18.27 (850).
[94] WT 21.4 (964). For Rohard of Jaffa see B. Hamilton, *The Leper King*, p. 86.
[95] B. Hamilton, *The Leper King*, p. 86.
[96] WT 11.11 (510). For Baldwin of Bourcq see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom*, p. 185 – 6.
[97] WT 11.21 (526).
[98] WT 19.1 (864).
[99] WT 7.1 (344). For Reinhard of Hemmersbach see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom*, p. 224.
[100] WT 10.1 (453).

of the Temple, was a *miles eximius*, *nobilis carne et moribus*, 'noble in the flesh and in character.'[101] William was not a credulous reporter of miracles, but two that he found acceptable concerned *milites*. Echoing a report of Raymond of Aguilers, William wrote that a *miles* on the Mount of Olives, waving a splendid gleaming shield, gave the signal for the decisive attack on Jerusalem (15 July 1099).[102] The identity of this *miles* was never discovered. Secondly, during a perilous retreat by Baldwin III from Cavea Roab to Gadara (1147) a mysterious *miles*, mounted on a white horse, with a breastplate, elbow-length gauntlets and a red standard, like an angel of the Lord, revealed the shortest routes to waters hitherto unknown to the Christian forces.[103] With the exception of one straightforward use of *milites* for a garrison,[104] it seems that William reserved the term for knights of exceptional character.

In a manner similar to the letters and histories of Roman authors, but also to the history of Guibert of Nogent, William of Tyre several times referred to an *ordo equestris*. Those riding away from Antioch as a ruse before the storming of the city (3 June 1098) were of the *ordo equestris*.[105] Five hundred of the *ordo equestris* died of the plague at Antioch (August – December 1098).[106] The Templars were founded by pious and God fearing members of the *ordo equestris*.[107] Soon after the death of Nūr-ad-Daulah Belek, emir of Aleppo (5 May 1124) in battle with Joscelin of Courtenay, count of Edessa, a messenger came to the army of Pons, count of Tripoli,[108] with the head of Belek to proclaim the news. Fulcher of Chartres reported that this messenger was the *armiger* of Joscelin and since he had brought such welcome news 'having received arms, he was advanced from *armiger* to *miles*. Indeed it was the Count of Tripoli who raised him to this *gradus*.'[109] William of Tyre's version of this event was that the messenger was promoted to the *ordo equestris*.[110] Ralph of Domfront, controversially elected patriarch of Antioch (1135) was a great favourite both with the people and the *ordo equestris*.[111] Stephen, abbot of St John of the Valley in the city of Chartres, a kinsman of King Baldwin II, became patriarch of Jerusalem (1128). He had

---

[101] WT 15.6 (682). For Robert of Craon see M. L. Bulst-Thiele, *Sacrae Domus Militiae Templi Hierosolymitani Magistri: Untersuchungen zur Geschichtes des Templeordens 1118/9 – 1314* (Göttingen, 1974), pp. 30 – 40.
[102] WT 8.16 (407). See also RA 343.
[103] WT 16.12 (733).
[104] WT 4.4 (237).
[105] WT 5.20 (297).
[106] WT 7.8 (353).
[107] WT 12.7 (553).
[108] Pons of Tripoli (c. 1098–1137), son of Bertrand of Tripoli and count of Tripoli from 1112 to 1137.
[109] FC III, XXXI, 7 (726): *Acceptis armis ab armigero in militem provectus est. Comes nempe Tripolitanus ad hunc gradum eum sublimavit.* See above pp. 62 - 3.
[110] WT 13.11 (599).
[111] WT 15.14 (695).

become a monk after having been a noble of the *ordo equestris*.[112] In his campaign of 1137, Zengi, atabeg of Mosul captured some of the *ordo equestris*.[113]

By far the most common term for knights in the *Chronicon* was *equites*. For William it was the fact that they were *loricati* or *armati* that distinguished the *equites* from the *pedites*.[114] He was, however, aware of the importance of horses to the *equites* of the First Crusade, repeating an incident reported in Raymond of Aguilers's history, in which outside the walls of Antioch, on the evening of 29 December 1097, certain *milites* left the battle to chase a horse, even though this resulted in a defeat for the Christian forces.[115] William's language followed closely that of Raymond, but substituted the term *equites* for *milites*.[116] William also reported that on a raid during the siege of Antioch by the Christians, in the spring of 1098, horses were obtained and no spoils were more valuable at the time.[117]

There is a passage in the history of Fulcher of Chartres, discussed in Chapter 3 above, in which a significant division was indicated among the mounted Christian forces. When the army of Jerusalem marched out to meet an invasion by al-Afdal, vizier of Cairo (27 August 1105), Fulcher, an eyewitness, wrote that 'there were 500 of our *milites*, excepting those, who although riding, were not counted with the name of a soldier.'[118] The most probable interpretation of this differentiation is that offered by Hagenmeyer who suggested that Fulcher was drawing a distinction between those of noble birth, who were counted as *milites* and the others, who were perhaps squires.[119] William of Tyre similarly made reference to distinctions within the category of *equites*. After defeat at the Second Battle of Ramleh (17 May 1102), King Baldwin I fled to Arsuf where he was met by ninety *equites promiscui meriti*.[120] William gave a description of Robert the Burgundian in which the master of the Knights of the Temple was described as being accompanied by a few *equites promiscui generis*.[121] The kind of 'mixed value' that William might have had in mind was indicated by his account of the battle of Ascalon (12 August 1099) where *equites* with *levis armatura* were sent ahead to scout the size of the enemy forces.[122] In the ranks of the army of king Conrad III of Germany at the outset of the Second Crusade (1147) were 70,000 with armour, not counting the non-combatants and *equites levis armaturae*.[123] The Turcopoles who fought with

---

[112] WT 13.25 (619).
[113] WT 14.25 (665).
[114] WT 1.25 (151); 2.3 (165); 2.23 (193 – 4); 3.16 (215); 3.25 (228); 16.19 (742); 16.22 (746).
[115] RA 39.
[116] WT 4.18 (260).
[117] WT 5.8 (282).
[118] FC II, XXXII, 3 (496): *Milites nostri erant D, exceptis illis, qui militari nomine non censebantur, tamen equitantes.*
[119] FC 496 n. 9. See above p. 67.
[120] WT 10.21 (480).
[121] WT 15.6 (683). For Robert the Burgundian (of Craon) see above n. 101.
[122] WT 9. 12 (434).
[123] WT 16.19 (742).

King Amalric I against Shirkuh, uncle of Saladin, at the battle of Lamonia (18 March 1167) were another example of *equites levium armaturae*.[124] Again, but this time expressed negatively, William indicated that to be numbered among the *equites* proper meant having better than light armour.

William had a very clear understanding of the social order of *nobiles*. In a comment about the Crusade of 1101 he gave something of a definition of his use of the term, when he said that the expedition was undertaken by *nobiles* who were illustrious because of their lands, life, lineage and prowess in arms (*regiones*, *vita*, *genus* and *arma*).[125] The theme of nobility by birth was repeated again when William explained that among those who fled the city of Antioch when the Christians were faced with the arrival of the army of Kerbogha (7 June 1098) were many *nobiles generositate insignes*.[126] That William had in mind a broad social layer was shown when he wrote that due to plague, 500 *nobiles* of the *ordo equestris* were killed at Antioch (August – November 1098).[127] The order of Templars was founded by *nobiles* of the *ordo equestris*.[128] There were *nobiles* to be found among the *familia* of the senior crusading princes.[129] Very many individual crusaders were described as *nobilis*. The *nobiles* among the People's Crusade were Thomas I of Marle and La Fère; Clarembold I of Vendeuil; William Carpenter; Count Hartman I of Dillingen and Kyburg and Emicho of Flonheim.[130] Those *nobiles* of the united expedition were the senior princes, along with Baldwin II of Mons, count of Hainaut; Hugh II of Saint-Pol, Engelrand his son; Garnier of Grez; Reinard III, count of Toul; Peter of Dampierre-le-Château; Baldwin of Bourcq; Henry of Esch and Godfrey his brother; Dodo of Cons-la-Grandville; Cono of Montague; Drogo of Nesle; Richard of the Principate, Rainald, his brother; Robert of Anzi; Herman of Canni; Robert of Sourdeval; Robert of Molise, son of Tristan; Humphrey, son of Ralph; Richard, son of Count Rainulf, the count of Rosinolo; Boello of Chartres; Albered of Cagnano; Geoffrey of Montescaglioso; William, bishop of Orange; Raimbald II, count of Orange; William III, count of Forez; Raymond Pilet; Baldwin Chauderon; Baldwin of Ghent; Gilbert of Clermont; Roger of Barneville; Raimbald Croton; Peter son of Gisla; Ivo of Grandmesnil; William of Grandmesnil, Aubery (his brother); Guy Trousseau of Montlhéry; Lambert the Poor; Stephen of Aumale, nephew of Robert of Normandy; Pons of Balazun; Achard of Montmerle; Gilbert of Traves; Ralph of Beaugency; Everard III of Puiset; Gaston IV of Béarn; William Amanieu

---

[124] WT 19.25 (898).
[125] WT 10.11 (466).
[126] WT 6.5 (312).
[127] WT 7.8 (353).
[128] WT 12.7 (553). See also above p. 185, n. 107.
[129] WT 3.25 (229), 6.17 (330).
[130] WT 1.29 (156), 1.30 (158). For these knights see J. Riley-Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 223 (Thomas I of Marle and La Fère), p. 203 (Clarembold I of Vendeuil), p. 226 (William Carpenter), p. 204 (Emicho of Flonheim).

II of Bezaume; Gaston of Béziers; William V of Montpellier; Gerard of Roussillon; Gerard I of Quierzy; Guy of Possesse and Walo II of Chaumont-en-Vexin.[131] Although encompassing a considerable section of the knightly order, (probably the entirety, although the formulations are not quite decisive), nobility certainly did not extend beyond the *equites*.

Maiores, principes, proceres

By far the most common term for the upper class in the *Chronicon* was *maiores*. William often coupled the term *maiores* with *minores* to indicate the totality of society, as noted above. The fact that William applied the term quite broadly was shown when, having listed by name the senior princes of the First Crusade, he wrote that among the other *maiores* who participated in the expedition were the *inclyti viri* and *nobiles*: Henry of Esch; Ralph of Beaugency; Everard III of Puiset; Gaston IV of Béarn; William Amanieu II of Bezaume; Gaston of Béziers; William V of Montpellier; Gerard of Roussillon; Gerard I of Quierzy; Roger of Barneville; Guy of Possesse; Walo II of Chaumont-en-Vexin and Thomas I of Marle and La Fère.[132] Many of these same knights were listed again when William explained that the *maiores principes* fought well at the battle of Dorylaeum (1 July 1097) and so too did the *mediocres principes*: Baldwin of Bourcq; Thomas I of Marle and La Fère; Rainald of Beauvais; Walo II of Chaumont-en-Vexin; Gaston IV of Béarn; and Gerard I of Quierzy.[133] William therefore saw a clear distinction within the class of *maiores* and *principes*. He seems in this regard to have adopted the same language as Guibert of Nogent, who was probably the

---

[131] WT 2.1 (161), 2.5 (168), 2.13 (177), 2.17 (182), 3.6 (203), 3.25 (229), 4.8 (242), 4.14 (254), 5.15 (291), 6.4 (310), 6.5 (312), 6.17 (330 – 31), 8.9 (398). For these knights see n. 79 (Hartman I of Dillingen), n. 94 (Baldwin of Bourcq), n. 79 (Henry of Esch); A.V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom*, p. 186 – 7 (Baldwin II of Mons, count of Hainaut), p. 213 (Hugh II of Saint-Pol), p. 192 – 3 (Engelrand of Saint-Pol), p. 205 (Godfrey of Esch), p. 189 – 191 (Cono of Montague), p. 191 (Drogo of Nesle); J. Riley-Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 206 (Garnier of Grez), p. 220 (Reinard III, count of Toul), p. 217 (Peter of Dampierre-le-Château), p. 203 (Dodo of Cons-la-Grandville), p. 220 (Richard of the Principate), p. 218 (Rainald of the Principate), p. 221 (Robert of Anzi), p. 211 (Herman of Canni), p. 221 (Robert of Sourdeval), p. 221 (Robert of Molise), p. 123 (Humphrey son of Ralph), p. 220 (Richard son of Count Ranulf), p. 207 (Geoffrey of Montescaglioso), p. 226 (William, bishop of Orange), p. 218 (Raimbald II, count of Orange), p. 221 (William III, count of Forez), p. 220 (Raymond Pilet) p. 200 (Baldwin Chauderon), p. 200 (Baldwin of Ghent), p. 208 (Gilbert of Clermont), p. 221 (Roger of Barneville), p. 128 (Raimbald Croton), p. 217 (Peter, son of Gisla), p. 214 (Ivo of Grandmesnil), p. 226 (William of Grandmesnil); p. 200 (Aubrey); p. 210 (Guy Trousseau of Montlhéry), p. 214 (Lambert the Poor), p. 223 (Stephen of Aumale), p. 218 (Pons of Balazun), p. 197 (Achard of Montmerle), p. 208 (Gilbert of Traves) p. 219 (Ralph of Beaugency), p. 205 (Everard III of Puiset), p. 206 (Gaston IV of Béarn), p. 224 (William Amanieu II of Bezaume), p. 234 (Gaston of Béziers), p. 300 (William V of Montpellier), p. 208 (Gerard of Roussillon), p.208 (Gerard I of Quierzy), p. 210 (Guy of Possesse), p. 224 (Walo II of Chaumont-en-Vexin).

[132] WT 1.17 (138 – 9). For these knights see n. 131.

[133] WT 3.16 (217). For Baldwin of Bourcq see n. 92; for Rainald of Beauvais see J. Riley-Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 218.

first medieval author to refer to the *mediocres principes*.[134] Guibert defined the *mediocres principes* as *nobiles* who were *domini* of between one and four towns.[135]

When William wished to refer to the senior princes of the First Crusade, he generally utilised the term *maiores principes*.[136] A less common term for the leaders of the expedition was *proceres*. He used this term only once for the senior princes of the First Crusade and once in a broader sense: it was the *proceres* who met to decide who should be ruler of Jerusalem after its capture (15 July 1099).[137] The *proceres* did, however, appear with greater frequency in the second half of the *Chronicon*, for the magnates of the kingdom of Jerusalem or of the principality of Antioch.[138]

William of Tyre had a rich and sophisticated language of social order. His writings represent an evolution in social thinking that went far beyond the eleventh century notion of 'three orders' based on function, to a rich hierarchical stratification of society, with a reinvention of the term *classis* as a label for social layers in general. It is interesting that in several instances William's formulations were close to those of Guibert of Nogent, who had the greatest sense of social differentiation of all the early crusading historians. Both used the term *conditio* to express the social state of a person. Both understood the footsoldiers and engineers of the First Crusade to be a 'middle class of person', or *mediocres exercitus personae*, as Guibert put it. Both distinguished the more turbulent and dangerous among the poor by the use of the term *vulgus indocile*. The classical notion that disorder occurred when the will of the mob prevailed was expressed by both historians. Another shared classical notion was the treatment of knights as an *ordo equestris*. Perhaps most striking was the fact that William and Guibert differentiated between the *principes*, to discern the *mediocres principes*, those who controlled only a few castles or towns. It seems quite possible that William consciously accepted the social schema of his fellow classicist, which was that of a pyramid-like hierarchical structure of status rather than the unsophisticated functional division of society into three orders. Both authors were unafraid to adapt classical notions to meet the need for a vocabulary that fitted the new social circumstances that they wrote about, with William adding even more layers to the various social categories depicted by Guibert.

---

[134] See above p. 169.
[135] GN 133.
[136] WT 1.8 (118), 1.17 (139), 1.23 (150), 5.16 (291), 8.6 (393).
[137] WT 7.16 (363); 9.2 (423).
[138] WT 12.7 (554); 12.24 (575); 13.21 (613); 14.5 (636); 14.7 (639); 14.26 (665); 15.4 (679).

II.1. *Pauperes* and the First Crusade

In 1921 Frederick Duncalf published his study of the People's Crusade, helping shift a perception that the participants were separated from those of the Princes' Crusade by a wide social gulf and were something of a rabble.[1] Duncalf pointed out that although the proportion of knights was indeed far less than for the later expeditions, they did include members of the nobility and displayed a high degree of organisation; especially the early contingents of the People's Crusade. The first group to set off under the leadership of a knight from Poissy, Walter Sanzavohir, reached Constantinople (20 July 1096) without significant mishap.[2] Duncalf's article, primarily a narrative of events based upon the account in Albert of Aachen's *Historia Iherosolimitana*, concluded with an argument that the economic background to the appeal of the Crusade was one of prosperity rather than poverty. This, rather unconvincing conclusion,[3] was somewhat tangential to the study and left unconsidered the question of the size and contribution of the survivors of the People's Crusade to the subsequent united army.

The key study of the role of the poor on the First Crusade, therefore, was that of Walter Porges published in 1946.[4] At the core of his study was a belief that 'by the time the siege of Antioch was well underway, the non-combatants – the sick, crippled, and destitute, the women, children, and clergy – had captured and maintained an absolute and overwhelming majority.'[5] Although the study did not explore in full the consequence of this observation for the internal dynamics and tensions of the expedition, it did allow Porges to emphasise the importance of the role of the large numbers of clergy present in acting as the guardians of the common welfare, with responsibility above all for the poor.[6] He was particularly insightful with regard to events at Antioch immediately before battle between the besieged Christian forces and Kerbogha, emir of Mosul (28 June 1098). Porges demonstrated that it was an alliance of the poor with the clergy, led by the papal legate, Bishop Adhémar of Le Puy, which, via visions and miracles, insisted the *maiores* lead the Christian forces into battle.[7] On this issue Porges has not been superseded, despite the publication of a number of subsequent studies.

---

[1] F. Duncalf, 'The Peasants' Crusade,' *American Historical Review*, 26 (1920/1), pp. 440 – 453.
[2] For Walter Sanzavohir see J. Riley-Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 224.
[3] Discussed below pp. 193 - 6.
[4] W. Porges, 'The Clergy, the Poor and the Non-Combatants on the First Crusade,' *Speculum*, 21 (1946), pp. 1 – 21.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 4.
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 9.
[7] *Ibid.*, p. 17. See below pp. 209 - 16.

Colin Morris's detailed study of the finding of the Holy Lance (1984) added an important political dimension to the context of the discovery of that particular relic, namely the rivalry between the Norman and the Provençal contingents.[8] His defence of the reliability of the account of Raymond of Aguilers was an important corrective to the view of the key historian for that event, whose credibility as a witness had been subject to challenge, particularly by J. H. Hill and L. L. Hill.[9] Morris's observation that the outlook of the visionary Peter Bartholomew was shaped by three influences, Provençal, social, and clerical, was astute and while only briefly substantiated in the short article, is nevertheless borne out by a close examination of the content of all of the visions.[10] Randall Rogers's subsequent study of the career of Peter Bartholomew in relation to the 'poor' on the First Crusade was disappointing (1992).[11] Ironically, given the title of his work, Rogers did not include the perspective of the poor in the context of the discovery of the Holy Lance, except as a passive body in need of alms.[12] Although he referenced Porges, Rogers failed to consider the earlier argument that behind the discovery of the Holy Lance was an active body of the poor, in alliance with the clergy, who through visions were articulating their own perspective and in particular their desire that the Christian forces should march out against Kerbogha before desertions by the *maiores* caused the expedition to disintegrate.[13] Rogers's most valuable observation was a passing one, that 'the thoroughness with which the poor and pilgrims conducted their sackings were in part a consequence of the structure of the expedition and the economic impulses of crusading. Looting captured cities was a primary source of the income so essential for continued crusading.'[14] Not only is this statement true but the sources also allow considerable insight into the tension that existed within the First Crusade over the distribution of booty and its eventual resolution in favour of the poor in the form of a 'law of conquest.'[15] This 'law' did not allocate any captured goods or houses by right to the leaders of the army, but insisted that all booty be considered the inviolate property of its discoverer. Rogers's discussion of the trial by ordeal of Peter Bartholomew fell short of that of Morris's brief account and was wrong in asserting that 'the poor exercised no independent political role

---

[8] Colin Morris, 'Policy and Visions: the case of the Holy Lance at Antioch,' in *War and Government in the Middle Ages: essays in honour of J.O. Prestwich*, ed. J. Gillingham and J. C. Holt (Woodbridge, 1984), pp. 33 - 45.
[9] See above pp. 32 - 3.
[10] Morris, 'Policy and Visions,' p. 41 - 2. For Peter Bartholomew and an analysis of his visions see below pp. 211 - 230.
[11] R. Rogers, 'Peter Bartholemew and the Role of "The Poor" in the First Crusade', in *Warriors and Churchmen in the High Middle Ages*, ed. T. Reuter (London, 1992), pp. 109-122.
[12] *Ibid.*, p. 115.
[13] See also below pp. 209 - 16.
[14] Rogers, 'Peter Bartholomew,' p. 117.
[15] See below pp. 234 - 5; see also J. Prawer, *The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem* (London, 1972), p. 65, and *Crusader Institutions* (Oxford, 1980), pp. 253 - 4; see also W. G. Zajac, 'Captured Property on the First Crusade,' *The First Crusade, Origins and Impact*, ed. J. Phillips (Manchester, 1997), pp. 153 - 180.

subsequent to the fall of Peter Bartholomew.'[16] As discussed below, an alliance between the poor and the *familiares* of Count Raymond of Toulouse drove their own prince on to Jerusalem, both from Arqa and from an attempt to stall at Tripoli.[17] The poor also asserted their property rights in advance of the storming of Jerusalem.[18] Rogers stated in his conclusion that he considered the poor to have been a grouping on the crusade who 'tried to influence its course,'[19] but gave no evidence that he believed they actually did so, other than as auxiliaries in military activities.

A few modern longer works give some attention to the role of the poor during the First Crusade.[20] Particular mention must be made of Norman Cohn's distinct perspective in *The Pursuit of the Millennium* where a short but vivid section attempts to place the violence of the poor in a context of wider medieval traditions of messianic fervour.[21] This argument certainly carries some weight and draws attention to the fact that the official ideology of the First Crusade, as represented by Pope Urban II, might not have been the dominant one in the minds of the majority of the participants. Cohn's work is a useful corrective to those historians who simply take the hegemony of the senior princes for granted. A close study of the sources, however, particularly the work of the historian and eyewitness with the greatest interest in the thoughts of the poor, Raymond of Aguilers, does not reveal a feverish subterranean messianism among the poor but in fact a pragmatic adoption of ideas that would have been recognised as orthodox by the senior clergy. This is not to belittle the levels of insubordination evidenced by the poor, but simply to recognise that their actions were justified by reference to current religious practices, rather than violent eschatological language. Peter Bartholomew was no Jan Brockelson.[22]

Possibly the most significant study of the poor on the First Crusade is the least readily available. In the introduction to his unpublished PhD. edition of Raymond of Aguiler's *Historia Francorum qui ceperunt Iherusalem*, John France undertook a considerable analysis of the political activities of the poor. Some of this material has found its way into his later work.[23] France added to Porges' view of the finding of the Holy Lance an assessment of the first vision of Peter Bartholomew that drew attention to those elements hostile to the

---

[16] Rogers, 'Peter Bartholomew', p. 121.
[17] See below pp. 230, 231.
[18] See below pp. 234 - 7.
[19] Rogers, 'Peter Bartholomew', p. 122.
[20] P. Alphandéry, *L'Europe et L'idée de Croisades*, 1 (Paris, 1954); N. Daniel, *The Arabs and Mediaeval Europe*, (London, 1979), pp. 120 – 135; J. Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading* (London, 1986) chapters 3 and 4; J. Flori, *Pierre L'Ermite et la Première Croisade* (Paris, 1999) chapters 17 and 18.
[21] N. Cohn, *The Pursuit of the Millennium* (London, 1957: Fifth edition 1972), pp. 61 – 70.
[22] Jan Brockelson (John of Leyden), leader of an Anabaptist sect and insurrection in Münster (1534 – 5), see N. Cohn, *In Pursuit of the Millenium*, pp. 261 – 280.
[23] J. France, 'The crisis of the First Crusade: from the defeat of Kerbogha to the departure from Arqa', *Byzantion*, 40 (1970), pp. 276 – 308; J. France, *Victory in the East* (Cambridge, 1994), chapter 10.

princes.[24] He also saw the vision following the death of Adhémar (1 August 1098) as one that 'revealed the anger, fears and desires of the people.'[25] The vision was correctly analysed as 'virtually a popular manifesto, but one with a strong Provençal bias.'[26] France also convincingly showed that there is a tension between the elements of the visions that articulate the needs of the poor and those that reserve a special position for Count Raymond of Toulouse.[27] This is the key, in fact, to understanding the fall of Peter Bartholomew, immediately after he gave voice to a vision that stood too firmly in the camp of Count Raymond.[28] In providing an introduction to one particular author France was necessarily limited from expanding these important insights into a full account of the career of Peter Bartholomew and the political role of the poor on the First Crusade.

A precondition for a thorough analysis of the role of the poor on the First Crusade has to be a close examination of the vocabulary of the major sources, in particular their complex use of a variety of terms for the lower social orders. The value of building a discussion on the results of the first part of this dissertation is that a tight focus can be achieved on the subject matter. Jonathan Riley-Smith once repeatedly utilised the term *minores* for a sustained investigation of those of the nobility on the First Crusade who were just below the level of the senior princes, although none of the crusading sources uses the term in this sense.[29] Karl Leyser in discussing the question of supplies and the First Crusade conflated the *pauperes* and the *pedites*.[30] That such distinguished medieval historians were capable of inexactness in their writing on the subject of the social structure of the First Crusade shows that although the subject of the poor on the First Crusade has been much discussed, it is possible to construct a fuller account of their role than has hitherto been achieved.

In his article on the Peasants' Crusade, Frederic Duncalf advanced the argument that the movement took place against 'favourable economic conditions rather than in famine and distress.'[31] Duncalf wished to reinforce his view that the expeditions of the People's Crusade were better organised than is generally given credit for. But while the main thrust of his argument was valid, this particular assertion needs amendment, for it gives the impression of an untroubled background to the preaching of the crusade. In fact, while the year 1096 might have been a relatively prosperous one, there is little doubt that the years immediately

---

[24] RA XXX.
[25] RA XXXI.
[26] RA XXXII. See also below pp. 219 - 20.
[27] RA XXXVIII.
[28] See below pp. 227 - 30.
[29] J. Riley-Smith *The First Crusade*, pp. 74 – 79.
[30] K. Leyser, *Communications and Power,* p. 93. See below pp. 203 -4.
[31] F. Duncalf, 'The Peasants' Crusade', p. 452.

preceding the departure of people on the First Crusade were extremely difficult ones all over northern Europe. An examination of the annalistic evidence makes clear that an acute upsurge of famine and plague took place at this time. Taking as the basis for a survey those annals published in the *MGH Scriptores*, it can be seen that for the year 1092 one (that of Bernold of St Blaisen or Constance) records a famine (for the whole of Saxony) and three plague.[32] For 1093 four annals report a plague, one a famine and one both.[33] With respect to the entries for 1094, however, twenty annals record plague, two famine and three both.[34] Furthermore Orderic Vitalis wrote of England that a drought that year gave rise to famine;[35] Bernold that a plague led to an increase in penitence and confession[36] and Frutolf that it was a year of plague, hurricanes and floods.[37] The upsurge of plague waned the following year, 1095, but it was still reported in seven annals, two of which recorded both plague and famine.[38] Six annals reported famine alone for 1095, including Sigebert's, which added that as a result theft and arson against the rich had increased.[39] Additionally the Annals of the Four Masters reported that in Ireland up to a quarter of the population died of famine in 1095.[40] Astonishingly, the only annals to record any natural disaster for 1096 were those of Prague, to where the plague had evidently spread and the Peterborough version of the Anglo-Saxon chronicle, which reported the continuation of famine in England.[41] In 1097 Ekkehard and Sigebert reported a famine and a plague respectively, but no other annal did so. In 1098 not one annal reported a natural disaster. These figures are not unproblematic, as some later annals incorporated earlier ones wholesale.[42] So, for example, information from the entries in the Annals of Rosenfeld or the Annals of Würzburg has not been used here, as at this point both were copies of the Annals of Hildesheim. The picture created by this information is nevertheless distinct enough to draw firm conclusions. Famine and plague were present but localised in 1092 and 1093, only to rage widely during the years 1094 and 1095, before abruptly ending. The preaching of

---

[32] Bernold of St. Blaisen (Constance), *Chronicon*, I. S. Robinson ed., *Die Chroniken Bertholds von Reichenau und Bernolds von Konstanz*, *MGH Scriptores rerum germanicorum nova series* 14 (Hannover, 2003), p. 494; *MGH SS* 17, 744; 30,527; 2, 246.
[33] *MGH SS*: 3, 134; 6, 394; 9, 568; 17, 277; 17, 744; 24, 36.
[34] *MGH SS*: 3, 134; 4, 21; 4, 29; 5, 8; 5, 27; 6, 366; 8, 547; 9, 103; 10, 21; 10, 35; 10, 54; 10, 54; 10, 253; 16, 16; 16, 604; 16, 726; 17, 14; 17, 294; 17, 585; 17, 744; 21, 313; 27, 521; 30, 366.
[35] OV 5, 8.
[36] Bernold of St. Blaisen, *Chronicon*, 515.
[37] Frutolf, *Chronicon*, *Frutolfs und Ekkehards Chroniken und die Anonyme Kaiserchronik*, ed. F-J Schmale and I. Schmale-Ott (Darmstadt, 1972), p. 106.
[38] Plague, *MGH SS*: 5, 8; 5, 1301; 10, 111; 13, 648; 17, 713. Plague and famine, *MGH SS*, 8, 547; EA xxx.
[39] *MGH SS*: 4, 29; 5, 27; 6, 367 (Sigebert); 14, 307; 19, 2; 23, 803.
[40] *Annals of the Four Masters*, ed. J. O'Donovan (Dublin, 1856), p. 949.
[41] Anon. various, *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicles*, ed. and trans. Michael Swanton (London, 2000), p. 233.
[42] For a discussion of this problem in general see F. Curschmann, *Hungersnöte im Mittelatler* (Leipzig, 1900), pp. 2 – 5. For the Annals of Nieder-Altaich, Regensburg, Freising, Slazburg and Passau in particular see W. Wattenbach ed., *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter* (Tübingen, 1948), I.3, 545 – 562.

the crusade, from November 1095 and through 1096, took place then against a background of recent hardship and dislocation. Indeed, according to the brief entry in the Annals of St Blaisen for 1093, it was the plague that created the movement to Jerusalem.[43]

The annalistic evidence is supported by the crusading sources. Guibert of Nogent, an eyewitness, reported that the preaching of the crusade took place at a time of famine, which had the consequence that the *inopum greges* learned to feed often on the roots of wild plants.[44] The famine reduced the wealth of all and was even threatening to the *potentes*.[45] Guibert condemned those magnates who stored food for profit during a year of famine writing that they considered the anguish of the starving *vulgus* to be of little importance.[46] The Bavarian monk, Ekkehard, later abbot of Aura (1108 – 1125), reported in his chronicle that it was easy to persuade the *Francigenae* to go to the orient because for some years previously *Gallia* had been afflicted by civil disorder (*seditio*), famine and an excessive mortality.[47] Ekkehard vividly portrayed the appearance of a plague that caused limbs to wither through an invisible fire. It has plausibly been suggested that this was an outbreak of ergot poisoning among the rye crop, which would fit not only Ekkehard's description but also the pattern of a sharp outbreak of plague that disappeared by the time of the next harvest.[48] In Robert the Monk's account of the preaching of the crusade by Pope Urban II at the council of Clermont, specific mention of the shortage of food in Christendom formed part of the appeal.[49] If the contrast between the poverty of the Western lands and lands flowing in milk and honey (Exodus 3:8) did indeed form part of the official message concerning the crusade addressed to the magnates, then it was all the more likely to have been an aspect of the unrecorded sermons of those who from their own initiative were preaching to more lowly orders.[50]

By the time for departure, however, especially for those leaving in the autumn of 1096, after the harvest, it was clear that yields for that year, on the continent, had recovered. Fulcher of Chartres, setting out in October 1096 with the contingent of Robert, duke of Normandy, wrote that there was a great abundance of grain and wine, so that there was no

---

[43] *Annales Sancti Blasii*, *MGH SS* 17, 277.
[44] GN 118.
[45] GN 118.
[46] GN 119.
[47] EA 140.
[48] EA 140: *Tactus quisquam igne invisibili quacumque corporis parte tam diu sensibili, immo incomparabili tormento etiam inremediabiliter ardebat, quosque vel spiritum cum cruciatu vel cruciatum cum ipso tacto membro amitteret. Testantur hoc hactenus nonnulli manibus vel pedibus hac pena truncati.* For Ergot poisoning, high temperatures and gangrenous limbs, see M. McMullen and C. Stoltenow, *Ergot* (Fargo, 2002). See also J. Sumption, *Pilgrimage* (paperback edition: London, 2002), p. 75; J. Riley-Smith, *The First Crusaders*, p. 16.
[49] RM 728.
[50] 'Freelance' preaching, see J. Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade,* p. 31.

lack of bread for the travellers.[51] Duncalf may have been right, therefore, to conjecture that the relatively successful march of the great crowds with Peter the Hermit, the itinerant preacher of the crusade,[52] and Walter Sanzavohir to Constantinople implied ample supplies were present. But the supplies for these early crusading contingents would either have been costly grain purchased from the great chest with innumerable gold and silver coins in which Peter the Hermit stored the contributions given to him,[53] or else would have been livestock brought by the farmers. Walter Sanzavohir left Cologne shortly after Easter (12 April 1096) and Peter soon after, on or around 20 April 1096, both too early to benefit from any improved grain or legume harvests but perhaps able to find sufficient resources from a revival of livestock numbers and milk products. Whether or not the armies of Walter and Peter departed with adequate provisions, Duncalf certainly underestimated the agricultural hardship of 1094-1095 and thus the sense of dislocation that would have formed the background to the dissemination of the news of the crusade in the winter of 1095 and the spring of 1096.

There was clearly a massive response from the lower social orders to the idea of an expedition for God under the sign of the cross. Ekkehard wrote the relevant parts of his chronicle around 1105, having returned from Jerusalem where he had been a participant of the Crusade of 1101 and had come across a *libellus* of the First Crusade.[54] He was an eyewitness to the departure of people in Bavaria on the expedition and a key source for the People's Crusade. He observed of the very first contingents that along with a great many legions of *equites* were as many troops of *pedites* and crowds of *ruricolae*, women and children.[55] Ekkehard also noted that some of the *plebs* as well as persons of higher rank admitted to having taken the vow through misfortune.[56] Furthermore, a great part of them proceeded laden with wives and children and all their household goods.[57] Guibert of Nogent, an eyewitness to the departure of people from northern France to join with Peter the Hermit's contingent observed exactly the same phenomena, that entire families of *pauperes* with carts full of their belongings joined the various contingents. He wrote that after the council of Clermont (18 – 28 November 1095): 'the spirit of the *pauperes* was inflamed with great desire for this [expedition] so that none of them made any account of their small wealth, or

---

[51] FC I, VI, 2 (154). Although famine persisted in England, *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicles*, ed. and trans. Michael Swanton (London, 2000), p. 233.
[52] For Peter the Hermit see J. Flori, *Pierre l'Ermite et la Première Croisade* (Paris, 1999). See also H. Hagenmeyer, *Peter der Eremite* (Leipzig, 1879); E. O. Blake and C. Morris. 'A hermit goes to war: Peter and the origins of the First Crusade,' *Studies in Church History* 22 (1984), pp 79 - 107; M. D. Coupe, 'Peter the Hermit – A Reassessment,' *Nottingham Medieval Studies 31* (1987), pp. 37 – 45 and below pp. 198 - 201.
[53] AA 104.
[54] EA 148.
[55] EA 140.
[56] EA 140.
[57] EA 140.

properly saw to the sale of homes, vineyards and fields.'[58] This passage is evidently a description of property-owning farmers, turning their fixed assets into ready wealth for the journey, even at much reduced prices. Guibert referred to the same body of people again, with additional detail: 'There you would have seen remarkable things, clearly most apt to be a joke; you saw certain *pauperes*, whose oxen had been fitted to a two-wheel cart and iron-clad as though they were horses, so as to carry in the cart a few possessions together with small children.'[59] Independently but with a similar turn of phrase, the northern French historian and the Bavarian chronicler found it noteworthy that peasant families participated in the crusade.

Guibert also provided clear evidence that people from the very lowest layers of the eleventh-century social spectrum responded to the idea of the crusade. He noted that the meanest most common men (*homines extremae vulgaritatis*) appropriated the idea of the expedition for themselves.[60] Further evidence of the presence of the lower social orders at the outset of the movement comes from a variety of sources. The Anglo-Saxon chronicler, writing in Peterborough, had very little to say about the Crusade, but he did think it noteworthy that countless people set out, with women and children (*wifan and cildan*).[61] The near contemporary Annals of Augsburg say that along with warriors, bishops, abbots, monks, clerics and men of diverse professions, 'serfs and women' (*coloni et mulieres*) joined the movement.[62] Anna Comnena, the daughter of the Byzantine Emperor, Alexius I, although writing in the 1140s gave a brief description of the People's Crusade to which she was a witness and whose unusual make-up must have been a striking feature. She remembered seeing 'a host of civilians, outnumbering the sand of the sea shore or the stars of heaven, carrying palms and bearing crosses on their shoulders. There were women and children too, who had left their countries.'[63] The Anglo-Norman historian and monk, Orderic Vitalis, wrote his *Ecclesiastical History* between 1125 and 1141. He was normally content to follow, verbatim, the account of the First Crusade written by Baldric of Dol, but occasionally inserted additional material, some of which was based on the testimony of returned participants. In one such digression from his source Orderic noted that the determination either to go to Jerusalem or to help others who were going there affected '*divites* and *pauperes*, men and women, monks and clerks, townspeople and peasants alike.'[64]

---

[58] GN 119: *... pauperum animositas tantis ad hoc ipsum desideriis aspiravit ut eorum nemo de censuum parvitate tractaret, de domorum, vinearum et agrorum congruenti distractione curaret.*
[59] GN 120: *Videres mirum quiddam, et plane joco aptissimum, pauperes videlicet quosdam bobus biroto applicitis, eisdemque in modum equorum ferratis, substantiolas cum parvulis in carruca convehere.*
[60] GN 300.
[61] Anon. various, *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicles*, p. 232.
[62] *Annales Augustani*, *MGH SS*, 3, 134.
[63] Anna Comnena, *The Alexiad*, trans. E. R. A. Sewter (Middlesex, 1979), hereafter AC, X.5, p. 309.
[64] OV 5, 17: *Diuitibus itaque et pauperibus, uiris et mulieribus, monachis et clericis, urbanis et rusticis ...*

The key figure in the mobilisation of the lower social orders on the First Crusade was Peter the Hermit.[65] In an important passage concerning Peter the Hermit, the monk and historian Albert of Aachen, who had direct experience of the mobilisations for the crusade, described how 'through [Peter's] assiduous warnings and summonses and by calling upon bishops, abbots, clerics, monks, then the most noble laity, the princes of various kingdoms, and the whole of the *vulgus*, whether pure or unchaste, adulterers, murderers, thieves, perjurers, robbers, everybody, in fact, of the Christian faith, even the feminine sex, joyfully undertook the journey led by penitence.'[66] Albert's evidence indicated that Peter was preaching to all social layers and he drew attention to the preacher's success in arousing criminals and women. Guibert of Nogent, who wrote as an eyewitness to the preaching of Peter the Hermit, gave a very similar picture. He described Peter as moving through cities and towns surrounded by great multitudes and being given great donations.[67] The fact that Peter the Hermit was described as travelling through towns and cities has been noted by E. O. Blake and C. Morris as showing that his was an urban audience.[68] The report of the donations of sizeable gifts suggests that Peter was obtaining some support from those with wealth in these urban centres. The evidence that Peter, nevertheless, had a particular appeal to the poor comes from Guibert's observation that the *vulgus*, slender in possessions and abundant in numbers, clung to the hermit. By contrast with the princes these *vulgus* made no careful preparations for the journey.[69] Furthermore Peter was very generous to the *pauperes* with the gifts he was given.[70] Guibert also reported that the *vulgus*, from love of novelty, tried to obtain hairs from the tail of the Hermit's donkey, as relics.[71] In a passage that could well have been that of an eyewitness, Baldric of Dol also noted a similar eagerness of the poor to believe in miracles in response to news of the expedition. Baldric wrote that the *gens plebia* displayed a cross that certain 'foolish women' (*mulierculae*) claimed had been made in heaven.[72]

Once Peter and his following were underway the sources make it clear that the army was not a conventional one. Albert reported that the contingent of Walter Sanzavohir contained only eight knights;[73] while that of Peter the Hermit was as innumerable as the sands

---

[65] For Peter the Hermit see n. 52.
[66] AA 86: *Huius ergo admonitione assidua et invocatione, episcopi, abbates, clerici, monachi, deinde laici nobilissimi diversorum regnorum principes, totumque vulgus, tam casti quam incesti, adulteri, homicide, fures, periuri, praedones, universum scilicet genus Christiane professionis, quin sexus femineus penitentia ducti ad hanc letanter concurrerunt viam.*
[67] GN 121.
[68] E. O. Blake and C. Morris, 'A hermit goes to war: Peter and the origins of the First Crusade', *Studies in Church History* 22, 1984, 79-107.
[69] GN 121.
[70] GN 121.
[71] GN 121.
[72] BD 17.
[73] AA 90.

of the sea and contained people who were foolish (*insipientes*) and rebellious (*rebelles*).[74] Several times both Albert and Guibert described the contingent of Peter the Hermit as the *vulgus*. Albert again described Peter's following as 'rebellious' and also this time 'the incorrigible *vulgus*' when they set off from Nish (4 July 1096) with their carts.[75] That Albert was using the term *vulgus* in a pejorative manner is clear not only from the adjectives *rebellis* and *incorrigibilis* but also from his later account of a vision in which St Ambrose of Milan appeared. In this vision the saint explained that not everyone had departed on the expedition in the proper spirit, some of the *primores* and very many of the *vulgus* had set about this through lightness of mind (*pro levitate animi*).[76] In a digression from his account of the People's Crusade Albert made his opinion clear, that many of these 'innumerable' people were using the glorious expedition inappropriately as pretext for constant pleasure and rejoicing.[77] Guibert, having observed that Peter the Hermit was unable to restrain the wayward behaviour of his followers in Hungary, described them as an *indisciplinatum vulgus utpote mancipia et publica servitia*.[78] Again Guibert described the same immense army as an *indocile vulgus* who ran completely wild (*debacchari*).[79] Robert the Monk wrote that because they did not have a wise *princeps* who ruled over them, they performed reprehensible deeds.[80] When reporting that the Turkish forces annihilated the People's Crusade at Civitote (21 October 1096), Robert wrote that 'there the *multitudo* overcame rashness, not rashness the *multitudo*.'[81] Guibert of Nogent applied the term *turba* to the People's Crusade on three occasions.[82] This kind of language was not used for the forces marshalled under the leadership of the senior princes. In part it expresses a sense of offended propriety by monastic authors that a section of the population should display an independence of spirit in choosing to join the crusade outside the direction of a superior. But it also reflects a genuine inchoateness in these armies, arising from the fact that non-combatants and poorly armed farmers with no military experience formed such a large part of their body. In the course of his account Albert used the device of an imagined letter from Kilij Arslan, sultan of Rũm, to Kerbogha after the destruction of the army of Peter the Hermit. This provides a summation of how Albert supposed an outsider would see the forces of the People's Crusade: a pitiful band,

---

[74] AA 93, 110- 11.
[75] AA 103 – 4.
[76] AA 348.
[77] AA 125.
[78] GN 123.
[79] GN 121.
[80] RM 732.
[81] RM 735: *Ibi multitudo audaciam, non audacia multitudinem superavit.*
[82] GN 98, 124, 127.

mostly footsoldiers and a useless *vulgus* of women, all being wearied from the long journey, with only 500 knights.[83]

Thousands more gathered together in armies intending to join with Peter the Hermit. One of these was the contingent led by the priest Godshalk, described by Albert of Aachen as having been inflamed by the preaching of Peter,[84] by Ekkehard as a false servant of God.[85] Another was led by a priest, Folkmar, a third by Count Emicho of Flonheim.[86] Parts of Emicho's army were described by Albert of as being *stultus* and having a 'frenzied *levitas*' for claiming to follow the lead of a goose and a she goat.[87] These expeditions disintegrated without contributing to the Christian forces in Asia Minor (with the exception of a group of knights from the company of Emicho, who later joined with Hugh the Great),[88] although not before terrorising the Jewish communities of the Rhineland.[89]

The reunited army of Peter the Hermit and Walter Sanzavohir at Civitote (11 August – 21 October 1096) was a vast one with a disproportionate body of people from the lower social orders. Can an estimate be made of its numbers? Among the wilder stylistic and biblical figures given by the sources, Jean Flori, in his discussion of the subject,[90] draws attention to two plausible figures. Raymond of Aguilers, who would have obtained the information only after his arrival at Constantinople the following April, wrote that 60,000 followers of Peter the Hermit were lost when the Christian forces suffered their catastrophic defeat at the battle of Civitote (21 October 1096).[91] Albert of Aachen wrote that Walter Sanzavohir led out 500 knights and 25,000 footsoldiers to that battle. The two figures are not incompatible as Albert also reported that 'innumerable' non-combatants remained in the camp.[92] An impressionistic but vivid indication of the large numbers of people who had been killed in and around the camp at Civitote was that given by the historian and chaplain, Fulcher of Chartres, who shed tears at the great number of severed heads and bones he saw in the fields nine months after the battle of Civitote.[93]

---

[83] AA 301.
[84] AA 121.
[85] EA 144. For Godschalk see J. Riley-Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 209.
[86] For Folkmar see J. Riley-Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 205, for Emicho of Flonheim see J. Riley-Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 204.
[87] AA 132, Guibert also reported on a contingent who followed a goose, GN 331.
[88] For these knights see below pp. 260 - 1.
[89] See R. Chazan, *European Jewry and the First Crusade*, (Berkeley, 1987). See also J. Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade*, pp. 50 – 7; J. Riley-Smith, 'The First Crusade and the Persecution of the Jews', *Studies in Church History*, 21 (1984), pp. 51 – 72; R. Chazan, *In the year 1096: The First Crusade and the Jews* (Philadelphia, 1996); A. Havercamp ed., *Juden und Christen zur Zeit der Krezzüge* (Sigmaringen, 1999); D. Malkiel, 'Destruction and Conversion: Intention and Reaction, Crusaders and Jews in 1096', *Jewish History* 15 (2001), pp. 257 – 80.
[90] J. Flori, *Pierre L'Ermite*, p. 455 – 7.
[91] RA 63.
[92] AA 116.
[93] FC I, IX, 5 (180).

With the destruction of the armies of Peter the Hermit and Walter Sanzavohir the unspoken assumption of many twentieth century narrative histories of the First Crusade is that the impact of the lower social orders on subsequent events was negligible. It will be demonstrated that this was not the case. A sizeable remnant of the forces of the People's Crusade joined with the Princes, not only the fragment remaining with Peter at Constantinople,[94] but also those who had been taken to Nicea as prisoners. The *Gesta Francorum* has quite a detailed account of the destruction of the united army of the People's Crusade. Although the anonymous author did not arrive in the region until April 1097, the details seem to be convincingly authentic and agree with the well-informed account of Albert of Aachen. Albert wrote that three thousand pilgrims sought to defend themselves in a ruined fortress and that the Turks sought to force them to surrender.[95] The *Gesta Francorum* reported these Christians as having been captured alive and distributed through all the neighbouring lands.[96] Raymond of Aguilers made a similar observation.[97] Guibert described how the defeated forces faced dismal servitude at the hands of cruel lords.[98] It is clear that the Turks sought for captives after defeating the military forces of the People's Crusade.[99] This explains the observation of Albert of Aachen, that on the surrender of Nicea (19 June 1096) many of the Christian prisoners were returned, including a nun from the convent of St Mary *ad Horreas* who was described as having been captured at the time of the reduction of Peter the Hermit's forces.[100] Given the nature of the market for slaves, it is likely that these released prisoners were female or young non-combatants.

If the regrouped remnants of the People's Crusade under Peter the Hermit, together with those released from captivity from Nicea, formed a part of the *pauperes* that now marched with the united expedition, there were even greater numbers of *pauperes* present who had set off with the Princes. The sources indicate that a body of *pauperes* accompanied each of the main contingents. Raymond of Aguilers wrote of how in the winter of 1096 the stragglers of the Provençal contingent became the targets of the inhabitants of Dalmatia who slaughtered old women, the *pauperes* and the sick.[101] Fulcher reported with compassion that very many of the *plebs* of the contingent of Duke Robert of Normandy and Count Stephen of Blois drowned in a sudden surge of the current as they tried to cross the Skumbi (*Genusus*) river on the *Via Egnatia* between Durazzo and Constantinople (April 1097).[102] The author of

---

[94] AA 161.
[95] AA 120.
[96] GF 5.
[97] RA 23.
[98] GN 126. For Rainald see J. Riley – Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 218.
[99] GN 126, GF 4, AA 113 – 4, AA 119.
[100] AA 185.
[101] RA 6 – 7.
[102] FC I, VIII, 6 (172).

the *Gesta Francorum* noted that the offer by the Byzantine emperor, Alexius I Comnenus, to Duke Godfrey that encouraged the leader of the Lotharingian contingent to cross the Arm of Saint George included the promise that the emperor would give alms to the *pauperes* of the Lotharingian forces.[103] As we have seen, the anonymous author of the *Gesta Francorum* had a limited vocabulary of social order and elsewhere rarely commented on the *pauperes*.[104] The Benedictine monks of Northern France who used his work as their *fons formalis*, however, added more social detail, including observations made with regard to the lower social orders. Robert the Monk, for example, wrote that when Bohemond gathered forces to him from Apulia for the journey to the Holy Sepulchre, it was not only *optimates* but people from across all social layers came to him, the *mediocres* and the *potentes*, the old and the young, *servi* and *domini*.[105] Guibert of Nogent indicated that he also considered there to have been a sizeable presence of *pauperes* in the contingent of Bohemond. According to the *Gesta Francorum*, as a result of a shortage of markets in Greece (5 April 1097), Bohemond left the route that he had agreed with the Byzantine authorities to march along and entered a valley abundantly supplied with different kinds of food.[106] In Guibert's recounting of this incident he added that the decision was taken in order to provide for the *pauperes*.[107] Baldric took the opportunity provided by the same incident to compose a speech for Bohemond that expressed one of Baldric's major themes: that the Christian forces on the expedition displayed social harmony.[108] He had Bohemond urge the *proceres* and *opulentiores* to attend to the *pedites* and use their resources as alms for the *pauperes*.[109] The speech is fanciful but it indicates that Baldric considered there to have been a sizeable body of *pauperes* attached to Bohemond's forces. This is also evident in Baldric's report that when the Norman prince Tancred wished to avoid taking an oath to Alexius, together with Richard of the Principality, count of Salerno, he hid among the commoners.[110] Albert of Aachen gave a summary of this issue with regard to all the contingents led by senior princes when he wrote that 'it is not to be doubted that together with so many captains of the first rank were not a few *sequaces* and *inferiores*: *servi*, *ancillae*; married and unmarried maids; men and women of every *ordo*.'[111]

The combined grouping of *pauperes* formed a significant body within the expedition. There were enough young children present for Guibert of Nogent later to learn that they formed themselves into an army and elected *principes* of their own, named after the adult

---

[103] GF 7.
[104] See above pp. 12 - 13.
[105] RM 742.
[106] GF 11.
[107] GN 141.
[108] See above pp. 113 -14.
[109] BD 22 – 3.
[110] BD 25.
[111] AA 167: *Nec dubitandum est cum tot capitaneis primis, non paucos affuisse sequaces et inferiores, servos, ancillas, nuptas et innuptas, cuiusque ordinis, viros ac mulieres.*

leaders of the army.[112] Albert of Aachen noted the presence of the poor during the siege of Nicea (April 1097 - 19 June 1097). At the funeral of Guy of Possesse and Walo of Lille, a large amount of alms was generously distributed to the *egeni*.[113] Here the poor were simply the conventional body to whom charity extended. Albert recorded, however, a more active role for them at the siege when he described a certain Turkish soldier as flinging rocky stones into the middle of the *vulgus* with both hands.[114] The *vulgus* here were evidently sufficiently close to the enemy that it seems that they might be playing a part in the battle. Alternatively it could be that, anticipating a breakthrough, non-combatants drew too close to the city. Towards the end of May 1097 Albert reported that 'the *magni et parvi*' met in council to make a decision about the distribution of the Christian forces.[115] Stylistically Albert very frequently embellished his work with couplets of this sort.[116] He often used this particular couplet to indicate the entirety of a body of people.[117] So, for example, while describing events at the siege of Nicea he wrote about the 'whole of the Christian army, *parvi et magni.*'[118] The information that everyone, including the *parvi*, participated in a decision-making council at Nicea is notable. Lacking one overall leader the expedition had decision-making bodies of several types.[119] Each contingent held meetings of its own people, and, separately, its own *proceres*. Collectively a council of the senior princes usually made the major decisions of the crusade, but sometimes, as in this instance, it seems to have been the case that a much broader assembly of people was called together.

After the siege of Nicea, very many of the sources note that the Byzantine emperor, Alexius I Comnenus, gave a distribution of alms to the *pauperes*. This was one of the few occasions that the *pauperes* came to the attention of the author of the *Gesta Francorum*. In summing up the siege and the sense of frustration that the sacrifices of the crusading forces had not been properly rewarded, he pointed out that many of the *pauperrimae gentes* starved to death.[120] Immediately afterwards he nevertheless noted that, exceedingly pleased with the fall of Nicea, Alexius 'ordered alms to be distributed bountifully to *nostri pauperes*.'[121] Karl Leyser wrote that those who received alms from the emperor were 'our "poor", i.e. the mass of the *pedites*.'[122] The conflation of *pauper* with *pedes* here is unhelpful. It does not seem to be the case that the alms distributed by Alexius were given to footsoldiers, since there was

---

[112] GN 309.
[113] AA 176-7. For Guy of Possesse see J. Riley – Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 210. For Walo of Lille see J. Riley – Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 224.
[114] AA 181.
[115] AA 179.
[116] See above p. 79.
[117] AA 210, 230, 417, 515, 560, 561, 753.
[118] AA 186: *Universi de exercitu, parvi et magni.*
[119] See J. Riley – Smith, *The First Crusade*, p. 86 - 8.
[120] GF 17.
[121] GF 18: *Iussit maximas elemosinas erogari nostris pauperibus.*
[122] K. Leyser, *Communications and Power*, p. 88.

considerable resentment after the siege of Nicea that those who actively took part in it were left without reward.[123] It seems inherently more likely that the alms were given to the most impoverished among the Christian forces, the non-combatant poor. Robert the Monk simply repeated the information that after fall of Nicea, Alexius instructed a payout of lavish alms to the *pauperes*.[124] Baldric of Dol, however, not only reported that Alexius made a large donation to the *pauperes* of the Christian forces,[125] but he elaborated on the *Gesta Francorum*'s implicit criticism that the crusading army had not been properly rewarded. Baldric wrote that the Christian army regretted the long siege and that if the property of their enemies had been made public, the poverty of the *egeni* could have been alleviated.[126] Raymond of Aguilers added a further small detail to this incident, when he reported that Alexius promised that when Nicea was captured he would found there a Latin monastery and hospice for *pauperes Francorum*.[127] The sources for the First Crusade at the siege of Nicea all therefore indicate an awareness of the Christian *pauperes* and also that they were suffering hardship. Only Albert of Aachen at this point described them as an active body of persons, rather than simply those in need of charity. This was a perspective that did not begin to change in the early crusading histories until they came to report the events following the fall of Antioch.

The Christian forces arrived at Antioch on 21 October 1097. It was not to fall to them until 3 June 1098. The various accounts of the siege of the city all included a recognition that when winter came, famine struck the besieging forces and it was the poor among them that suffered the most. Albert of Aachen described how death from famine was great among the *humilis populus*.[128] He also reported that the great famine caused an inestimable mortality of the *humilis plebs* and the whole army began to diminish.[129] In writing about the extreme hardship of January 1098, Fulcher described a situation where 'both *divites* and *pauperes*, were desolate either from famine or the daily slaughter.'[130] Verena Epp noted this passage as one of her examples for the view that Fulcher tended to blur social distinctions.[131] Certainly Fulcher was emphasising how the entire body of Christians was suffering. But he was also aware that the suffering was unequal, noting that in the same period of famine 'the poorer people (*pauperiores*) ate even the hides of the beasts and seeds of grain found in manure.'[132]

---

[123] GN 153. WT 3.12 (211).
[124] RM 758.
[125] BD 30.
[126] BD 30.
[127] RA 22.
[128] AA 268.
[129] AA 271.
[130] FC I, XV, 15 (223): *Desolati tam fame quam cotidiana occisione, tam divites quam pauperes.*
[131] V. Epp, *Fulcher von Chartres*, p. 242.
[132] FC I, XVI, 2 (226): *Pauperiores etiam bestiarum coria et annonae grana in stercoribus reperta comedebant.*

A similar awareness of the uneven pressures on the poor seems to be evident when he reported that because of this hardship some left the siege, first the *pauperes* and then the *locupletes*.[133] Although the lower social orders on the expedition were no longer strictly peasants or farmers, their former status was reflected in the vocabulary of Raymond of Aguilers. In the winter of 1097 sorties from the city of Antioch against their besiegers killed squires and *rustici* who were pasturing horses and oxen beyond the river.[134] Presumably the squires were attending to the needs of the horses and the *rustici* the oxen. Writing about a foraging expedition (31 December 1097), Raymond described how Bohemond was alerted to the presence of an enemy force when suddenly 'he heard certain *rustici* from his men suddenly flee and cry out.'[135] John France assumes this was a passing reference to Christian infantry, although, given the purpose of the expedition, it could be that non-combatants in search of foodstuffs accompanied the fighting forces.[136] Raymond of Aguilers also reported that as a result of the famine experienced by the expedition as it besieged Antioch in the early days of 1098, the *pauperes* began to leave and also many *divites* fearing *paupertas*.[137] In another example arising from the same period of the expedition the *pauperes* were described as fearing to cross the Orontes to find fodder, giving an insight into at least one of their activities.[138] The anonymous author of the *Gesta Francorum* wrote that because of the famine, around February 1098, the *gens minuta et pauperrima*, fled to Cyprus, Rum and into the mountains.[139] The author of the *Gesta Francorum* seems not to have ready expressions for the poor and coined the very unusual term *gens minuta* for them.[140] Guibert's version of the same information was that the *vulgus*, having been eaten up by all kinds of poverty, wandered through various provinces.[141] Both Guibert and Robert the Monk made the similar observation that it was no wonder those of poor or feeble spirits faltered at this time when even the princes wavered.[142] The anonymous mentioned the poor again, this time in attributing a speech to Bohemond shortly before the city fell (3 June 1099), in which the Norman prince drew attention to the great poverty that everyone was suffering, *maiores siue minores*.[143] Baldric of Dol in his version of the same speech had Bohemond refer to the suffering both of the *plebeii homines* and those who were *illustris sanguinis stemmata*.[144]

---

[133] FC I, XVI, 6 (228).
[134] RA 36.
[135] RA 42: *Subito fugere et clamare quosdam rusticos de suis audivit.*
[136] J. France, *Victory in the East*, p. 237
[137] RA 46.
[138] RA 50.
[139] GF 35.
[140] See above p. 11.
[141] GN 185.
[142] RM 781, GN 175.
[143] GF 44.
[144] BD 53 –4.

By and large the depiction of the suffering of the poor the winter of 1097 was a passive one. One passage that might indicate a degree of social tension over the direction of the crusade at this time occurred in Robert the Monk's version of events. He reported that as the *multitudo* was being pressed by so many hardships, there was no lack of murmuring voices.[145] In the vocabulary of a Benedictine monk the verb *murmurare* has strong overtones of rebellion, as 'murmuring' was considered a major infringement of the well known *Rule of St Benedict*.[146] A similar note of social dissension occurred in the appearance of a distinct band of poor crusaders at this time, the *tafurs*. In a famous passage Guibert of Nogent described the band as marching barefoot, without arms or money. They were naked, needy and filthy, living off the roots of herbs and any worthless growth. Their leader was a well-born man from Normandy who having become a *pedes* from an *eques* wished to give them direction and had himself declared their king.[147] The *tafurs* feature in two vernacular epics, the *Chanson d'Antioche* and the *Chanson de Jérusalem*.[148] The consensus of modern historians over the value of the *Chanson d'Antioche* as a source is that despite a great deal of fictional invention valuable eyewitness material can be found within it.[149] The *Chanson de Jérusalem* is, however, clearly not historical. Both epics were likely to have exaggerated the more striking aspects of the *tafurs* for the sake of entertainment. Nevertheless, as Norman Daniel has argued, the kinds of behaviour these epics ascribe to the *tafurs* was likely to have been a reflection of a social reality, even if particular actions and speeches attributed to them were fictitious.[150] The *tafurs* were portrayed in these epics as being near to starvation, resorting to cannibalism and being so wild that even the Christian princes did not dare to approach them.[151] As Guibert would in all likelihood have been exposed to epic material concerning the First Crusade before writing the *Gesta Dei Per Francos* around the year 1109, he cannot be considered an independent source for the actions of the *tafurs* or the existence of King Tafur. However his comment that the king of the *tafurs* was an *eques* who had become a *pedes* and his vivid description of the impoverished condition of the *tafurs* is crucial evidence that for Guibert and his readers such a change in status was readily conceivable under the difficult circumstances of the First Crusade. Albert of Aachen described other bands of

---

[145] RM 777.
[146] *Benedicta Regula*, 34, 6: *Ante omnia, ne murmurationis malum pro qualicumque causa in aliquo qualicumque verbo vel significatione appareat*
[147] GN 310.
[148] *La Chanson d'Antioche* ed. S. Duparc-Quioc, 2 (Paris, 1977); *La Chanson de Jérusalem*, ed. Nigel R. Thorpe, (Tuscaloosa, 1991). See also L. A. M. Sumberg, 'The *Tafurs* and the First Crusade', *Mediaeval Studies 21*, (1951), pp. 224 – 246; N. Cohn, *The Pursuit of the Millennium* (London, 1970), pp. 65 – 7, 72, 89, 283; N. Daniel, *The Arabs and Mediaeval Europe* (London, 1979), pp. 133 – 4.
[149] S. B. Edgington, 'The First Crusade: Reviewing the Evidence', in *The First Crusade, Origins and Impact*, ed. J. Phillips (Manchester, 1997), pp. 55 – 77, p. 62.
[150] N. Daniel, *The Arabs and Medieval Europe* (London, 1979), p. 133.
[151] L. A. M. Sumberg, 'The *Tafurs* and the First Crusade', *passim.*

starving people from the Christian army, some two or three hundred strong, searching for food with an agreement to divide everything they found or captured equally.[152]

While there is a more than a hint of insubordination in this banding together of the poor, in general it is clear that the princes of the expedition did consider it their responsibility to assist those in need in this time of famine and harassment from the garrison of Antioch. Albert of Aachen reported that Duke Godfrey agreed to lead an expedition for the sake of the *adtenuatus plebs*.[153] He also described how Count Hugh of Saint-Pol urged that his son Engelrand should free and avenge his *pauperes* and fellow Christians from the attacks and slaughter of the Turks.[154] Shortly before Christmas 1097 the hardship experienced by the Christian forces before Antioch resulted in a decision to send out a detachment in search of supplies. Baldric of Dol's account of this period follows the *Gesta Francorum* very closely. After he reported the announcement of the decision to send out foragers, however, Baldric added the extra observation that, 'naturally, with paternal affection, the *maiores* were giving protection to the *minores*.'[155] Baldric was consistently anxious in his work to emphasise that social harmony existed on the crusade.[156] Perhaps a more reliable indicator of the historical reality was Guibert's description of the building of the castle Malregard, soon after 17 November 1097. Guibert was well aware that he lived in a society in which the rich preyed upon the poor,[157] so although he was no nearer to events than Baldric, his observation that both the *egena manus* and the *maiores* worked equally hard to build the castle looks less like a didactic insertion.[158]

Antioch fell on 3 June 1097. According to the account of Fulcher of Chartres, who was in Edessa at the time, the scramble for booty in the city led to the first open social breach between rich and poor on the First Crusade. While the *plebs* seized everything they could in a disorderly manner, the *milites* continued to seek out and kill Turks.[159] The question of the distribution of captured goods was an acute one. As early as at the siege of Nicea the right of the princes to dispose of captured property was being challenged; not initially by the poorest of the *pauperes*, who had been given a gift of cash by Emperor Alexius I Comnenus, but those of the middle rank, who felt that they had done all the work but been deprived of their just reward.[160] In the poetic reworking of the *Gesta Francorum* by Gilo, a Cluniac monk from

---

[152] AA 271.
[153] AA 279.
[154] AA 265. For Hugh II, count of Saint–Pol A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem* (Oxford, 2000), p. 213. For Engelrand of Saint-Pol see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom*, p. 192 – 3.
[155] BD 42: *Affectu quippe paterno maiores minoribus patrocinabantur.*
[156] See above pp. 113 - 14.
[157] See above pp. 153, 155.
[158] GN 172.
[159] FC I, XVII, 7 (234 – 5).
[160] GN 153, WT 3.12 (211).

Toucy in Auxerre who subsequently became cardinal-bishop of Tusculum,[161] there is more than a suggestion that during the course of the siege the knights had sought to retain to themselves all the plunder they had obtained. On 5 April 1098, during the siege of Antioch, a fort was built opposite the Gate of St. George and for the sum of four hundred marks Tancred took charge of it. Of this Gilo stated: 'Here also a certain fortress was renovated and an old rampart was repaired where the *iuvenes* could keep their plunder.'[162] As we shall see, however, by the time of the fall of Jerusalem a law (*ius*) had become established that ownership of booty was retained by the first person to lay hands on it, or leave their mark on it, no matter how lowly their status.[163] The fall of Antioch was the first opportunity for the poor to obtain plunder ahead of the knights and they seem to have taken it without reprisal.

Within four days of Antioch having fallen to the Christian forces a great army, led by Kerbogha, emir of Mosul, arrived to trap the Christians in the city. A Turkish garrison still held the citadel, putting the crusaders under pressure from within the walls. This was the period of greatest crisis for the expedition, where it seemed to be on the verge of disintegration right up to the moment when the Christian army came out to battle (28 June 1098) and inflicted a decisive defeat on Kerbogha's forces. The *vulgus* were the subject of comment by Albert of Aachen in this period. He firstly reported that the Turkish forces in the citadel savaged with arrows very many incautious Christians of the *vulgus*, men and women.[164] A more complicated depiction of layers within the *vulgus* was then indicated when Albert wrote that due to continued famine conditions inside the city the inactive and *modicum vulgus* were compelled to devour the leather from their shoes.[165] If the 'middle commoners' ate their shoes, those below them fled the city. Albert described the *humilis vulgus*, at risk of their lives, secretly leaving the city by night for the port of St. Symeon.[166] Guibert of Nogent similarly wrote that the extraordinary lack of food particularly weakened the courage of everyone of poorer means (*pauperior*).[167] He continued by reporting that while the wealthy ate the meat of animals, the poor ate the skins that had been boiled for a long time.[168]

The real danger for the poor, however, was that knights were lowering themselves by ropes from the walls of Antioch in order to escape the crisis and if this were to continue the Christian forces would melt away to the point that battle against Kerbogha was impossible. As early as 20 January 1098 Peter the Hermit, the main leader of the People's Crusade, and

---

[161] GP xviii. For Gilo see GP xix-xxii and R. Hüls, *Kardinäle, Klerus and Kirchen Roms* (Biblothek des Deutschen Historischen Instuits in Rom 48: Tübingen, 1977), p. 142 - 3.
[162] GP p. 123: *Hic quoque, quo iuuenes predam cepere, nouatur*
Quoddam castellum uallumque uetus reparatur. For *iuvenes* see below Chapter II.3.
[163] See below pp. 234 - 7.
[164] AA 326.
[165] AA 341-2.
[166] AA 344.
[167] GN 225.
[168] GN 225.

William Carpenter had attempted to abandon the crusade, only to be hauled back by Tancred, nephew of Bohemond.[169] Tatikios, the envoy of the Byzantine Emperor, made his excuses and abandoned the siege shortly after the return of Tancred.[170] Just before Antioch had been captured, Stephen of Blois had departed, giving rise to a great deal of bitterness at his conduct.[171] Now, while besieged by Kerbogha, many more knights were stealing away from the Christian army. The *Gesta Francorum* recorded that William of Grandmesnil, Aubrey his brother, Guy Trousseau of Montlhéry, Lambert the Poor and many others let themselves down from the wall secretly during the night and fled on foot towards the sea.[172] In one of his rare additions to the *Gesta Francorum*, Peter Tudebode added the name Ivo of Grandmesnil, sheriff of Leicester and reported that many of the *maiores* wished to flee from the city by night.[173] Raymond of Aguilers reported that the people believed there were few *principes* who did not, in fact, wish to flee to the port. But for the fact that the Bishop Adhémar of Le Puy, the papal legate, and Bohemond had closed the gates to the city 'very few would have remained.'[174] Raymond reported that many people did leave, both clergy and laity.[175] Fulcher similarly reported that many people wished to descend by ropes at night and escape.[176] According to Albert of Aachen, there was a widespread rumour throughout the city that the most illustrious *proceres* were considering flight.[177] Robert the Monk was apologetic for reporting such desertions and explained that he did so only so that it should be learned how great a need existed in the camp that even the *divites* were compelled to flee and to break their oaths (*perjurare*).[178] Guibert, familiar with some of the returned knights, was more scathing and added the information that Guy Trousseau of Montlhéry was the ringleader of the party of deserters listed in the *Gesta Francorum*.[179] The phenomenon of knights slipping away by rope was sufficiently widespread that it came to the attention of Anna Comnena and by the time that Orderic Vitalis wrote his *Ecclesiastical History* (1125 and 1141) these escapees were being known by the mocking sobriquet 'rope-dancers.'[180]

---

[169] GF 33. See H. Hagenmeyer, *Chronologie de la Première Croisade 1094-1100*, (Hildesheim, 1973), p. 122. For whether Peter the Hermit did, in fact, abandon the expedition see J. Flori, *Pierre L'Ermite*, pp. 482 – 92.
[170] GF 34.
[171] GF 63. FC I, XVI, 7 (228).
[172] GF 56 – 7. For these knights see J. Riley-Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 226 (William of Grandmesnil); p. 200 (Aubrey); p. 210 (Guy Trousseau of Montlhéry) and p. 214 (Lambert the Poor).
[173] PT 97 - 8. For Ivo of Grandmesnil see J. Riley-Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 214.
[174] RA 256: ... *admodum pauci remansissent.*
[175] RA 256.
[176] FC I, XX, 2 (246).
[177] AA 347.
[178] RM 782.
[179] GN 217; GF 56.
[180] AC XI.6 (348), OV 6, 18.

Under these circumstances two visionaries came forward (11 June 1098),[181] both connected to the *pauperes* of the Christian forces and both with a similar message, that God would aid the Christians if they sought battle with Kerbogha. Stephen of Valence was a priest,[182] ' a man most worthy of credit and of good life.'[183] He mounted the hill in Antioch, to where there was a gathering of the princes near the citadel, and reported his vision. Stephen said that he had taken refuge in the Church of St Mary in a fearful state of mind. Christ had appeared to him and, although expressing anger at the lust of the Christians following the fall of Antioch, Christ had relented following the intervention of Our Lady and St Peter. The Lord promised that if they sung *Congregati sunt* (Psalm 47:5) in the daily Office he would return within five days with a mighty help.[184] In another of his rare additions to the text of the *Gesta Francorum*, Peter Tudebode, present in Antioch at the time, added an extra line of *oratio recta*, reporting that Christ ordered everyone to accept penance and with bare feet make procession through the churches and give alms to the *pauperes*.[185] This is useful additional information that the vision of Stephen was giving expression to the needs of the poor. The vision of Stephen was rooted in an orthodox theology and practice of the clergy. He offered to throw himself from a tower to prove the truth of his words, but Adhémar, who instead had the priest swear on the Gospels and a crucifix, rejected this.[186] As a result of this vision the princes assembled and took an oath. According to the *Gesta Francorum* the oath was that they would not flee so long as they lived. Raymond of Aguilers's version had the qualification, 'unless by the common counsel of all,' testifying to the low morale among even the most determined of the princely leaders of the crusade.[187] In either case as the news of the oath spread it greatly encouraged the broader body of Christians. Guibert of Nogent elaborated on the terse account in the *Gesta Francorum* to make it clear that it was the *minores*, the lower social order, who rejoiced on the news of the oath taking.[188]

The other visionary who came forward at this time was Peter Bartholomew, the discoverer of the much-debated relic, the Holy Lance. Peter Bartholomew was the servant of William Peyre of Cunhlat, from the Provençal region of France.[189] Raymond of Aguilers introduced Peter as, 'a certain *pauper rusticus*.'[190] He reported Peter as being hesitant to approach the princes, recognising his *paupertas*.[191] Similarly Peter claimed to have been,

---

[181] H. Hagenmeyer, *Chronologie*, pp. 162 - 4.
[182] GF 57; RA 236: *sacerdos*.
[183] RA 236: ... *vir magni testimonii, et bonae vitae*.
[184] GF 57 - 8.
[185] PT 100.
[186] GF 58.
[187] GF 59, RA c.256
[188] GN 221.
[189] For Peter Bartholomew see J. Riley-Smith, *The First Crusaders*, p. 216.
[190] RA 88 - 9: ... *pauperem quemdam rusticum*.
[191] RA 95.

standing in fear from his *paupertas*.[192] Peter emphasised his *paupertas* twice more, the second time indicating that he was among those of the expedition who were starving at the siege of Antioch, telling the princes that having reflected again on the weakness of his *paupertas* he feared that if he came forward they would proclaim him a famished man who invented the visions to obtain food.[193] In these statements are possible reminiscences from the Vulgate, where there are many references to *pauperes* and *paupertas*.[194] In Ecclesiasticus 11:12-13, the point is made that no matter how lowly, a person can be raised up by the eye of God, a view that is very similar to Raymond's with respect to Peter Bartholomew.

In general the chronicler, Raymond of Aguilers, had a very different view of the *pauperes* from the other early crusading sources. For him they were not a burden, nor dissolute or foolish, but rather they were particularly suited to the expedition, with its echoes of the journey of the children of Israel.[195] Peter Bartholomew in particular fitted Raymond's notions that poverty was no barrier to being close to God. According to Raymond, it was precisely this point that was at issue in the credibility of Peter Bartholomew as a visionary. Those who disbelieved Peter drew attention to his low social state. 'Certain people began to say that they would never believe that this man was spoken to by God, and He would desert princes and bishops to be revealing Himself to a *rusticus homo*.'[196] Peter Bartholomew had a certain level of knowledge of Scripture and church Offices.[197] He was, however, a combatant, as he was on foot in a skirmish between the arriving forces of Kerbogha and the garrison of Antioch (10 June 1098), where, trapped between two knights, he was nearly crushed in the retreat through the city gates.[198] The other sources, especially those dependent on the *Gesta Francorum*, were unable to define the social status of the visionary, as for them Peter Bartholomew was described very vaguely as 'a certain man' or 'a certain pilgrim.'[199] The descriptions provided by Raymond of Aguilers are therefore crucial, particularly as the chaplain was given responsibility for Peter after the visionary came forward and they shared a tent together.[200] From Raymond's account and his report of the views of the enemies of the visionary it is clear that Peter was a youth of very lowly social status.

It is understandable then that Peter Bartholomew should initially approach the senior princes in a very deferential and cautious manner. He returned from several wide ranging

---

[192] RA 96.
[193] RA 97.
[194] Tob 5:25; Lam 3:1; Eccus 10:33.
[195] See above pp. 36 - 8.
[196] RA 229 – 30: *coeperunt quidam dicere, quod numquam crederent quod huiscemodi homini loqueretur Deus et dimitteret principes et episcopos et ostenderet se rustico homini.*
[197] RA 113 – 14.
[198] RA 89.
[199] GF 59: *Quidam peregrinus.* FC I, XVIII, 1 (235): *Quodam homine.* BD Col.1115A: *Quidam peregrinus.* GN xix: *Cuidam de exercitu.* RM Col.0724C: *Quidam peregrinus.*
[200] RA 100.

foraging expeditions to seek a meeting with the papal legate, Bishop Adhémar of Le Puy, Count Raymond of Toulouse and Peter Raymond of Hautpoul, one of the Count's leading vassals.[201] The peasant visionary claimed that St Andrew had appeared to him during the night and that this was the fifth such visitation. After a lengthy recounting of the circumstances that obliged such a lowly person as himself to approach the princes, Peter came to the point. He declared that he had a tangible proof of divine aid, the Lord's Lance, whose hiding place was revealed to him by St Andrew.[202] St Andrew was the predominant figure in the visions of Peter Bartholomew. J. Riley-Smith suggested that being the patron of Constantinople in its resistance to Petrine ecclesiology, St Andrew would have been seen to be more exotic and appropriate to the fact that the crusaders found themselves in a foreign region.[203] This issue might well have influenced the visions of Peter Bartholomew. Although there was a church dedicated to St Andrew in Antioch at the time of the First Crusade,[204] it would have been extremely undiplomatic to come before a legate of the Gregorian papacy with the news that the lance that had pierced Christ's side had been hidden there, rather than that of St Peter. As it was, Adhémar was extremely sceptical of the news brought by Peter Bartholomew, not least because, as Stephen Runciman has shown, the legate would have been aware of Constantinople's much more convincing claims to house the same lance.[205] One of the themes of the visions of Peter Bartholomew was that God had allocated a special role in the expedition to Count Raymond of Toulouse.[206] This bid for the patronage of the elderly and devout count was entirely successful and Peter Bartholomew was taken into the care of his chaplaincy.[207]

On 13 June a meteorite fell in the direction of the camp of Kerbogha, giving material for the clergy to give further encouragement to the Christian forces.[208] The following day digging began in the Church of St Peter in order to unearth the Holy Lance. Initially Count-Raymond of Saint-Giles himself, along with his more powerful vassals, undertook the work. But by evening they were overcome by tiredness. A note of doubt and inconsistency enters the description of events by Raymond of Aguilers, himself a member of the first party of workers. St Andrew had been described by Peter as having placed the Lance in the ground while the visionary was watching, implying that it was close to the surface; but the initial twelve men must had dug a great deal deeper than they would have been led to expect and

---

[201] RA 254. For Peter Raymond of Hautpoul see J. Riley-Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 217.
[202] RA 94.
[203] J. Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade*, p. 105 - 6.
[204] AA 410.
[205] S. Runciman. 'The Holy Lance Found at Antioch', *Analecta Bollandiana* 68 (1950), pp. 197 - 205.
[206] RA 93.
[207] RA 100.
[208] RA 257, GF 62.

indeed 'by evening some had given up hope of unearthing the Lance.'[209] Fresh workers dug furiously until they too became tired. At this point Peter dropped into the deep hole and urged everyone to pray at length. Raymond's account is honest enough to convey a certain lack of conviction in his description that while everyone else present was above the pit, praying, Peter alone discovered the Lance.[210]

Those who had less of an interest in promoting the leading role of Count Raymond were quick to dispute the legitimacy of the relic. Fulcher of Chartres reported that the allegation made against Peter Bartholomew by many of the clergy and the people was that it 'was not the Lord's Lance, but it was another one deceitfully contrived by that stupid man.'[211] Guibert of Nogent, a defender of the Holy Lance, wrote that later the *vulgus* began to challenge Peter Bartholomew for staging the discovery and exhibiting an ordinary lance.[212] Ralph of Caen, the author of the *Gesta Tancredi*, wrote that Peter Bartholomew was a 'versatile fabricator of lies'.[213] Ralph described the finding of the Lance as a deception involving the planting of an Arabic spear point. Ralph was not present on the First Crusade. He wrote his near panegyrical metrical work between 1112 and 1118, but he had served with Bohemond and Tancred. More importantly for Ralph's sources with regard to Peter Bartholomew, Arnulf of Chocques, chaplain to Duke Robert of Normandy on the First Crusade and Patriarch of Jerusalem from 1112, whom he visited before writing his history, taught him and helped shape the work. It was Arnulf who led the challenge that resulted in the death of Peter Bartholomew.[214] Not only did Ralph record the grounds on which the legitimacy of the Lance was challenged: he also saw the whole issue in decidedly political terms. Those in favour of the Lance were Count Raymond and the Provençals; those against were led by Bohemond.[215] Unsurprisingly, equal scepticism was evident in the version of events that circulated in the Arab world. Ibn al-Athïr (1160-1233) wrote that

> There was also a holy man who had great influence over them, a man of low cunning who proclaimed that the Messiah had a lance buried in the Qusyãn, a great building in Antioch: "and if you find it you will be victorious and if

---

[209] RA 257: *In vespere desperare quidam de inventione lanceae coeperunt.*
[210] RA 203.
[211] FC I, XVIII, 3 (237 – 8): *... contigit multos de clero ac populo haesitare, quod non esset illa dominica Lancea, sed ab homine illo stolido altera erat fallaciter inventa.*
[212] GN 262.
[213] RC 676: *versutus mendaciique commentor.*
[214] For Arnulf, chaplain to Robert I, duke of Normandy before becoming patriarch of Jerusalem in 1099 and again from 1112 to 1115. See R. Foreville, 'Un chef de la première croisade: Arnulf Malecouronne,' *Bulletin Philologique et Historique du Comité des Travaux Historiques et Scientifiques* (1953 –4), pp. 377 – 90. See also B. Hamilton, *The Latin Church in the Crusader States* (London, 1980), pp. 12 – 13.
[215] RC 678.

you fail you will surely die." Before saying this he had buried a lance in a certain spot and concealed all trace of it.[216]

At the time, however, as several modern historians have noted, all the crusading princes united behind the Lance.[217] This is evident from the view of the *Gesta Francorum*, which, while generally being positively disposed towards Bohemond, whose faction later became the greatest critics of the Lance, wrote of the discovery of the Lance that it was found as had been foretold by Peter Bartholomew with subsequent boundless rejoicing.[218] A letter to Pope Urban II of the united princes, headed by Bohemond, also referred favourably to the Lance, reporting that through its discovery and many other divine revelations they were much strengthened and more willing to do battle.[219]

In his account of the finding of the Holy Lance, Robert wrote that once it had been unearthed all swore that they would not give up the journey and so all the *plebeia multitudo* rejoiced, that the *maiores* had sworn this oath.[220] This oath taking, as has been noted, was attested to by other sources but was described as arising from the vision of Stephen of Valence rather than the discovery of the Holy Lance. Robert's version of events does, however, convey his understanding that a tension existed between the upper and lower social orders over the question of flight from Antioch, as well as contain the interesting phrase for the lower class, the *plebeia multitudo*.

The chronicler Fulcher of Chartres, not an eyewitness at this point, being with Baldwin's contingent in Edessa, nevertheless reported a further vision of which he was subsequently informed and which he described as being typical of many. A fleeing Christian descended by ropes from the walls of Antioch only to meet the apparition of his dead brother, who told him not to flee because the Lord would be with the Christians in battle.[221] It is extraordinary how consistent was the issue addressed in the cluster of visions that took place at this time of crisis. In each case they were a response to the threat of the disintegration of the movement and an appeal for battle with Kerbogha.

The *vulgus* was revitalised by the oath of the senior princes and the apparent signs of divine favour. They now began to agitate that the princes should go further and initiate battle without delay. Raymond of Aguilers wrote that the *vulgus*, despite having recently been consumed by famine and fear, now criticised the princes, questioning the reason for the delay

---

[216] F. Gabrieli, *Arab Historians of the Crusades*, trans. E. J. Costello, (London, 1969), p. 8.
[217] C. Morris, 'Policy and Visions – The case of the Holy Lance at Antioch' *War and Government in the Middle Ages*, ed. J. Gillingham and J. C. Holt (Woodbridge, 1984), p. 36; J. France, *Victory in the East*, pp. 278 – 9.
[218] GF 65.
[219] H. Hagenmeyer ed. *Die Kreuzzugsbriefe aus den Jahren 1088 – 1100* (Innsbruck, 1901), p. 163
[220] RM 823.
[221] FC I, XX, 1 (244 – 7).

in the battle.[222] This observation was echoed by the historian Archbishop William of Tyre, writing some seventy years after these events, but with eyewitness accounts before him, including now lost material and with access to an oral tradition about the First Crusade. William wrote that 'the common people, aflame with desire, accused the princes of inactivity and criticised their delays.'[223]

The princes responded by sending an envoy to negotiate with Kerbogha. Their surprising choice was Peter the Hermit. The negotiations between Peter the Hermit and the Turkish emir provided dramatists with a great moment. Those parts of the *Gesta Francorum* that read most like a *Chanson* take place here and in the preceding discussion between Kerbogha and his mother. The opportunity for placing a proud defence of Christianity into the speech of Peter and a hubristic reply into that of Kerbogha undoubtedly distorts the report of this mission in the *Gesta Francorum* and those writings dependent on it. John France has drawn attention to the version of the embassy in a source belonging to a different tradition, the *Historia Iherosolimitana* of Albert of Aachen.[224] According to Albert, the city was offered to Kerbogha and the senior princes were willing to serve under him, providing that he become a Christian; failing this, a combat of twenty champions was offered. [225] This latter part of the embassy is confirmed by the accounts of the embassy in Raymond of Aguilers and Fulcher of Chartres.[226] France found Albert's report difficult to take seriously and conjectures that it might have reflected Albert's sources, who were ordinary crusaders, suspicious at this point of the senior princes.[227] This is a possibility. Certainly if the Christian princes seriously intended to come to an understanding with Kerbogha they picked an unlikely conduit for the negotiations. Peter the Hermit continued to have special responsibility for the *pauperes* on the First Crusade, despite having attempted to leave the expedition, if indeed he actually did so (Jean Flori has raised serious doubts over this incident).[228] It seems likely, given the agitation of the poor in favour of battle that formed the background to this embassy, that Peter the Hermit was chosen precisely to allay the mistrust shown by the *pauperes* towards the princes. In an interesting amendment to a line in the *Gesta Francorum* Peter Tudebode altered Peter's speech to Kerbogha from reading 'our *maiores*' say that you should quickly withdraw[229] to 'our *maiores sive minores*' say that you should quickly withdraw.[230] Peter Tudebode generally followed the *Gesta Francorum* word for word, so although the alteration is slight, it might

---

[222] RA 259.
[223] WT 326: *populares, eodem succensi desiderio, principum arguebant desidiam et moras increpabant.* For William and lost sources see above pp. 77 - 8.
[224] J. France, *Victory in the East*, p. 280.
[225] AA 357 – 58.
[226] AA 358, RA 127, FC I, XXI, 1 (247 – 8).
[227] J. France, *Victory in the East*, p. 280.
[228] RA 214-5; J. Flori, *Pierre L'Ermite*, pp. 482 - 92.
[229] GF 66.
[230] PT 108.

well reflect the fact that Peter Tudebode wanted to make clear that Peter the Hermit was speaking not just on behalf of the *maiores* but everyone trapped in the city. Peter Tudebode also made a similar small alteration to the *Gesta* when he reported that just before battle with Kerbogha (28 June 1098) alms were given 'to the *pauperes*.'[231] The version in the *Gesta* simply said alms were given.[232]

The authority of Peter Bartholomew and Stephen of Valence was greatly enhanced by the decisive victory of 28 June 1098. Not only was the result of the battle an indication for contemporary eyes of God's judgement, but also during the course of the battle, Stephen's predicted divine aid was said to have materialised in the form of three fighting saints leading a detachment of troops.[233] Bruno of Lucca was one of those who claimed to have seen this divine intervention. On 20 July he left Antioch and returned to describe his experiences, which were put into a letter by the clergy and people of Lucca and widely circulated. He claimed that the crusaders entering battle saw a wonderful white standard and a countless host of knights.[234] Raymond of Aguilers believed that the Holy Lance that he brought into battle protected those marching near it.[235] There was a great deal of plunder arising from the victory about which Guibert of Nogent wrote that if a *pauper* took something that he wanted, no wealthier man (*ditior*) tried to take it from him by force, but each permitted the other to take what he wanted without a fight.[236] Whether or not this was one of the insertions by Guibert of actual historical material from returned eyewitnesses, it is interesting testimony that Guibert considered the conditions on the First Crusade at this point unusual because the rich were not taking wealth by force from the poor. By contrast Raymond of Aguilers reported conflict over property then took place among the *princes* and their followers. He wrote that in the period after the victory *discordia* shook not only the *principes*, but thefts and robberies took place among their households.[237]

Social tension between rich and poor did not ease once the battle with Kerbogha took place, but rather it found different expression. The key issue that now made manifest this social tension was that of whether the expedition was to continue to Jerusalem or not. The princes, wanting to avoid plague in Antioch and to consolidate their local gains, scattered throughout the region. Firstly though, they did make an offer to the poor. In a very interesting passage, describing an offer by the princes after the victory over Kerbogha, the author of the *Gesta Francorum* wrote: 'The princes had it announced throughout the whole city that if by

---

[231] PT 110: *Et dederunt eleemosynam pauperibus.*
[232] GF 67-8.
[233] GF 69.
[234] *Letter of the clergy and people of Lucca to the faithful*, H. Hagenmeyer ed. *Die Kreuzzugsbriefe aus den Jahren 1088 – 1100* (Innsbruck, 1901), p. 166.
[235] RA 263.
[236] GN 243.
[237] RA 136.

chance there should be present someone *egens* in that place, and lacking in gold and silver, if he wished to remain, having made a compact with them, he would be retained with pleasure.'[238] To whom was the offer being made? Clearly it was addressed to persons experiencing poverty, but did the princes, after their stunning victory, want to consolidate a labour force or a military following? Were they appealing to non-combatants, footsoldiers, or knights? Some insight on the matter is offered by the reworking of the incident by one of the later authors. Baldric of Dol interpreted the offer as deriving from a concern by the princes for the welfare of the *pauperes* and while this is possible, it has to be borne in mind that Baldric used every opportunity to portray the First Crusade as displaying social harmony between rich and poor.[239] Baldric did, however, offer a clarification of the offer of the princes. His version of the same passage distinguished between those *egeni* who were vigorous (*corpore vegetus*), whom the princes wished to take away into service, and those too weak to leave the city, who were instructed to be maintained from public stipends until recovered.[240] So, according to Baldric's interpretation of this passage of the *Gesta Francorum*, even though the language used by the anonymous author had overtones of a feudal legal contract of vassalage, particularly with the use of the verb *retinere*, it was addressed, in fact, to the lower social order. The offer does not seem to have been a popular one. Instead, when Raymond Pilet attempted prematurely to lead an expedition against Ma'arat-an-Numan an-Nu'man in July 1098, a great number of poor from Antioch and local Christians unused to combat had attached themselves to him. In large part it was their presence that resulted in Raymond Pilet's forces being thrown back by Ridwan of Aleppo. According to the author of the *Gesta Francorum* it was the Syrians and the *gens minuta* who fled first.[241]

Expressions of social discontent increased following the death of Bishop Adhémar of Le Puy (1 August 1098), the papal legate and the key figure in maintaining harmony between the princes and between the different social forces. The final appearance of the term *pauperes* in the text of the *Gesta Francorum* was in the epitaph to Adhémar: 'Because he [Adhémar] was the helper of the *pauperes*, the counsel of the rich, and he ordered the clergy, preached to and summoned the knights, saying this, "None of you can be saved unless he does honour to the *pauperes* and assists them; you cannot be saved without them, and they cannot live

---

[238] GF 72-3: *Feceruntque principes preconari per urbem universam, ut si forte aliquis egens illic adesset et auro argentoque careret, conventione facta cum illis remanere si vellet, ab eis cum gaudio retentus esset.*
[239] BD 80.
[240] BD 80: *Dispersi sunt ergo duces et familiae per finitimas regiones et egeni eos subsequebantur, vivendi causa. Dixerant enim duces: 'Si quis egenus est et corpore vegetus, jungatur nobis, et nos omnibus, datis unicuique stipendiis, subsidiabimur; infirmi publica stipe donec convaluerint, sustententur.'*
[241] GF 74.

without you.'"[242] There is a slight but interesting change to this passage in the *Historia De Hierosolymitano Itinere* of Peter Tudebode where Adhémar is reported as saying 'none of you can be saved unless he honours and assists the *pauperes clerici*.'[243] This significantly changes the meaning of the passage. The theological message from Adhémar is not now that by the meritorious deeds of the knights towards the *pauperes* they save their own souls, but by the prayers of the clergy the souls of the knights are saved. It is a change that shifts the psychological standpoint of salvation from that of a knight to that of a cleric and it is in keeping with the view that the author of the *Gesta* was a knight, while Peter Tudebode was a priest.[244] It should also be noted that the addition is clumsy and not convincing, as the new sentence no longer follows consistently from the start of the eulogy in which Adhémar is described as the helper of the *pauperes*. Guibert's version of the same passage returned to the theme of tension over property. He had Adhémar say that unless the *minores* were treated as equals and wealth that was obtained unequally was shared, the magnates would exclude themselves from divine mercy.[245] For Guibert of Nogent the death of Adhémar also marked the point at which the *principes* began to argue among themselves, while the *mediocres* and *vulgus* became insolent, obeying no one single ruler and regarding all things as equal among them. He added that often, while the desire of the *vulgus* prevailed, their conduct was inappropriate for the divine nature of the expedition.[246] This passage is important in showing that Guibert's perspective was markedly different from that of Raymond of Aguilers. While Guibert encouraged acts of charity from magnates to the poor, he did not approve of the lower social orders acting for themselves and displaying *insolentia* towards the princes. Albert's account of the death of Bishop Adhémar of Le Puy emphasised the respect that the legate received from all social groupings by reporting that everyone, *nobiles et ignobiles*, mourned with extreme lamentations.[247]

No sooner was Adhémar dead, than Peter Bartholomew stepped forward in an immediate bid to step into the role played by the legate and address the social and political issues facing the crusade. He reported a vision two days after the death of the legate, in which the dead bishop appeared accompanied by St Andrew.[248] Firstly Peter reinforced the

---

[242] GF 74: *Quia ille erat sustentamentum pauperum, consilium divitum, ipseque ordinabat clericos, predicabat et summonebat milites, dicens quia: 'Nemo ex vobis saluari potest nisi honorificet pauperes et reficiat, vosque non potestis saluari sine illis, ipsique vivere nequent sine vobis.'* For an analysis of this passage see above p. 13.
[243] PT 117: *Quoniam nemo ex vobis salvus fieri potest, nisi honorificet et reficiat pauperes clericos.*
[244] See above pp. 26 - 7.
[245] GN 246.
[246] GN 262: *Cepere inter principes simultates aliquotiens ac insolentiae oboriri, apud mediocres preterea et vulgares licentiae quas non omnino deceret haberi... Dum ergo nemini singulariter parent et universa inter eos estimantur equalia, fiebant sepius, dum vulgi libido prevalet, apud ipsos minus apta iudicia.*
[247] AA 379.
[248] RA 263.

legitimacy of the Lance – and therefore his own prestige - by describing Adhémar as appearing before him with terrible burns on his head and face, the scars of being in hell for a time, for having doubted the miracle. Secondly, Peter reported that Adhémar asked that his, by no means inconsiderable following, attach themselves to Count Raymond. Thirdly, Adhémar stated that 'I have never been as useful to [the Christian forces] as I shall be [in future] ... For I shall dwell with them ... I shall appear and offer better counsel than I have done hitherto.'[249] Although it is unstated, there is no doubt as to whom the dead Bishop would communicate his future, better, counsels. Peter also had Adhémar emphasise the value of charity extended to the *pauperes*. According to Peter the Bishop said that he was saved from a punishing fire by a robe returned to him by the Lord, because on his ordination as bishop he had presented it to a certain *pauper*.[250] St Andrew then intervened to address the split among the princes over the issue of who should rule Antioch. The saint was non-committal as to which individual prince should command Antioch, but was very clearly hostile to restoring the city to the Byzantine Empire, using the example of Nicea as a city won by God for the Christian forces only to be given away. St Andrew added that to use force to obtain the city was illegal and unrighteous, which was clearly an attempt to head off a coup attempt by Bohemond by threatening him with the united disapproval of the entire Christian body. Already by the time of the vision Bohemond had violently ousted Raymond's troops from the citadel of Antioch and was tightening his grip over towers and gates. St Andrew's message in response was that peace was essential as disunity could lead to disaster. A major theme of the vision concerned the poor crusaders. St Andrew commanded that there should be a public accounting of the wealth of the princes through their bishops followed by a redistribution of wealth to the *pauperes*.[251] This seems to be a direct alternative to the offer of the princes to take the poor into their service. Many *pauperes* had marched for over two years without experiencing any form of lordship; this proposal by St Andrew for a public accounting of the wealth of the princes followed by increased donations to the poor would have been immensely more palatable to them. This vision of Peter Bartholomew then, was a highly political one, shaped by the immediate circumstances, particularly those arising from the death of the papal legate. The most striking feature of the vision was the confident tone in which one of the poorest of the crusaders was addressing one of the most senior princes. Count Raymond was reminded of his faults and given orders. Even at this early stage of his career the tone of Peter Bartholomew was becoming bolder. But neither the social weight of his supporters among the *pauperes*, nor his appeal to the patronage of Count Raymond proved

---

[249] RA 263: ... *nunquam eis profui quantum prodero...Etenim cum illis habitabo... ut ego, finierunt; et eis apparebo, et multo melius quam hactenus consiliabor eis.*
[250] RA 138 – 9.
[251] RA 264.

successful. Raymond of Aguilers reported that the words of St Andrew were first believed but due to continuing strife over whether to acknowledge the Byzantine emperor as ruler, and other discords, the property of the *pauperes* was destroyed and nothing came of the advice that the *principes* had obtained from St Andrew.[252] Nonetheless, through his association with the Lance and under the protection of Count Raymond, Peter Bartholomew remained in a position to reassert himself at a later date.

The longer time passed without the Christian forces reuniting and pressing on to Jerusalem, the greater the hardship on the *pauperes*. Lacking any form of income other than plunder, victory over Kerbogha had brought the *pauperes* only temporary relief from the hardship they were suffering. Not only did famine conditions continue inside the city but in August there was an outbreak of a plague that, reported Albert of Aachen, killed an uncountable multitude, whether *nobiles proceres* or *humilis vulgus*.[253] Albert reflected the discontent of the poor from the perspective of the Lotharingian contingent in his account of the period from September to November 1098. He reported that Duke Godfrey of Lotharingia was urged to undertake warfare by the complaints of the *pauperes Christi*.[254] Godfrey, having learned of the attacks of Armenian Bagrat, brother of the robber prince Kogh Vasil, on messengers sent by his brother Baldwin, now ruler of Edessa, undertook an expedition north from Antioch to Turbessel (Tell Bashir) and Ravendel. Albert wrote that the Duke set out because of this incident 'and the complaints of the *pauperes*.'[255] By October 1098, according to Albert, a great dissension took place among the *populus*. And many of the *populus* of Duke Godfrey, Robert of Flanders and Bohemond, who had no faith or trust in their replies and their words about going to Jerusalem before long, withdrew themselves.[256] Raymond of Aguilers had a similar account of the same period, from the Provençal perspective. Count Raymond of Toulouse was described as leading a raid, 14 – 17 September 1098, from Antioch, *pro causa pauperum.*[257] Raiding again in the latter half of the month, the Count assembled his knights that he might lead the *plebs pauperum*, who were suffering hunger and weariness at Antioch, into Palestine.[258] These 'commoners of poor means' seem to be a variation on *pauperes* used by the author to avoid direct repetition of very similar phrases. So too with the appearance of *populus pauperum* in a sentence that arose in the historian's account of a third raid led by Count Raymond, which captured Albara on or about 25

---

[252] RA 264.
[253] AA 379.
[254] AA 390.
[255] AA 391: *... et pauperum querimoniis ...*
[256] AA 407.
[257] RA 148.
[258] RA 149. For *Hyspaniam* see RA xxix where John France defines it as roughly, 'Saracen held land to the South.'

September 1098.[259] Raymond of Aguilers also singled out the *pauperes* as being most affected by the expedition being stalled at Antioch due to the discord of the princes at the end of October 1098.[260]

During this period Peter Bartholomew consolidated his position within the Provençal contingent with further visions. One took place during the foraging expedition of Count Raymond 14 – 17 September. This time the visionary spoke aloud in the night in the tent that housed the count's chaplaincy and subsequently attempted to draw the others present into supporting the revelation, but Simon, a chaplain, covered his head. The Bishop of Apt was not sure if he had seen a vision or whether he had been dreaming. He shook awake the chronicler Raymond of Aguilers, who felt that he was in the presence of extra light and great emotion, as if Holy Grace had entered his soul. Peter Bartholomew explained that was indeed the case as the Lord had been present for some time.[261] The message of the Lord and St Andrew was for Count Raymond and it was a strong one. They claimed that although he had received the gift of the Holy Lance he had nonetheless sinned badly. Therefore he was commanded to do penance before Peter Bartholomew.[262] The visionary was playing for high stakes by confronting Count Raymond in this way and he risked reprisals from the wrath of the Count's vassals or the Count himself if he made an error of judgement. It was an extraordinary encounter, most unusual in any medieval period, that a servile youth would seek to dictate to prince of great age, dignity and standing. The particular theology of the crusade, adapted to the mood of a politically large body of suspicious and discontented *pauperes*, had allowed Peter Bartholomew to project himself into an extraordinary prominence that he could never otherwise have achieved. This is not to portray the visionary as necessarily a charlatan. Although there were certainly rogues in France at this time who cynically traded on the credulity of others to obtain an income,[263] equally those monks who created false documents to serve the Church saw themselves as divinely inspired rather than forgers. Peter Bartholomew might well have seen himself in this light, acting out of necessity, to save a divine expedition that might otherwise disintegrate through the rivalry of the princes. He had to strike a careful balance; promoting Count Raymond over the other princes but at the same time giving voice to the criticisms of the count raised by the poor. His room for manoeuvre was narrow, as his visions were making many enemies, particularly among the other princes. By coming forward and taking up a significant position as a leader of the expedition Peter Bartholomew was playing with fire, literally.

---

[259] RA 156: *Igitur comes cum populo pauperum et paucis militibus in Syriam profectus.*
[260] RA 163.
[261] RA 265.
[262] RA 265.
[263] For example, in Guibert's autobiography the saintly Everard of Breteuil was unpleasantly surprised to encounter an impersonator claiming to be himself. Guibert of Nogent, *Monodiae*, I. 9.

Faced with the news of this vision from his own clerical household Count Raymond prevaricated before Peter privately told him his sin, after which he confessed and performed penance.[264] The political content of the vision consisted of a demand for an immediate resumption of the crusade and an attack on the advisers of the count for their evil counsel. Whatever difficulties Count Raymond had in controlling an unruly and disparate following were by this point clearly compounded by the role of Peter Bartholomew. Just why Raymond accommodated the self-proclaimed visionary in the tent of his chaplaincy in the first place becomes more understandable in the light of Raymond of Aguilers' observation that during the siege of Antioch, it was proclaimed that Count Raymond was nobody because he was believed to be shirking from battle. Having incurred this problem, namely about the substance of his courage, he suffered such great hostility from his men that he was almost estranged from his household.[265] Having leapt at the chance of increased authority through supporting the legitimacy of the Holy Lance, which Peter Bartholomew humbly and cleverly cited as being evidence of particular divine favour for Raymond, the count was in no position to doubt the subsequent visions. His choice was either to have the Lance accompanied by a special status for Peter, or to discredit them both. Count Raymond followed the direction of Peter's latest vision.

On 5 November 1098 the senior princes and their immediate followers met in the Cathedral of St Peter. It soon became clear that a deep division remained between Count Raymond, who reminded Bohemond of the oath they had taken to the Byzantine emperor and the Norman prince who was determined to hold the city. Raymond of Aguilers reported that as a result frustration grew among the *populus*. The fact that he used a wider term at this point than *pauperes* is indicative that a wide social grouping wished to press on to Jerusalem. The people threatened to choose their own leader to lead them onward and even to tear down the walls of the city if no resolution was come to.[266] A compromise was resolved, that in practice favoured Bohemond. Oaths were taken and the expedition resumed by the princes with agreement that their first goal should be the reduction of Ma'arrat-an-Nu'mān. It was Count Raymond and Robert, count of Flanders, who led the first army out of Antioch (23 November 1098) accompanied, wrote William of Tyre, by a great number of *pauperes*.[267]

Once underway, the apostles returned to give advice to the crusaders through their now powerful intermediary, Peter Bartholomew. On the night of 30 November 1098, at the siege of Ma'arrat-an-Nu'mān, Peter Bartholomew claimed to a mass assembly the next day, SS Peter and Andrew, initially clad in the ugly and filthy clothing of *pauperes*, visited him.

---

[264] RA 266.
[265] RA 250.
[266] RA 163 – 4.
[267] WT 7.8 (352).

The saints explained that this dress was the garb in which they came to God, a point that no doubt was welcomed by the poor crusaders.[268] Their initial appearance also gave an answer to the critics of Peter Bartholomew who could not believe that God would reveal himself to one so lowly.[269] The saints then outlined their criticisms of the crusade and how they should be addressed:

> Among you are murders and plunders and thefts, there is no justice and very many adulteries, although it is pleasing to God if you all take wives. Concerning justice, however, the Lord commands thus: that if anyone does violence to a *pauper*, whatever is in the oppressor's house should entirely be made public. Concerning tithes, however, the Lord says that if you pay them, he himself is willing to give you what is necessary.[270]

Peter Tudebode has a description of the same vision of Peter Bartholomew in his most marked departure from the *Gesta Francorum*. It is drawn from the account of Raymond of Aguilers but is worth noting in full, as it is clear from his other comments concerning the siege of Ma'arat-an-Numan that Peter Tudebode was an eyewitness to events there and that his borrowing from Raymond can be considered corroborative.

> St Andrew announced to Peter Bartholomew ... that the Lord had instructions: *Love your brothers as yourself* (Lev 19:34). And they should return that part which He individually retained, when He created the world itself and all the creatures that are in it, namely a tenth part of all things that are possessed. He himself will give the city in a short time and fulfil all His will. He ordered the aforementioned tithe to be divided into four parts, one of which was to be given to the bishop, another to the priests, another to the churches and the other to the *pauperes*. This they all conceded after it was recited in a council.[271]

---

[268] RA 269.
[269] RA 229 - 30. See above p. 211.
[270] RA 269: *Inter vos caedes et rapinae et furta; nulla justitia, et plurima adulteria: quum Deo placitum sit, si uxores vos omnes ducatis. De justitia vero, sic praecepit Dominus: ut quicumque pauperi violentiam intulerit, quicquid in domo oppressoris est, totum publicetur. De decimis autem dicit Dominus, quod si reddatis eas, quicquid necesse fuerit, ipse donare paratus est.*
[271] PT 122: *... beatus Andreas nuntiavit Petro Bartholomaeo ... quod ipsemet praecepit, dicens: 'Diligite fratres vestros tanquam vosmetipsos' atque redderent illam partem quam ipse propriam retinuit quando mundum ipsum, omnesque creaturas que in eo sunt, creavit, scilicet decimam partem omnium rerum quae possidentur; ipse daret illis civitatem brevi tempore atque impleret omnem suam voluntate; quam praedictam decimam partem jussit dividi in quatuor partibus, una quarum detur episcopo, alia sacerdotibus, alia ecclesiis, alia pauperibus. Quod postquam fuit in concilio recitatum, concesserunt omnes.*

These reports suggest that the vision contained four significant points. The first was that justice was seen as being required on behalf of the *pauperes*, to defend them from violence from their fellow Christian oppressors. The second, that the solution to the presence of large numbers of unmarried women on crusade is that they be married; a response that contrasts with the policy of the senior clergy who were more inclined to drive women from the crusade altogether.[272] The third point was that once again the Peter Bartholomew raised the idea of a public accounting of the resources available to the crusaders, this time of those suspected of taking goods from the *pauperes*. Lastly the vision raised the idea of taking a tithe for the church and the *pauperes*. This reflects the harsh poverty that existed among the Christian forces at the siege and that would shortly drive some of the poorest crusaders to acts of cannibalism. At a council of Count Raymond's faction the following day, which was attended by the people as well as the nobles, a partial concession was made to the needs of the poor crusader. A collection was taken to which the faithful offered generous alms.[273] Having been inspired by this vision of Peter Bartholomew, reported Raymond of Aguilers, the army was now aroused and willing to attempt to seize the city, in order that the *plebs pauperum* means should be liberated.[274] The subsequent attack (11 December 1098) was partially successful and the *pauperes* took advantage of the now established tradition of looting to break into the city at night to secure all the plunder and houses, after the *milites* had forced a way into the city during the day. When the *milites* entered the next morning they found little they could take away with them.[275]

The plunder clearly only ameliorated the hardship faced by the *pauperes* for a short interval. Within a month of the fall of Ma'arat-an-Numan the *pauperes* engaged in cannibalism. According to Peter Tudebode the *pauperes peregrini* began to split open the bodies of the pagans, because they came across bezants hidden in the stomachs. Others then fell to the meat of these for scraps of food. As a result the *seniores* had the pagans dragged outside the gates of the city, where they made mountains of them and afterwards they were burned.[276] The *Gesta Francorum* formed the basis of Peter Tudebode's phrasing, but typical of the anonymous's limited social vocabulary, he did not distinguish the *pauperes* from the *seniores*.[277] According to the *Chanson d'Antioche* it was the *tafurs* who ate the bodies of the Saracens.[278]

---

[272] GN 196. See also J. A. Brundage, *The Crusades, Holy War and Canon Law*, (Aldershot, 1991) II, 380 and XIX, 59.
[273] RA 269.
[274] RA 173.
[275] RA 270.
[276] PT 124 – 5.
[277] GF 80.
[278] CA II, 4 - 9. See also M. Rouche, 'Cannibalisme sacré chez les croisés populaires', Y. M. Hilaire ed. in *la Réligion Populaire* (Paris, 1981), pp. 56 – 69.

Among the Christian forces at Ma'arat-an-Numan a major political upheaval now took place, one in which the latent alliance of *pauper* and *miles* that had recently made threats towards the *principes* at Antioch became manifest. Count Raymond had hoped to use the town as a base for a principality that he could hold as a vassal of the Byzantine emperor. But in the harsh circumstances of December 1098 this was an ambition that neither the *pauperes* nor the *milites* would support. Around Christmas 1098 at a council of the Provençals the *milites* sided with the *pauperes* in insisting that the Count lead the way to Jerusalem, failing which they demanded that he hand over the Holy Lance and the people would march to Jerusalem with the Lord as their leader.[279] Count Raymond therefore arranged a conference with the other princes to negotiate the terms on which the expedition would continue. This meeting took place at Chastel-Rouge, probably on 4 January 1099, but came to nothing. According to Robert the Monk, when the other princes departed, many *iuvenes*, the shock troops of the First Crusade,[280] remained at Chastel-Rouge, 'on fire' to complete the journey to Jerusalem.[281] Count Raymond, however, now allocated a significant number of his knights and footmen to garrison Ma'arat-an-Numan. As a result, reported Raymond of Aguilers, the *pauperes* began to worry that the Christian forces would be diminished by the allocation of a garrison to every captured city between Antioch and Jerusalem.[282] They decided to force Raymond's hand and destroy the walls of the city, making it defenceless and unsuitable as a base for Raymond's local operations. The bishop of Albara, acting for the Count, used threats and force to prevent the poor, including the sick and infirm, from destroying the city defences. But as soon as his guards passed by people returned to their task. Count Raymond on his return to the city was furious but helpless. He bowed to the alliance of poor pilgrim and knight and set off southwards, *pro causa pauperum*, wrote Raymond of Aguilers.[283] On the march through the Buqaia, the plain that connects inner Syria to the sea, in January 1099, those *pauperes*, who because of their weakness lingered a long way behind the army, were killed by Turkish forces.[284] The situation of the *pauperes* and the whole army improved, however, reported Raymond of Aguilers, following the arrival of provisions from the Emir of Shaizar in January 1099. Day by day the *pauperes* regained health, the *milites* became stronger, and the army seemed to multiply.[285] Soon after, the *pauperes* again grabbed plunder from under the noses of the *milites* at Hosn al-Akrad (28 January 1099). While Count Raymond with certain *milites* strained in the battle, the *pauperes*, having obtained booty,

---

[279] RA 270 – 1.
[280] See below Chapter II.3.
[281] RM, 837.
[282] RA 271.
[283] RA 183.
[284] RA 191.
[285] RA 188.

began to leave, one after the other. Next the poor footsoldiers took to the road, and after these the common knights.[286]

Count Raymond still harboured ambitions in the region. Raymond of Aguilers reported a very interesting speech by Tancred against diverting the expedition from its goal of Jerusalem, at a time, during January 1099, when Count Raymond was considering the capture of Jabala (Djebali): 'God visited the *plebs pauperum* and us, and must we therefore turn aside from the journey?'[287] The Norman faction of the expedition was willing to endorse the idea that God was making his will known through visions, provided that the visionaries endorsed the idea of moving southwards. In this Tancred might well, as R. L. Nicholson has suggested, have been acting under instruction from Bohemond, anxious to extend his domain from a base at Antioch, without obstacle from fellow crusading princes and especially Count Raymond of Toulouse.[288] Bribed with a huge amount of gold and silver from the Emir of Tripoli, however, and with a temporary restoration of loyalty from his *milites* who anticipated further tribute, Count Raymond did manage to divert the crusade to 'Arqah ('Akkār) and began a three month siege on 14 February, 1099. The support for this action quickly became lacklustre, especially after the Emir of Tripoli ceased his payments.[289] Soon, wrote Albert of Aachen, all persons, *parvi et magni*, pressed for a continuation of the journey to Jerusalem according to their vow.[290]

At some point in March 1099 the idea of taking a tithe was implemented. According to Raymond of Aguilers, 'it was announced there at that time that the people should give tithes of all things which they had captured, since there were many *pauperes* in the army and many infirm people. And it was ordered that they should deliver a fourth part to their priests whose masses they attended, a fourth to the bishops and the remaining two [fourths] to Peter the Hermit whom they had placed in charge of the *pauperes*, from the clergy and the people.'[291] This is an interesting passage, clearly the source of Peter Tudebode's phrasing for the earlier vision of Peter Bartholomew. The division of *pauper*, *clerus* and *populus* looks a little like the traditional tripartite division of those who work, pray and fight. But this cannot be Raymond's meaning as Peter the Hermit was not in charge of the entire expedition. Rather it seems that he had a special responsibility for non-combatants, as was seen again before the battle of Ascalon (12 August 1099), where he was left behind in Jerusalem after the fighting

---

[286] RA 195-6.
[287] RA 189: *Deus visitavit plebem pauperum et nos, et declinare ab itinere debemus?*
[288] R. L. Nicholson. *Tancred: A study of his career and work in their relation to the First Crusade and the Establishment of the Latin States in Syria and Palestine*, (Chicago, 1940), pp. 76 - 85.
[289] WT 7.20 (366).
[290] AA 419.
[291] RA 214-5: *Praedicatum est eo tempore ut daret populus decimas de omnibus quae cepisset, quoniam multi pauperes erant in exercitu, et multi infirmi: et mandatum est ut quartam partem redderent sacerdotibus suis ad quorum missas veniebant; et quartam episcopis; reliquas vero duas Petro Heremitae quem pauperibus de clero et populo praefecerant.*

forces had left, in order to lead the processions and services.[292] The ambiguity of the report of the tithe might well reflect the confused organisation of the expedition at this point. As well as horizontal divisions between rich and poor, there were vertical ones between the different regional contingents, many of which were hostile to Count Raymond of Toulouse. The distribution of the tithe looks like a compromise. All the tithe was intended to go to the clergy, the *pauperes* and the infirm, but apart, perhaps, from a share that was given communally to those most in need by Peter the Hermit, like the stipend mentioned by Baldric available to the sick in Antioch in August 1098, the rest was distributed to the clergy through their particular regional contingents.

On the night of 5 April, during the now deeply unpopular siege, another vision occurred to Peter Bartholomew, which he dictated to Raymond of Aguilers. The peasant visionary had been brooding on why Christ had favoured Stephen of Valence by not only appearing before him on the cross but also addressing him. That night Peter Bartholomew caught up to his rival with a vision of St Peter, St Andrew and Christ, in which Christ addressed the visionary. The Lord had a five-fold assessment of the crusading expedition. The first rank of the crusaders consisted of those who fought and who after dying would be seated on God's right. In the second rank were the auxiliaries, the rear guard for the fighters. In the third rank were crusaders who acted to provide supplies to the fighters. But those of the fourth rank were reprehensible as they stayed away from combat. Even worse, in the fifth rank were the cowards who urged other crusaders not to join the battles or even furnish arms to the fighters. These types of crusader were compared to Judas and Pontius Pilate. Christ then gave orders intended for Count Raymond concerning the cowards. The crusaders were to be called together and the alarm sounded, then the shirkers would be discovered. They should then be executed and their worldly goods given to those of the first rank. The Lord also gave a command to the crusaders regarding justice, which was that they appoint judges according to family and kin. These judges should have the right to take the possessions of a defendant, giving half to the plaintiff and half to the authorities.[293]

This vision was to cost Peter Bartholomew his life. The visionary had kept his influential position by striking a balance between enhancing the authority of Count Raymond and by articulating the needs of the *pauperes*. His enemies included the secular vassals of the count and the nobility of the other factions. As has been noted, although the Normans were sceptical of the Holy Lance, it seems that Tancred was willing to utilise the message of the visionary so long as it advocated continuation of the expedition towards Jerusalem. By siding with the unpopular perspective of the count at 'Arqah, the visionary had made a fatal mistake. The attitude of the Norman contingent hardened against him. Worse, the last message that the

---

[292] GF 94.
[293] RA 280.

now politically active body of poor crusaders wanted to hear was that they must bestir themselves in this siege or risk execution for cowardice. By advocating a continuation of the siege of 'Arqah Peter Bartholomew precipitated a clash with the other princely factions and by alienating himself from his supporters amongst the *pauperes*, Peter Bartholomew allowed his enemies the chance to bring him down.

The legitimacy of the Lance was immediately challenged at a two-day council of the clergy 6-7 April 1099.[294] The chief author of this controversy, wrote William of Tyre later, was Arnulf of Chocques, the friend and chaplain of the count of Normandy.[295] Testimony was taken from Arnulf against the Lance. In favour of the authenticity of the relic were not only Peter Bartholomew but also other visionaries of lowly status, including a priest Peter Desiderius, chaplain to Isoard I, count of Die (a senior noble in the company of Raymond of Toulouse),[296] who had come to the attention of the Provençal chaplaincy at Antioch with a vision concerning the relics of St George.[297] Peter Desiderius claimed also to have seen a vision of the singed Adhémar. Ebrard, a priest, said that Mary, Christ's mother, had appeared to him while he was in Tripoli shortly before Antioch's capture and told him of the Lance. Stephen of Valence repeated his story of Christ's appearance, and while not claiming to have had foreknowledge of the Lance, believed that it was part of Christ's promise of aid to the crusaders. The bishop of Apt and Raymond of Aguilers himself both were inclined to support the Lance, but hedged their testimony, the bishop by being uncertain if his vision of the Lance may have been a dream, and the chronicler through his wavering defence of the Lance.[298] Raymond of Aguilers was later confronted by Peter Bartholomew and in tears admitted to the visionary that he had secretly desired to see the miracle of the Lance confirmed by ordeal.[299] According to Raymond of Aguilers, Arnulf backed down when faced with this testimony, effectively a rallying of a section of the clergy to Peter Bartholomew. He was about to perform penance for his false accusation, when he changed his mind. William of Tyre's later summary of the situation was that for a long time the pilgrims discussed this matter, hesitating between different opinions.[300] Albert of Aachen's report of a *schisma* among the Christian forces suggests the matter was the cause of a serious split.[301] Evidently, despite his loss of prestige from the latest vision, Peter Bartholomew had enough support to make the crisis a close run thing. Tipping the balance were probably those, like Raymond of Aguilers, who

---

[294] H. Hagenmeyer, *Chronologie*, p. 224.
[295] WT 366. For Arnulf see above n. 214.
[296] WT 138, 330, 411 WT 8.XIX. For Isoard I, count of Die see J. Riley-Smith, *The First Crusaders*, p. 213.
[297] RA 111 – 13. For Peter Desiderius see J. Riley-Smith, *The First Crusaders*, p. 216.
[298] RA 238 -43.
[299] RA 284.
[300] WT 366.
[301] AA 412.

sincerely believed in Peter and his visions but wished to see them proven. Arnulf faced down the visionary, who then offered to undertake an ordeal by fire to prove his testimony.[302] The body of people who demanded that the visionary Peter Bartholomew test the legitimacy of the Holy Lance were termed *plebeculae* by Guibert. He wrote that the rumour began to circulate that the discovery of the relic had been staged and that it was merely a lance, therefore an enormous *plebeculae* began to mutter (*mussitare*).[303] As has been noted, to 'mutter' was extremely disobedient conduct from the perspective of an abbot of a Benedictine monastery.[304] Guibert was a supporter of the legitimacy of the Holy Lance and therefore his sense of the term *plebeculae* here is thus probably pejorative, 'a mob of commoners.' Guibert also wrote that the pile of timber needed for the trial was heaped up by many of the *populus*, 'eager for novelty,' a classical phrase employed by Guibert for tumultuous and irresponsible crowds.[305]

The ordeal of Peter Bartholomew is one of the clearest descriptions of trial by fire in the Middle Ages. The sources for the First Crusade are extremely consistent in the description of it, less so on the meaning of the outcome.[306] Two huge pyres were set alight, with a small path between them. Raymond of Aguilers, the chronicler, was master of ceremonies and shouted aloud the issue to the eager crowd: if God and St Andrew had talked to Peter Bartholomew, he would walk through unhurt, if it was a lie, Peter and the Lance that he carried would be consumed by the flames.[307] Clad only in a tunic Peter Bartholomew carried the Lance through the fire and emerged from the flames to hold the Lance aloft and scream "God help us." He was mobbed by the crowd and had to be forcibly taken from them by Raymond Pilet. In the light of the Gospel depiction of the passion of Christ it is significant that in his account of this event Raymond of Aguilers described the watching crowds at the ordeal initially as *populus*, then *multitudo populi*, then *turba* as they progressed from praying, to watching, to charging across to Peter and inflicting wounds more lethal than those of the flames.[308] In Guibert's account of the ordeal he wrote that the *vulgus* surrounded the visionary to seize his clothes like relics.[309] Moreover the outcome of the trial led to a division among the *vulgus*, who unreliable and fickle in their judgment, were now disturbed by an even worse form of confusion.[310] Albert of Aachen and Fulcher of Chartres both considered the outcome to have been more decisive. For Albert the ordeal led to a decline in the veneration of the

---

[302] RA 236.
[303] GN 262: *Incipit itaque enormis plebeculae passim mussitare...*
[304] See above p. 206.
[305] GN 262: *rerum novarum cupidis ...* See also n. 71. For classical examples, Caesar, *Gallic War*, 1.18; Tacitus, *History*, 2.8, 3.4, 3.12 (specifically the *vulgus*); Tacticus, *Annals*, 3.13, 5.3, 5.46.
[306] GN 121 - 2, WT 7.18 (324), RA 100 - 2.
[307] RA 283.
[308] RA 252 – 254.
[309] GN 263.
[310] GN 263..

relic. To a great extent it was now thought that the relic had only come into being through the ambitions of Count Raymond.[311] Fulcher described the followers of the Lance as becoming sad and disillusioned, although he noted that it continued to be venerated by the count.[312]

Twelve days after his ordeal Peter Bartholomew was dead. Not only had he to contend with burns but the wounds inflicted upon him by his enemies among the mob that engulfed him had been deep; furthermore his back was probably broken.[313] With the death of the visionary came the final disintegration of the hegemony of Count Raymond's entourage over the crusade, particularly because those Southern French followers of the Bishop of Le Puy who had joined the *familia* of the Count after the death of their lord no longer co-operated with their Provençal comrades. Around 18 April, 1099, during the siege of 'Arqah, at a point where the emir of Tripoli was refusing to pay further tribute, emissaries from Emperor Alexius I Comnenus caught up with the main body of crusaders, to complain about Bohemond's possession of Antioch. Their arrival reawakened Count Raymond's aspiration of using the presence of crusaders, who might otherwise leave following the capture of Jerusalem, to win a principality that could be held as a fief from the Emperor. He advocated stepping up the siege and waiting for aid from Alexius before journeying on to Jerusalem.[314] Raymond of Aguilers noted that the majority of people rejected these arguments, but the crusade remained at an impasse due to the large entourage of Count Raymond.[315] Prayers, fasting and alms for the people were proclaimed in the hope of resolving the situation, and another vision promptly occurred. Into the vacuum created by the death of Peter Bartholomew stepped the priest and visionary Stephen of Valence.

Stephen now reported that Christ, Bishop Adhémar and Mary had appeared to him. The papal legate had shown Stephen his burns, supporting therefore the legitimacy of the Lance, but the legate primarily urged veneration for the relic of the True Cross that was brought with him on crusade.[316] The vision of the Bishop also turned Stephen's ring into a relic by asking him to present it to Count Raymond as an object through which he should invoke the aid of Mary. The legate had further instructions as to how the Lance should be treated, namely that it should not be shown unless carried by a priest clad in sacred vestments and that it be preceded by fragment of the True Cross.[317] The effect of the vision was to eclipse the discredited Lance and substitute the new relics in its place, in particular the True Cross of the legate, which had been left in Latakia. William Hugh of Monteil, brother of Adhémar, was sent to retrieve the relic. The vision, as reported by Raymond of Aguilers, did

---

[311] AA 412.
[312] FC I,XVIII,4 – 5, (240 – 1).
[313] RA 252.
[314] RA 106.
[315] RA 266.
[316] RA 287.
[317] RA 287.

not contain a resolution to the issue of the siege of 'Arqah. However it is significant that with the return of William and the cross a new mutiny broke out against Count Raymond and the other princes. This time the *familia* of the Count led the way and the drawback to having absorbed so many followers from the following of Bishop Adhémar of Le Puy became apparent. A great commotion took place in which Count Raymond's followers set fire to their own tents and departed from the siege.[318] The count broke into tears and attempted to halt the movement, but, once a part of the Provençal contingent was underway the other crusaders quickly followed. They needed little encouragement from Duke Godfrey of Lotharingia who now urged a resumption of the journey to Jerusalem.[319]

At Tripoli, from 13 to 16 May 1099, Count Raymond made one last attempt to channel the crusade into the direction he desired. He offered gifts to the *nobiles*, that they should besiege Tripoli.[320] This elicited the stinging rebuke that took the form of another vision. According to Raymond of Aguilers, St Andrew appeared to Peter Desiderius and said to him: 'go and speak to the count as follows: do not be a plague to yourself or to others because unless Jerusalem is captured you will have no help. Let the incomplete siege of Arqah not trouble you, it is not to concern you that this city or others which are on the route are not at present captured.'[321] This vision encouraged a further mutiny, with Raymond of Aguilers reporting that the Lord sent so great a love of going to Jerusalem that no one could restrain themselves and they set out in the evening against the decrees of the princes and against the custom of the army.[322] The resumed march was enthusiastic but hard on those who could not keep up. On or around 18 May 1099 the army was near Gibel (Djebali), where those of the *debile vulgus* who had been overcome by the hardship of the journey were buried.[323] A few days later at a river bank near Sidon they found enough shade for the *debile* and *pauper vulgus* to rest.[324]

After the investment of Jerusalem (7 June 1099) the vision of an unnamed hermit gave hope that the city could be stormed, despite the lack of siege machinery. So on the night 12 June a great assault was attempted but beaten back. Thereafter the crusaders settled down to fill the town ditch and build substantial siege engines. Raymond of Aguilers reported that the Christian army at this point had no more than twelve thousand fighters, as well as many

---

[318] RA 289.
[319] RA 281 – 2.
[320] RA 282.
[321] RA 289: '*Vade et loquere comiti, dicens: Noli esse molestus tibimet, neque aliis: quia nisi prius capta fuerit Iherusalem, nullum succursum habebitis. Non te molestet inexpleta obsidio Archados; non te gravet quod haec civitas vel aliae quae in itinere sunt ad praesens non capientur.*'
[322] RA 291.
[323] AA 423.
[324] AA 425.

who were infirm and *pauperes*.[325] The work was hard and a great deal of suffering was caused by the lack of drinkable water nearby. In a very interesting comment on the differing extent of hardship on the different social classes, Albert of Aachen wrote that during the siege of Jerusalem 'a quantity of grapes and a rich supply of wine always abounded for the *primores* and for those who had the money. For the *egeni*, however, and those whose means had been exhausted, you have heard, there was even an extreme lack of water.'[326] The *iners vulgus* risked drinking bad water and many died of the swelling that resulted.[327] Guibert was disturbed by accounts of the shortages of food and water among the Christians at the siege of Jerusalem and he gave vent to his sympathy for the *viri nobiles* having to undergo the experience of eating rough bread and drinking bitter liquids. Unconsciously Guibert was highlighting the same point made more directly by Albert of Aachen, that although the nobility suffered hardship, unlike the *pauperes* they did not face death from poverty, but rather, upset stomachs.[328] During this time the castellan Achard of Montmerle left the siege of Jerusalem to contact six Christian vessels that had arrived in Jaffa on 17 June 1099; he was intercepted by some Arab soldiers and killed. Guibert's account of this reported not only the death of Achard, but also some of the most respected leaders (*honoratiores*) among the *pauperes* and the *pedites*.[329] This seems to be a clarification of the *Gesta Francorum*, in which the same incident is reported as involving the death of 'Achard of Montmerle and the *pauperes homines pedites*.'[330] The latter is a slightly ambiguous term that should probably be understood as meaning poor footsoldiers, although Guibert's separation of *pauperes* and *pedites* is a plausible amendment. If Guibert was correct he was providing valuable evidence for the continuing organisation of leadership among bands of *pauperes*.

The manufacture of great siege towers was an important feature of the siege of Jerusalem. The *Gesta Francorum* simply reported that Duke Godfrey and Count Raymond had two siege towers made. Non-Christian slaves did some of the work. The senior princes of the expedition had no qualms about selling pagan prisoners as slaves[331] and were not averse to making use of them, as Raymond of Aguilers indicated in his description of the construction of the siege towers. The men of Count Raymond had taken many fortresses and villages of the Saracens and the Saracens, as if his *servi*, were inflicted with the work, fifty or sixty of whom carried on their neck great logs that could not be brought by four pairs of oxen, to make siege

---

[325] RA 338: *Et qui de nostris ad arma valebant, in quantum nos existimabamus, numerum duodecim millia non transcendebant, sed habebamus multos debiles atque pauperes.*
[326] AA 443-4: *Vuarum copia et vini affluentia primoribus semper habundabat, et precium habentibus, egenis vero et rebus exhaustis, etiam aque ut audistis nimia erat defectio.*
[327] AA 443.
[328] GN 274.
[329] GN 273. For Achard of Montmerle see J. Riley – Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 197.
[330] GF 89: ... *Achardum de Mommellou, et pauperes homines pedites.*
[331] RA 156 – 7. RM 868, 869. For Guibert on slavery see above p. 151.

machines for Jerusalem.[332] Baldric, however, made it clear that the skilled work was done by Christian *lignarii* and *artifices*.[333] Fulcher also wrote that *artifices* were ordered to build machines of war for the siege of Jerusalem (15 June 1099).[334] From the account of the building of the same siege towers by Raymond of Aguilers it can be determined that these craftsmen were independent paid labourers rather than serfs. Everyone was working spontaneously, except for the *artifices*. To them, however, were given wages from the collections that were made among the people. But Count Raymond paid out from his own wealth what was owed to his *operarii*.[335] The urgency to have this equipment made, led the council of leaders to order those present to offer their mules and boys to the *artifices* and *lignarii* so that they could carry off tree-trunks, poles, stakes and branches for the making of wicker screens.[336] The term *operarii* seems to have been used by Raymond as synonymous with *artifices*. Not only is this evident in the first example above, but also in the report that Duke Godfrey and the counts of Normandy and Flanders placed Gaston, viscount of Béarn, over the *operarii* who were constructing machines, and they prepared wickerworks and material for ramparts for the purpose of attacking the walls. Gaston was described as dividing up the *operarii* wisely.[337] Count Raymond put William Ricau in charge of his *operarii* on Mount Zion.[338] Nothing more is known of William Ricau, but John France has observed that the name suggests that he was Genoese.[339] Sailors from Genoa, who had abandoned their ships at Jaffa, had recently reinforced the Christian army. Raymond of Aguilers states that they aided Count Raymond in the construction of siege equipment with the ropes, iron mallets, nails, axes, pick-axes and hatchets they had salvaged.[340] These skilled workers were paid, unlike the captured Saracens described above, who were put to work under the direction of the bishop of Albara.[341]

A spate of people came forward during this time, claiming to have messages from God as to how Jerusalem could be taken, but, wrote Raymond of Aguilers, they were not believed.[342] In the end it was Peter Desiderius who had the authority to determine the final direction of the crusade. Peter Desiderius claimed to have received instructions from Adhémar who urged a fast and that the whole army walk on bare feet around the besieged city. Following this an all-out assault was to take place. It is noteworthy that Peter Desiderius

---

[332] RA 333. For enslavement after the fall of Ceaserea to Baldwin I (17 May 1101) see FC II, IX, 6, (403).
[333] BD 100.
[334] FC I, XXVII, 3 (294).
[335] RA 333.
[336] RA 334.
[337] RA 331 – 2.
[338] RA 332.
[339] J. France, *Victory in the East*, p. 346.
[340] RA 337.
[341] RA 332 – 3.
[342] RA 296.

took news of this vision to his lord, Count Isoard of Die and to Adhémar's brother, William Hugh of Monteil rather than Count Raymond.[343] It seems likely that the split in the southern French contingent that took place when William Hugh returned with the Cross had continued down to Jerusalem and that the visionary had permanently aligned himself with those who led the ending of the siege of 'Arqah. They called a council on 6 July, which decided to adopt the legate's commands. Although the noisy procession must have seemed bizarre, and was indeed amusing to those within the city, it did serve a practical purpose. It united the rival factions – who had recently been quarrelling over Tancred's seizure of Bethlehem – and raised the morale of the army for the effort ahead of it.[344]

The *vulgus* made an appearance in Albert of Aachen's description of the fall of Jerusalem (15 July 1099). They were described as being let into the city once the gates had been breached, where they perpetrated slaughter with extreme cruelty.[345] The *vulgus* here are probably better understood to be a crowd of non-combatant poor rather than the common footsoldiers for whom Albert preferred the phrase *pedestre vulgus*. Once inside the city there was a scramble for the goods of the former citizens. Fulcher, not present, but a resident of the city from 9 November 1100, wrote that after such great bloodshed they entered the homes seizing whatever they found in them. Whoever had entered the home first, whether he was a poor man (*pauper*) or a rich man (*dives*), was in no way to be subject to injury by any other. Whether a house or a palace, he was to possess it and whatever he found in it was his own. They had established this law (*ius*) to be held mutually. And thus many poor (*inopes*) were made wealthy (*locupletes*).[346] William of Tyre's description of the fall of the city included the report that whoever broke into a house, he claimed it together with all its contents as a perpetual right (*ius*), for it had been agreed among them before the city was captured that once the city had been violently attacked, whatever anyone acquired, he should posses it in perpetuity and without molestation by right of ownership (*ius proprietatis*). Therefore very diligently searching through the city and most energetically taking part in the massacre of the citizens, they broke into the recesses and more hidden places of the city, fixing swords or any other kinds of weapons on the entrance of the house so they should be a sign to those who set foot there that they should avoid these places as already seized.[347] This is important testimony from a careful historian who was born in Jerusalem a generation later (c. 1130). The same sentiment reappears in Guibert's description of the sacking of the city. He reported an equality in the method of the Lord's army, so that even the poorest (*pauperrimi*) should have whatever good things came to them thereafter without doubt or challenge, whatever the

---

[343] RA 296.
[344] RA 322.
[345] AA 459 and 464.
[346] FC I, XXIX, 1 (304).
[347] WT 8. 20 (412-13).

station of the man into whose hand it should have fallen first.[348] In Baldric's version of the sacking of the city the scene appears to be more harmonious than in other sources. The houses were discovered to have been filled with all good things. They held on to these hoarded necessities and with an abundance having been discovered they were shared with the *pauperiores*.[349] Orderic Vitalis wrote an account of the First Crusade in his *Ecclesiastical History* (written between 1125 and 1141), informed by previous chronicles and returning crusaders. Orderic generally was content to follow Baldric of Dol word for word, but significantly added to the description of the fall of Jerusalem the following lines: 'Everyone freely and peacefully obtained possession of whatever house, great or small, that he first broke into and emptied of pagans, together with all the possessions inside it, and up to the present day he has retained it by hereditary right (*hereditarium ius*).'[350] This very distinct right, which by the time of the later chroniclers (Orderic and William) was considered a legal tradition accepted without question, seems to have evolved out of the practice already noted, that during the expedition it became accepted practice that whoever first obtained plunder, even if they were poor non-combatants, could not have it forcibly removed from them.[351]

After the massacre in Jerusalem the Christian leaders were faced with an immense number of bodies that needed to be carried out. Baldric's *Hierosolymitanae Historiae* had a detail concerning this, not reported elsewhere until it was incorporated into the history of William of Tyre, but which has a note of authenticity about it. Baldric wrote that the surviving pagans were ordered to take the bodies out and, because their numbers were not sufficient, the poor Christians (*pauperes Christiani*), after being given pay (*dato pretio*), engaged in the same work.[352] The report in the *Gesta Francorum* agrees that the surviving Saracens dragged out the dead bodies, but has no mention of this being insufficient and the Christian poor being paid for the same work.[353] This is possibly an authentic historical detail, but even if it is an invention by Baldric, it indicates that he considered the *pauperes* on the expedition at this point to be free from compulsory labour. The princes had to offer pay for the work. It is noteworthy in this regard that labour at the siege of Jerusalem could not be commanded, except from non-Christian captives: rather, it was voluntary or else had to be paid for.[354] Nor does it seem to be the case that after the fall of Jerusalem the Christian poor became serfs; those who stayed as settlers in the Kingdom of Jerusalem were free, rent

---

[348] GN 281.
[349] BD 103.
[350] OV 5, 172: *Unusquisque domum qualemcumque magnam seu paruam quam primitus inuasit, ac ethnicis euacuauit; quietam sibi cum omnibus gazis quae intus erant libere possedit, et usque hodie hereditario iure custodit.*
[351] See above pp. 208, 216 – 17, 224.
[352] BD 103, WT 8.24 (417).
[353] GF 92.
[354] GF 91, RA 333.

paying, farmers. As Joshua Prawer concluded in his study of charter evidence, 'with rare exceptions there was no *terra dominicata*, no lordly demesne in the Crusader Kingdom. There is no reason to accuse our documentation. Dozens of villages are minutely described, but the demesne is conspicuous by its absence.'[355]

The payment of the *pauperes* for their work in the siege and in particular the manner in which property was distributed on the fall of Jerusalem is testimony to the political strength of the *pauperes* in the later stages of the crusade. For the *milites* the conquest of Jerusalem meant the fulfilment of their vows. For some, a minority in the service of Godfrey of Bouillon, it meant the establishment of a state in which they could be property holders. However the majority of knights subsequently returned to Europe or served in the followings of Bohemond, Raymond and Baldwin. For the *pauperes* who had come on the expedition as emigrants, however, the question of property was a vital one to their future status. It is no wonder that they made reference to a 'right of ownership'. In addition to any religious motivations for a massacre of the inhabitants of the city, such as those expressed by Raymond of Aguilers,[356] the *pauperes* had a powerful material incentive: the previous inhabitants had to be eliminated, for this was to be their new home.

Robert the Monk articulated his admiration for the position of the *pauperes* who had travelled so far and undergone so much hardship with reference to the Old Testament. 'Then [Jerusalem] enriched her *sons*, *coming from afar* [Isa 60:4], so that no one in her remained a *pauper*.'[357] This passage is more theological and literary than historical, although the information it conveys is consistent with other sources, which indicate that the *pauperes* gained considerable property on the fall of Jerusalem. But its main message, by association with chapter 60 of Isaiah, was that the journey of the *pauperes* had culminated in a glorious conclusion and that they had obtained their just reward.

The early crusading sources were not generally sympathetic to the lower social orders. But their evidence is sufficient to show that the *pauperes* on the First Crusade were not simply a passive body awaiting alms and military success from the *milites*. The crisis at Antioch as the 'rope-dancers' fled the city impelled them to find their voice. Given the inappropriateness of a member of the *pauperes* attempting to command senior princes directly, the political demands of the *pauperes* were cloaked in the respectable and orthodox language of visions. Often historians have removed from its political context the fervour with which the visions at Antioch were greeted, making the visionaries and their supporters appear irrational. But the outcry in support of the finding of the Holy Lance was an opportunity for

---

[355] J. Prawer, *Crusader Institutions,* (Oxford, 1980) p. 141.
[356] RA 346 - 8.
[357] RM 868: *Tunc quippe filios suos, de longe ad se venientes, ita ditavit quia nullus in ea pauper remansit.*

the crowds to bring pressure to bear on the knights to come to battle while there was still hope of victory. Thereafter the presence of the *pauperes* as an active, creative, force in the direction of the expedition was constant, surging up in alliance with the Norman contingent and the large numbers of knights who were not tightly bound into the following of a senior prince to force the movement onwards, firstly from Antioch itself, then Ma'arat-an-Numan, Jabala, 'Arqah, and Tripoli. No account of the First Crusade that ignores this pressure from below can be considered a full one. Even at the culmination of the expedition, the fall of Jerusalem, the political momentum of the poor was visible in the fact that their property rights were respected, albeit at the cost of the lives of the local inhabitants.

II.2. The terms *milites*, *equites* and *equestres* in the early crusading histories.

There is a considerable literature on the question of 'knighthood' in the eleventh century, particularly with regard to various debates on the nature and evolution of the knightly class and whether, indeed, it is correct to see knights as forming a class. While the discussions have been widespread, it seems to be the case that European continental scholarship has had the most concentrated focus on the question of knighthood around the year 1100.[1] The incontestable spread of the use of the term *milites* from the ninth to the thirteenth centuries, so that it came to be applied to emperors, kings and princes as well as less distinguished soldiers, has created a debate of a very important and wide ranging nature. A typical topic of this debate would be the issue of whether the change in the usage of *milites* was a reflection of the growth of a rising social class of knights from lowly soldiers into an aristocracy, or whether the sources are indicating not so much change in material social conditions but an ideological change in the concept of knighthood and the evolution of the term *milites*.[2] In other words, was the change in the usage of *milites* sociological or philological? Or, if there was an interaction between the two, what was its nature?

Such questions are wide-ranging and complex. They are not the subject matter of this dissertation, deserving dissertation length investigation in their own right. This study of the social vocabulary of the early crusading sources can, however, at least shed some light on the usage of the term *milites* for this particular group of historians. Two closely related themes arise from an examination of the use of the term *milites* by the early crusading authors; did these historians understand the *miles* to be a member of a certain social rank? Was that rank one of nobility? Or did they employ the term to indicate a person performing a particular

---

[1] G. Duby, *La Société aux XI^e et XII^e siècles dans la région mâconnaise* (Paris, 1953). A. Borst, 'Das Ritterum im Hochmittelalter. Idee und Wirklichkeit,' *Saeculum 10* (1959), pp. 213 –231; J. M. van Winter, *Ridderschap. Ideal en werkelijkheit* (Bussum, 1965); G. Duby, 'Les Origines de la chevalerie,' *Ordinamenti militari in occidente nell'alto medioevo*, 2 (Spoleto, 1968) reprinted in G. Duby, *Hommes et Structures du Moyen Âge* (Paris, 1973), pp. 325 – 41; G. Duby, 'La Noblesse dans la France médiévale. Une enquête à poursuivre,' *Revue Hisorique* 226 (1961), pp. 1 – 22 reprinted in G. Duby, *Hommes et structures*, pp. 145 – 66. P. van Luyn, 'Les *milites* dans la France du XI^e siècle. Examen des sources narratives,' *Le Moyen Âge* 77 (1971), pp. 5 – 51; 193 – 238; J. Johrendt, *Milites und Militia im 11. Jahrhundert. Untersuchung zur Frühgeschichte des Rittertums in Frankreich und Deutschland* (unpublished PhD. dissertation: Erlangen-Nürnberg, 1971); J. Fleckenstein, 'Zum Problem der Abschliessung des Ritterstandes,' *Historische Forschungen für Walter Schlesinger*, ed. H. Beumann (Köln, 1974), pp. 252 – 71; J. Bumke, *Studien zum Ritterbegriff im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert* (Heidelberg, 1977) translated as *The Concept of Knighthood in the Middle Ages* (New York, 1982). Sections from some of these articles are to be found in A. Borst ed. *Das Rittertum im Mittelalter* (Darmstadt, 1976), G. Duby's key articles in full are reprinted in *Hommes et Structures du Moyen Âge* (Paris, 1973) translated as *The Chivalrous Society* (Berkeley, 1977).

[2] See J. Bumke, *The Concept of Knighthood*, p. 77.

function, a soldier? Secondly, the sources reflect a major concern among the *milites* of the First Crusade for their horses. All the historians comment on the loss of horses during periods of hardship during the First Crusade and many state that because of this there were *milites* who became *pedites*. This warrants close examination. Were they reporting a loss of social status or a change in military function?

Before examining these issues a preliminary investigation is necessary concerning the terms *equites* and *equestres*. Were they synonymous with the term *milites* for the early crusading sources? The term *equestres* was used above all by the most consciously classicist author, Guibert of Nogent. At issue is whether Guibert was using the term to indicate *milites* or a broader body of mounted soldiers. Among the passages in which Guibert used the term was the report that many *equestres viri* died during the harsh passage of the First Crusade through the desert terrain of Anatolia in July 1097.[3] Here Guibert was making a minor alteration to a passage in his *fons formalis*, the *Gesta Francorum*, which referred to *milites*.[4] This was the important passage discussed below in which the anonymous author of the *Gesta Francorum* described *milites* becoming *pedites* through the loss of their horses.[5] Guibert used this information about knights becoming footsoldiers for his description of a later part of the difficult journey through Anatolia, after the expedition had passed through Coxon (October 1097). In Guibert's account hardship converted *equestres* into *pedites*.[6] These two examples suggest that Guibert saw the term *equestres* as interchangeable with *milites*. In his dispute with the chaplain and historian Fulcher of Chartres over the numbers that participated on the First Crusade, Guibert wrote that the entire Christian force could not have been 6,000,000 as he believed there to be scarcely 100,000 fully equipped *equestres* at the first assault on Nicea (April 1097).[7] Here the term was evidently being used by Guibert to cover a body of knights who were not simply riders, as they were attempting to storm a city. Fulcher of Chartres also used the term *equestres*, but only once, in 1118, for those knights in the company of Baldwin I at the Nile near al-Faramā', where they were described as skilfully using their lances to spear fish.[8] The context makes it clear that these *equestres* were not simply riders, as Fulcher considered the term appropriate to them even while they were described as on foot and fishing. The evidence for seeing *equestres* and *milites* as synonymous in the work of both Guibert and Fulcher is therefore strong.

A similar question arises over the term *equites*, which appears in all the early crusading sources other than the *Gesta Francorum* and its close variant the *Historia de*

---

[3] GN 161.
[4] GF 23.
[5] See below 251 -2.
[6] GN 168.
[7] GN 344.
[8] FC II, LXIV, 1 (610).

Hierosolymitano Itinere of Peter Tudebode. There are several clear examples of the interchange of the terms *milites* and *equites* within the individual works as well as examples of the substitution of *equites* for *milites* by later writers in their version of passages in the *Gesta Francorum*. Fulcher of Chartres generally used the phrase *equites* and *pedites* to refer to the entirety of an army.[9] In describing an expedition of King Baldwin II in 1125, Fulcher initially referred to the *equites* of the king and soon after the same body of knights was termed *milites*.[10] Guibert of Nogent shared with Fulcher the phrasing *equites* and *pedites* to indicate a typical body of fighting men.[11] Three examples in the *Gesta Dei per Francos* show that Guibert considered *equites* and *milites* to be interchangeable. In mid June, 1098, the Byzantine emperor, Alexius I Comnenus, turned back from his march towards Antioch having been brought the news, by Stephen of Blois amongst others, that the rest of the expedition was doomed. Guibert described how the *milites* accepted the order to turn back, he then added that the *pedites* could not keep up with these swift *equites* on the retreat.[12] The second example of the interchange of *milites* and *equites* appears in a passage concerning the expedition to Jaffa of Raymond Pilet during the siege of Jerusalem in mid-June 1099. Raymond Pilet, together with two other *proceres*, was described as taking 100 *equites* from the army of his lord, the count of Saint-Giles; soon after 30 of these *equites* left the main body and were referred to by Guibert as *milites*.[13] Thirdly, Gervase of Bazoches was referred to as both an *eques* and a *miles*.[14] A comparison with the anonymous *Gesta Francorum* also shows Guibert using the term *equites* for the Anonymous's *milites*. The *Gesta Francorum* has a passage in which the Turkish emir of Mosul, Kerbogha, offered to make *milites* from the *pedites* of the Christian forces facing him in Antioch (27 June 1098).[15] In Guibert's version Kerbogha offered to make *equites*.[16] The work of Robert the Monk reveals the same type of substitutions in his reworking of the *Gesta Francorum*. In his account of the journey through the desert after the battle of Dorylaeum (1 July 1097) Robert wrote that 'there died the greater part of our horses, and many who previously had been *equites* became *pedites*.'[17] The *Gesta*

---

[9] FC I, III, 4 (134); I, VIII, 6 (172 –3); I, XI, 5 (193); I, XXI, 3 (249); I, XXXI, 7 (315); I, XXXIII, 8 (328); II, II, 6 (364); II, XV, 1 (425); II, XVI, 3 (431); II, XXXI, 1 (490); II, XXXI, 11 (493); II, XXXII, 11 (500); III, II, 1 (618); III, XI, 2 (647 – 8); III, XXXI, 1 (722); III, XXXI, 4 (725); III, L, 12 (791); III, L, 15 (793).
[10] FC III, XLVI 2 and 3 (773).
[11] GN 135; 137; 164; 171; 185; 231 – 2; 239; 293 – 4; 336; 345.
[12] GN 231 – 2.
[13] GN 272 – 3.
[14] GN 349 (*miles*); 350 (*eques*). For Gervase of Bazoches see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem* (Oxford, 2000), pp 201 – 2.
[15] GF 67. See below p. 252.
[16] GN 236.
[17] RM 766: *Ibi mortua fuit major pars equorum, et multi qui prius equites* [*milites* in three ms. variations] *exstiterant pedites effecti sunt.*

Francorum has a near identical account, but used the term *milites*.[18] Robert also wrote that when Bohemond and Robert decided to lead a foraging expedition from the siege of Antioch, around Christmas 1097, they picked out thirty thousand *equites et pedites*.[19] The *Gesta Francorum* referred to twenty thousand *milites et pedites* for the same expedition.[20]

Baldric of Dol used the term *equites* rather than *milites* in connection with the battle between the Christian forces and Kerbogha (28 June 1098) and subsequently only on one other occasion.[21] The account of the battle with Kerbogha was embellished by Baldric with many poetic details. A consciously literary context is probably the reason why Baldric preferred the classical term for an order of horsemen, *equites*, to that used for the same scenes in the *Gesta Francorum*, *milites*. Raymond of Aguilers' preferred term for knights was *milites*, but on five occasions he used the alternative, *equites*. Two of these instances were simply a result of stylistic considerations, the chronicler preferring not to repeat himself when he wished to use a noun for knight twice in the same sentence. Thus Raymond reported a speech of Tancred in which the Norman prince pointed out that that while there had once been a hundred thousand *equites* in the Christian forces now hardly a thousand *milites* remained.[22] Later the historian wrote of there being an increase in the garrison of Albara from seven *milites* to sixty *equites*.[23] For Raymond of Aguilers it is unlikely that the use of the term *equites* was shaped by classical authors, of whom he showed little awareness. His influences in choosing to use the term were likely to be biblical.[24] In the Vulgate the term *equites* is used approximately twice as often as *milites* and it might well be that Raymond of Aguilers found it the more appropriate of the terms when he reported a certain vision of divine aid. This miracle took the form of two *equites* who were said to have appeared before the Christian forces at the battle of Dorylaeum (1 July 1097).[25]

As there are no examples where the terms *equestres*, *equites* and *milites* are juxtaposed to suggest they carry different meanings, but several where they are used synonymously, it seems reasonable to conclude that for these authors the terms were being applied to the same category of person. This was also the conclusion of Pierre van Luyn in his study of eleventh century narrative sources, which included the early French crusading sources.[26]

---

[18] GF 23: *Illic fuit mortua maxima pars nostrorum equorum, eo quod multi ex nostris militibus remanserunt pedites.*
[19] RM 778
[20] GF 30.
[21] BD 75, 76, 78, 86.
[22] RA 190.
[23] RA 193.
[24] See above p. 32.
[25] RA 25 - 6.
[26] P. van Luyn, 'Les *milites* dans la France du XI^{e} siècle', pp. 20 – 1.

Did the early crusading sources use the term *miles* to refer to riders, soldiers, or nobles? Were they consistent in their use of the term or did it have a broad enough range of meaning for it to be applied in several different senses? Joachim Bumke's summary of his chronologically and geographically wide ranging study of the terms *miles*, *chevalier* and *Ritter* was that 'at times it was the military, the social, the religious, the ideological or the hierarchical meaning of the word which was most prominent. For the most part they ran parallel to one another and it is fair to assume that there was mutual influence and that they overlapped.'[27] This, 'multiple-meaning', view was followed by Verona Epp in her study of Fulcher of Chartres and, consciously following Epp, by Carol Sweetenham in her translation of Robert the Monk.[28] Undisputable as Bumke's conclusion is for a period of several centuries and across a great extent of Western Europe, the work of an individual author, or those closely linked by subject matter and chronology, might yield a more restricted and consistent meaning. A study of the use of the term *milites* and its equivalents in the early crusading sources reveals, in fact, that they gravitated towards an understanding of the term that included a social sense to it. In other words, in the main, they were writing about 'knights' rather than 'soldiers' or 'cavalry'.

Verena Epp is the only historian to have conducted a very close analysis of the social vocabulary of one of the early crusading historians, namely that of Fulcher of Charters. In her study of Fulcher's use of the term *milites* she concluded that the term was used almost equally in a functional sense, for soldiers, as well as in a social sense, for noble knights.[29] For her a key passage was one in which Fulcher lamented for the loss of many '*nobiles* and *probi milites*,' at the second battle of Ramleh (17 May 1102).[30] Epp observes of this passage that it implies there were other losses of non-noble *milites*.[31] This is a possibility, but it might also simply have been that Fulcher was trying to emphasise the loss of several senior princes. In other words his intended distinction might not have been between noble and non-noble *milites* but between *milites* and very distinguished princes, all of whom were noble. That this was Fulcher's intended meaning is suggested by the fact that immediately after his general lament he recorded the deaths of Count Stephen of Blois, a *vir prudens et nobilis* and Count Stephen of Burgundy.[32] Epp also made a similar point in regard to a second instance in which Fulcher referred to *milites nobiles*.[33] The passage in question is Fulcher's account of the march of Baldwin of Edessa and Bohemond of Antioch to Jerusalem in the autumn of 1099. Fulcher, who was present, wrote that 'you would see *milites nobiles*, having lost their horses in some

---

[27] J. Bumke, *The Concept of Knighthood*, p. 155.
[28] V. Epp, *Fulcher von Chartres*, p. 251. C. Sweetenham, see below p. 245.
[29] V. Epp, *Fulcher von Chartres*, p. 251.
[30] FC II, XIX, 4 (443).
[31] V. Epp, *Fulcher von Chartres*, p. 257.
[32] FC II, XIX, 4 (443).
[33] V. Epp, *Fulcher von Chartres*, p. 256.

way, become *pedites*.'[34] Epp's understanding of this passage is that by reporting the loss of status of the noble knights, Fulcher therefore implied the existence of non-noble knights. Again this is a possible interpretation, but equally the Latin does not preclude the interpretation that through his application of the adjective *nobiles* to the *milites*, Fulcher was emphasising how painful the loss of status was for certain particularly distinguished *milites*. Fulcher's first, 1105, redaction shows that he was writing in this spirit as he referred to *milites progenie inclyti*, 'knights, illustrious by their ancestry' becoming *pedites*.[35] If Fulcher's intended meaning in these two passages is uncertain, there is one clear example where Fulcher does distinguish between the different status of those within a body of cavalry, and here it is clear that he was not using the schema suggested by Epp, of noble and non-noble *milites*. When the army of Jerusalem marched out to meet an invasion by al-Afdal, vizier of Cairo (27 August 1105), Fulcher, an eyewitness, wrote that 'there were 500 of our *milites*, excepting those, who although riding, were not counted with the name of a soldier.'[36] Heinrich Hagenmeyer discussed the unusual phrase *qui militari nomine non censebantur*, making the likely suggestion that Fulcher was drawing a distinction between those of noble birth, who were counted as *milites* and the others, who were perhaps squires.[37] Even if Hagenmeyer's view is not accepted, this passage does show that Fulcher did not extend his use of the term *milites* down a social or military scale beyond a certain point. They were a group apart, in some sense other than riding horses. It remains to be shown that this was a social division and not simply a division according to the quality of their military equipment.

It is clear that Fulcher at times considered some bodies of *milites* to be members of a distinct social order, that is, a knightly class. Those passages in which Fulcher referred to *milites nobiles* discussed above are important in this regard, whether Epp's understanding of them is accepted or not. Two other passages deserve consideration here. In Fulcher's account of Pope Urban II's speech at Clermont he described the pope as asking his audience to urge 'everyone of whatever *ordo*, whether *equites* or *pedites*, *divites* or *pauperes*' to join the expedition.[38] Here Fulcher made it clear that he understood the division between knight and footsoldier to mirror that of rich and poor, suggesting that *ordo* was not a matter of function, 'cavalry' and the footsoldiers, but of social rank, 'knights' and footsoldiers. Fulcher wrote an even clearer passage for indicating that he considered the position of a *miles* to be a social rank. Soon after the death of Nūr-ad-Daulah Belek, emir of Aleppo (5 May 1124) in battle with Joscelin of Courtenay, count of Edessa, a messenger came to the army of Pons, count of

---

[34] FC I, XXXIII, 13 (331): *Videretis milites nobiles, equis quoquomodo amissis, pedites effici.*
[35] FC I, XXXIII, 13 (331 d).
[36] FC II, XXXII, 3 (496): *Milites erant D, exceptis illis, qui militari nomine non censebantur, tamen equitantes.*
[37] FC 496 n. 9.
[38] FC I, III, 4 (134): *Cunctis cuiuslibet ordinis tam equitibus quam peditibus, tam divitibus quam pauperibus ...*

Tripoli,[39] with the head of Belek to proclaim the news. Fulcher reported that this messenger was the *armiger* of Joscelin 'and since he had brought this most greatly desired news to our army standing before Tyre, having received the arms of a *miles*, he was advanced (*provectus est*) from *armiger* to *miles*. Indeed it was the Count of Tripoli who raised him (*sublimavit*) to this rank (*gradus*).'[40] Here there is no doubt that for Fulcher to become a *miles* was not only to receive the appropriate arms but also a promotion in status.

Does the description, discussed above, of *milites* becoming *pedites* due to the loss of their horses contradict the view that Fulcher saw the *milites* as being of a certain social status? Fulcher made it clear that the change was a temporary one in his description of the very many *milites* who were in Joppa in May 1102 awaiting to cross to France. These *milites* had no horses because they had lost everything in Anatolia, on their way to Jerusalem (a reference to the Crusade of 1101).[41] For this large body of *milites* in Joppa, no longer part of a campaigning army, their lack of horses did not mean they were termed *pedites*. Fulcher went on to report that many of them, including the very senior nobles Geoffrey I Jordan, count of Vendôme, Stephen, count of Burgundy and Hugh VI of Lusignan, borrowed horses in order to fight in the second battle of Ramleh (17 May 1102).[42] The fact that this body of soldiers were termed *milites* whilst awaiting return on foot to France and the inclusion of senior princes in the category does make their social status evident here.

Many other appearances of the term *milites* in Fulcher's work are statements that describe the military activities of Christian knights but contain no social information.[43] Verena Epp's analysis of Fulcher's use of the term *milites* found that approximately half the terms were associated with a social dimension and of the other uses of the term *milites*, she found it to be equally often used for a soldier in general and for a mounted soldier.[44] As Epp herself observed, however, for Fulcher the functional and social sense of the term *milites* frequently overlaps and it would perhaps be imposing an artificial distinction to assume that in such examples he intended to convey the meaning 'soldiers' rather than 'knights.'[45] Overall it does seem to be the case that Fulcher used the term *milites* for 'knights' and understood that

---

[39] Pons of Tripoli (c.1098 - 1137), son of Bertrand of Tripoli and count of Tripoli from 1112 to 1137.
[40] FC III, XXXI, 7 (726): *Et quia nuntium attulit desiderantissimum in exercitu nostro ante Tyrum astante, acceptis armis ab armigero in militem provectus est. Comes nempe Tripolitanus ad hunc gradum eum sublimavit.*
[41] FC II, XV, 6 (427 - 8).
[42] FC II, XVIII, 4 (437 – 8). For these princes see J. Riley-Smith, *The First Crusaders 1095-1131* (Cambridge, 1997), p. 207 (Geoffrey); p. 222 (Stephen) and p. 213 (Hugh).
[43] FC I, XVII, 5 (233); I, XXIV, 10 (263); I, XXVII, 6 (296); I, XXXI, 5 (314); II, II, 3 (359); II, II, 5 (361); II, III, 2 (363); II, VI, 9 (389); II, IX, 2 (402); II, XI, 2 (408); II, XI, 14 (414); II, XVIII, 7 (440); II, XXXII, 2 (495); II, XXXII, 3 (496); II, XXXVII, 3 (517); II, XLIII, 4 (540); II, XLV, 8 (556); II, XLVI, 3 (560); II, XLIX, 5 (569); III, XXVIII, 4 (698); III, XXXI, 4 (725); III, XLIV, 4 (769); III, L, 8 (789).
[44] V. Epp, *Fulcher von Chartres*, p. 251.
[45] V. Epp, *Fulcher von Chartres*, p. 251.

it had a distinct social aspect to it, *milites* were not simply soldiers or mounted soldiers but were of a distinct *ordo* or *gradus*.

The anonymous author of the *Gesta Francorum* had a great deal to say about the relationship between a *miles* and his horse, but he was not given to generalisations of a social nature. One passage worth noting with regard to whether *milites* were noble in the *Gesta Francorum* occurs during the course of a discussion of the fighting qualities of the Turkish *milites*: 'They say of themselves that they are of Frankish extraction and because of that no men ought by nature to be *milites*, except the Franks and themselves.'[46] Contained in this comment is the view that to be a *miles* is a condition that is related to birth. The content of the passage does not, however, stretch to the implication that all *milites* are of high birth as clearly not all Franks are nobles. Nevertheless the connection between *generatio* and *miles* was in the author's mind and this is of interest as a tentative step in the direction of seeing the status of a *miles* as one that is inherited. For a greater understanding of the nature of the *milites* on the First Crusade, the work of the northern French historians who, some ten years later, rewrote the *Gesta Francorum*, has to be examined.

In the introduction to her English translation of Robert the Monk's *Historia Iherosolimitana*, Carol Sweetenham noted that 'Robert's use of the term *miles* is fluid; in this he mirrors his contemporaries such as Fulcher. *Miles* can mean variously a soldier, a vassal, a Christian soldier or a knight.'[47] There are several individuals given the epithet *miles* by Robert the Monk. Walter Sanzavohir, a leader of one of the contingents of the People's Crusade was a *miles egregius*;[48] Duke Robert of Normandy a *miles animosus* and *miles interritus*;[49] Fulcher of Chartres, first on to the walls of Antioch, a *miles*;[50] Guy of Hauteville, half-brother of Bohemond a *miles*,[51] Bohemond himself, *miles* and *animosus miles*;[52] Raymond Pilet a *miles*;[53] Gouffier of Lastours, *miles honestus*,[54] and Letold of Tournai, a *miles*.[55] Robert did not name a certain Armenian lord, who was appointed ruler of a castle between Mamistra and Caesarea, although the *Gesta* referred to him as Symeon. While the author of the *Gesta* simply called Symeon 'a man', Robert described him as a *miles fortis et*

---

[46] GF 21: *Verumtamen dicunt se esse de Francorum generatione, et quia nullus homo naturaliter debet esse miles nisi Franci et illi.*
[47] C. Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade*, p. 71.
[48] RM 735.
[49] RM 760, 875.
[50] RM 799. Fulcher of Chartres the *miles* is not to be confused with the chronicler of the same name. See C. Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade*, p. 145 n. 24.
[51] RM 816.
[52] RM 817, 741.
[53] RM 838, 844. For Raymond Pilet see J. Riley-Smith, *The First Crusaders*, p. 220.
[54] RM 847. For Gouffier of Lastours see see J. Riley-Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 209.
[55] RM 867. For Letold of Tournai see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem* (Oxford, 2000), p. 216.

strenuus.[56] Peter of Aups was described as a *miles* by both the *Gesta* and Robert.[57] The Byzantine envoy Tatikios together with William Carpenter was called a *miles* and *dives*.[58] With the one exception of Raymond Pilet, Carol Sweetenham has preferred to translate all these terms as 'soldier.' This seems to be overly cautious, as all of those described as *miles*, with the possible exceptions of the Armenian Symeon and Byzantine Tatikios, clearly held a distinct social position, a very senior one in the case of Robert of Normandy and Bohemond. To portray Robert the Monk as intending the meaning 'soldier' rather than 'knight' in these cases risks losing information concerning the term *milites*.

The passages in the *Historia* in which Robert was making a theological point are those that seem to use the term *milites* for soldiers in a broad sense rather than knights in particular. A very interesting passage in this regard occurs in Robert's report of a speech of Bohemond at Constantinople, a speech that is not in the *Gesta Francorum*. Bohemond is described as being tearful with delight that so many *consules*, *duces* and *optimates* are at the city to meet him. He opened his address to these senior nobles by calling them '*bellatores Dei*.'[59] Later he declaimed, 'O *ordo* of *milites*, now three and four times blessed! You who up to these times were polluted by the blood of murder, are now through the sweat of the saints equal to the martyrs.'[60] In a metaphorical language, Robert was making the point that the expedition to Jerusalem gave a soldier the opportunity to earn a heavenly reward through the same activity that formerly condemned him. The occurrence of *bellatores* and *ordo* in the same passage makes it clear that at this point Robert was writing within the functional framework of the 'three orders.'[61] His theological message was aimed at the broad category of 'those who fight' from emperor to poor footsoldier. Because of this context it would probably be inaccurate to narrow down those *milites* being addressed to the category of knights. The sense of *ordo* here is not one of hierarchy; Sweetenham in her translation also preferred 'soldiers' to 'knights' at this point.[62] A similar observation can be made for Baldric of Dol's reworking of the *Gesta Francorum*. Baldric used the term *miles* in a passage with a curious division of the Christian forces present at the siege of Antioch. When the knights departed from the Christian camp to fight the 'Lake Battle' (9 February 1098), Baldric wrote that everyone became anxious. 'No one was confident in themselves, neither the *sacerdos*, nor the

---

[56] RM 768, GF 25.
[57] RM 769. GF 25. For Peter of Aups see C. Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk's History*, p. 117 n. 52.
[58] RM 782. For William Carpenter see J. Riley-Smith, *The First Crusaders*, p. 226.
[59] RM 747.
[60] RM 748: *O ordo militum, nunc terque quaterque beatus! Qui huc usque fuisti homicidii sanguine deturpatus, nunc sanctorum sudoribus compar martyrum.*
[61] On the 'three orders' see Georges Duby, *The Three Orders, Feudal Society Imagined,* (London, 1980).
[62] C. Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk's History*, p. 98.

woman, nor the *populus*, nor the *miles*.'[63] There is an echo here of the famous three orders based on function, with *miles* here almost certainly standing for a soldier in general rather than a knight in particular. So for Robert the Monk and Baldric of Dol, Benedictine monks of northern France, *milites* were not necessarily a distinct social grouping of 'knights', particularly when they used the term in the context of a schema of society that ordered people by their function.

For Guibert of Nogent, however, although sharing a similar background to Robert and Baldric, the use of the term *milites* is very different. Not least because Guibert's rich social vocabulary and acute awareness of social division led him to echo a classical hierarchical ordering of society rather the simple functional division of orders.[64] Guibert used the terms *milites, equites*, and *equestres* for 'knights' of a distinct social class and not simply mounted soldiers. This is particularly evident from the three appearances of the phrase *ordo equestris* in the *Gesta Dei Per Francos*, although J. Bumke has pointed out that such a phrase is not necessarily a 'star witness' for the case that *equestres* or *milites* formed a knightly class.[65] Bumke argued that as the phrase *ordo equestris* or *ordo militaris* often appears in the works of writers consciously emulating Cicero, it might better reflect the transmission of classical language than the actual sociological formation of a class of knights. Certainly Guibert's work contained a certain amount of Ciceronian imagery.[66] His three uses of the phrase *ordo equestris* can be seen as echoes of Ciceronian history, but they are not simply rhetorical flourishes. Guibert's description of how before the expedition the *ordo equestris* were engaged in mutual slaughter with the *vulgus* had a real content.[67] Social discontent and the Truce of God were major themes of Urban II at the Council of Clermont (18 – 28 November 1095).[68] Guibert was very conscious of the depredations against the poor made by certain knights known to him.[69] Guibert was using his classical vocabulary to comment on a genuine sociological issue of his day, the conflict between knights and commoners. The other two examples of the phrase were introductions by Guibert to specific figures: Raymond Pilet was described as a *vir equestris ordinis* among the *primores* of Count Raymond[70] and an unnamed 'knight' who appeared in a colourful anecdote as joining the expedition to rid himself of the devil, was again a *vir equestris ordinis*.[71] The imagery is evocative of the

---

[63] BD 46: *Neuter de se confidebat, nec sacerdos, nec mulier; nec populus, nec miles.*
[64] See above Chapter I.7.
[65] J. Bumke, *The Concept of Knighthood*, p. 110.
[66] GN 100, 121, 206, 298, 308, 319.
[67] GN 87.
[68] R. Somerville, *The Councils of Urban II, 1, Decreta Claromontensia* (Amsterdam, 1972).
[69] GN 179.
[70] GN 244. For Raymond Pilet see n. 53.
[71] GN 324. This person was later described as a *miles*, he was the owner of a horse, his brother died in combat and he was approached by the devil in the guise of an *eques* with a falcon on his hand. See below p. 249.

ancient Roman order of knights,[72] but if the sentences meant anything at all to Guibert and his contemporaries, it was surely that that Raymond Pilet and the anonymous figure belonged to a current social *ordo* of knights. Nor was Guibert referring to the so-called 'open'[73] *ordo* of *bellatores* from the functional tripartite schema of those who pray, those who work and those who fight. By analogy with Roman social order, Guibert here was referring to an *ordo* with a distinct position in the social hierarchy.[74] Of all the early crusading authors Guibert had the most refined sense of social hierarchy, reflected in particular in his use of the term *mediocres*.[75] Indeed Guibert indicated that stratification existed among the class of *equestres* with his use of the highly original phrase, *mediocritates equestrium virorum*, the 'middle ranks of knights'. The context of this improvisation by Guibert was his observation that after Pope Urban II had preached the *iter Dei* at the Council of Clermont, 'the will of counts palatine was aroused and the middle ranks of *equestres* besides had come to the brink [of departure].'[76] The distinction made here indicates that Guibert considered that senior nobles were part of the order of *equestres*, but so too were *equestres* of more modest means. To emphasise how the whole of that order, great and lesser, desired to join the expedition he coined a unique phrase. Further evidence that Guibert's social schema for the First Crusade was a pyramid-like hierarchy arises from his observation that a multitude of the *mediocres principes* joined the expedition. These 'middling princes' were defined by Guibert as the owners of one, two, three or four towns and were present in sufficient numbers to draw comparisons with the siege of Troy.[77] Guibert might well have coined the highly unusual phrase *mediocres principes* to assist his description of the Christian forces. At the top were the handful of senior princes, below them a large number of others encompassed by the term *princeps*, but of more modest means, being the lords of between one and four towns. Below these were the *milites*. All these groupings were encompassed within the category *equestris ordo*.

In describing the forces that accompanied Bohemond from Apulia, Guibert wrote that in his following were many *equestres* of the highest probity (*virorum probitas*).[78] Again the term *equestres* here clearly has a social content. Similarly in Guibert's report of the departure of the Crusade of 1101 he noted the presence of 'so many battalions of *equestres* of

---

[72] About which in Cicero's time see R. Syme, *The Roman Revolution*, (Oxford, 1939), pp. 13 –14.
[73] On 'open' orders, that is those without a barrier created by the need for distinguished birth, see J. Fleckenstein, 'Zum Problem der Abschliessung des Ritterstandes,' in *Historische Forschungen für Walter Schlesinger*, H. Beumann ed. (Köln, 1974), pp. 264 –5.
[74] Roman hierarchy, for classes in particular see Livy, *Ab Urbe Condita,*ed. B. O. Foster (Cambridge, Mass., 1976) 1.42 – 3. See also R. Syme, *The Roman Revolution*, (Oxford, 1939), *passim*.
[75] See above p. 158 - 9.
[76] GN 118: *Iam Palatinorum comitum pruriebat intentio, et mediocritas equestrium virorum parturire iam coeperat.* For *comites Palatinorum* see above p. 171.
[77] GN 133.
[78] GN 138.

considerable reputation (*non contemnendi nominis*).'[79] Two individuals termed 'knight' by Guibert were specifically praised as noble as a result of birth. It has been noted that Guibert described Gervase of Bazoches as an *eques* and a *miles*. Guibert described Gervase as an *eques* 'of famous descent' (*nobiliter oriundus*). Gervase was related to the lords of Milly in the Beauvaisis, was a senior member of the entourage of Baldwin I and was made lord of Tiberias in 1106.[80] A more significant example is that of Guibert's friend Matthew, who was described as being an *equester* of noble birth (*genere nobilis*);[81] Matthew was not a particularly senior *eques* as Guibert informs us that Matthew's parents owed homage to Guibert's.[82] Between them these examples indicate that Guibert considered nobility was associated with family and that it extended down the social scale as far as otherwise undistinguished *milites* and *equites*. The fact that Guibert saw the whole body of *milites* on the First Crusade as noble is strengthened by consideration of his description of the moment the entire Christian fighting force gathered at Nicea (June 1097). Guibert wrote that those present wearing the arms of *equestres* were the 'flower of the nobility' (*flos nobilitatis*) of the Franks.[83]

It is worth noting the story in the *Gesta Dei Per Francos* of the devil who appeared to the unnamed knight mentioned above. Guibert's description of the devil reads: 'Indeed he appeared as an *eques*, holding a sparrow-hawk in his hand.'[84] The hunting bird as an accoutrement of the *eques* is important here. As Albert of Aachen noted, such birds were beloved 'of the highest *nobiles*.'[85] Although Guibert's story here is a miraculous and edifying anecdote it does provide evidence linking the term *eques* to a noble class with a distinct culture and not simply a soldier on a horse.

The work of Guibert of Nogent therefore provides the strongest evidence that the *milites* of the First Crusade were a social as well as a military grouping. By contrast there is one passage in the work of Albert of Aachen that suggests that for him there was a distinction between *milites* and *nobiles*. Albert described Duke Godfrey of Lotharingia reacting to the outbreak of plague in Antioch (August 1098) by remembering his experience in Italy while with King Henry IV when 'in the pestilential month of August 500 very brave *milites* and many *nobiles* had died [in Rome].'[86] The incident was presumably that of 1083, where

---

[79] GN 312.
[80] See above n. 14.
[81] GN 198.
[82] GN 198.
[83] GN 147.
[84] GN 324: *Videbatur etiam et ipse eques, accipitrem manu gestans.*
[85] AA 200: *...gratissime procerum nobilium.*
[86] AA 389: *In pestifero mense Augusto quingenti fortissimi milites et plures nobilies obierint.*

Bernold of St Blaisen (Constance) spoke only of *milites*.[87] At no point did Albert make a similar distinction for those present on the First Crusade, and, indeed, he described many of the Christian *milites* with the adjective *nobilis*.[88] As with the other early crusading historians Albert considered there to be a connection between nobility and family. Henry of Esch was called a *miles nobilis* by birth (*genere*).[89] Similarly Walter of castle Verra was described as 'a man and *miles* from noble elevated parents'[90] Reinhard of Hemmersbach, while not obtaining the epithet *nobilis* was 'a *miles* most famous in deeds and birth';[91] as was Folbert, 'a *miles egregius* by birth from the castle Bouillon';[92] It is also notable that in Albert's references to certain *milites*, he introduced them as being identified by their main castle. Henry of Esch,[93] Warner, count of Grez,[94] Thomas de Marle,[95] Oliver of Jussey,[96] Folbert of Bouillon[97] and Walter of Verra,[98] were all described as being from a particular castle. Albert's brief epithets are evidence that by 1100 many a *miles* was identified by the castle that they were from, rather than by having a cognomen. This change in the manner by which persons were identified, particularly with regard to castle ownership, although disputed, has been seen as important evidence for the 'feudalisation' of society.[99] In Albert's writing then, it seems that there is a considerable overlap between *milites* and *nobiles*. Although Albert at no point gave clear evidence for *milites* in the First Crusade being a term applied to common soldiers, from his example of Duke Godfrey's experience in Rome it is clear that for Albert the term *milites* in general did not necessarily include the concept of nobility. This might well reflect a regional difference between Lotharingia and northern France, both in the sociological makeup of those who were 'knights', and in the use of the term.

Although not absolute, fixed, categories, a survey of the usage of the terms *milites*, *equites* and *equestres* in the early crusading histories shows their usage to cluster far more

---

[87] I. S. Robinson, *Henry IV*, p. 255. Bernold of St Blaisen (Constance), *Chronicon*, ed. I. S. Robinson, *Die Chroniken Bertholds von Reichenau und Bernolds von Konstanz, MGH Scriptores Rerum Germanicorum nova series* 14 (Hannover, 2003), pp. 432.
[88] AA 379, 389, 400, 426, 539, 540, 559, 822, 831. See also above p. 93 - 4 for a full list of *milites* in Albert of Aachen.
[89] AA 379: M*iles nobilis genere*. For Henry of Esch see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom*, p. 209.
[90] AA 426: *Vir et miles nobili editus parentela.* For Walter of Verra see J. Riley – Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 224.
[91] AA 379: *Reinardus de Hamerbach, miles clarissimus opere et genere.* For Reinhard of Hemmersbach see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom*, p. 224.
[92] AA 380: *Folbertus, miles egregius de castello Bullon ortus*. For Folbert of Bouillon see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom*, pp. 195 – 6.
[93] AA 343.
[94] AA 164. For Warner, count of Grez see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom*, p. 234.
[95] AA 165. For Thomas of Marle see J. Riley – Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 223.
[96] AA 166. For Oliver of Jussey see J. Riley – Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 215.
[97] AA 380. For Folbert of Bouillon see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom*, pp. 195 – 6.
[98] AA 426.
[99] For a summary of the discussion see D. Crouch, *The Birth of Nobility* (Harlow, 2005), p. 204 – 7. For castles in the era of the crusades, see J. France, *Western Warfare in the Age of the Crusades, 1100 – 1300* (London, 1999), pp. 77 – 106. See also J. Flori, 'Knightly Society', *The New Cambridge Medieval History IV c. 1024 – 1198*, ed. D. Luscombe and J. Riley-Smith, 2 (Cambridge, 2004), I, 169.

around a notion that includes that of social status than that of their being simply *bellatores*. David Crouch's discussion of this issue made the point that 'knighthood and noble status came together at some time before 1190.'[100] It seems, in fact, that around 1110, especially in the history of Guibert of Nogent, the two concepts, knighthood and nobility, were already closely linked. This is not to argue that the sociological phenomenon came into being at around this date, conceptual language has always lagged behind social evolution. The testimony of the crusading sources is not that there was a new knightly nobility on the First Crusade, but only that the terms *milites*, *equites* and *equestres* were becoming fastened to the activities of a social layer who might well have seen themselves as both knights and noble for some time, perhaps for as long as a hundred years in parts France.[101] This conclusion is strengthened by the considerable commentary of these sources on the relationship between knights and horses.

> Since there were very many illustrious and *nobilissimi equites*, whose number lies hidden, their horses having died and having been consumed because of the hunger of famine, they were reckoned in the number of *pedites*. And they, who from their boyhood had always been accustomed to horses and had been in the habit of riding horses into battle, were schooled to do battle as *pedites*. Indeed among these illustrious men he who could acquire a mule or ass or worthless beast of burden or palfrey, would use it as a horse. Among them were *principes*, most powerful and rich in their own lands, who entered the conflict sitting on an ass.[102]

Albert of Aachen wrote this key passage concerning *equites* and *pedites* at the time of the battle outside Antioch between the Christian forces and Kerbogha, the emir of Mosul (28 June 1098). The statement that illustrious and noble *equites* were numbered among the *pedites* seems to be carefully chosen by Albert, especially in the light of his following remark. The loss of status indicated was temporary and could be alleviated by the *eques* obtaining any kind of mount on which to ride. The *eques* did not become a *pedes*, but was counted among them, his years of training from boyhood still represented a differentiation from those with whom he now fought. Nevertheless, the desperation of the *eques* to hold on to their visible status was shown by those who could obtain mules preferring the humiliation of riding an ass into battle to that of being assigned to the *pedites*.

---

[100] D. Crouch, *The Birth of Nobility*, p. 246.
[101] G. Duby, *La Société aux XI^e et XII^e siècles dans la région mâconnaise* (Paris, 1953).
[102] AA 371: *Plurimi sequidem egregii equites et nobilissimi quorum latet numerus, equis mortuis et pre famis inopia consumptis, in numero peditum computati, pedites prelia discebant, qui a puerili euo semper equis assueti et invecti certamen inire solebant. Ex hiis vero egregiis viris qui mulum aut asellum vel vile iumentum vel palefridum nunc adquirere poterat pro equo utebatur. Inter quos fortissimi et ditissimi sua in terra principes asino insidentes certamen inierunt.*

The struggle by *milites* not to fall into the ranks of the *pedites* is one of the themes of the *Gesta Francorum*, noted by those who used the history for their *fons formalis*. In describing the hardship of the march, early in August 1097, en route to Iconium, the anonymous author wrote that 'a great number of our horses died, so that many of our *milites* remained *pedites*, and for lack of horses oxen served us in place of nags.'[103] Fulcher of Chartres used the *Gesta Francorum* for this period of his own history, although he was an eyewitness to the difficulties of the march of the united Christian army. His repetition that the loss of horses led to the use of oxen as mounts by some knights is therefore corroborative.[104] Baldric of Dol's version of this passage was very similar, reporting that many renowned *milites* were compelled to march as *pedites*.[105]

The anonymous author wrote that due to poverty at the siege of Antioch early in 1098 there were less than a thousand *milites* who had kept their horses in the best condition.[106] Baldric's version of the same report was that 'at that time, indeed, there was so great a decline in the number of horses of the Christians, that scarcely a thousand *milites* could be found in the whole of that great army who still enjoyed the use of a mount.'[107] Both versions suggest there were very many *milites* without mounts, but at the same time, in calculating the forces available to the Christian army the message seems clear. Only those with a mount counted. This tension, between the practical assignation of *milites* without mounts to the ranks of *pedites* but their theoretical retention of their former status was an important source of internal stress within the expedition.[108]

The section of the *Gesta Francorum* dealing with the embassy of Peter the Hermit to Kerbogha (27 June 1098) has the form of a *chanson* with invented speeches by the two parties.[109] One feature of the account that is important here is Kerbogha's purported offer to the Christian forces that if they renounced their religion he would give them land, cities and castles, so that none should remain a *pedes*, but all would be *milites*.[110] Whether apocryphal or not the matter was *milites* becoming *pedites* was a continual grievance of some significance to the author of the *Gesta Francorum*, since he placed it at the heart of Kerbogha's offer to the Christians. It is notable that the author's definition of a *miles* here was to be the owner of land, cities or castles. Baldric of Dol, Guibert of Nogent and Robert the Monk all repeated the

---

[103] GF 23: *Illic fuit mortua maxima pars nostrorum equorum, eo quod multi ex nostris militibus remanserunt pedites; et pro penuria equorum, erant nobis boves loco caballorum.*
[104] FC I, XIII, 3 (202). GF 23.
[105] BD 37.
[106] GF 34.
[107] BD 44: *Tunc etiam in tantum Christianorum defecerunt equi, ut vix in toto et tanto exercitu mille milites invenirentur qui caballis uterentur.*
[108] See above p. 225 and below p. 255.
[109] For a discussion of this embassy see above pp. 215 - 16.
[110] GF 67.

offer in similar terms, although all three substituted *equites* for *milites* at this point.[111] Carol Sweetenham was so anxious to avoid the difficulties of the term 'knight' that in her translation of Robert the Monk's *Historia Iherosolomitana* she had Kerbogha offer land so as to make the Franks 'mounted soldiers.'[112] But 'knights' makes much more sense here, as the offer of land is an offer to raise their status: there is no mention of mounts. In his version of the negotiations between Peter the Hermit and Kerbogha, Fulcher, dependent on the *Gesta Francorum* for information as he was in Edessa at the time, wrote that 'indeed [Kerbogha's forces] knew our *milites* had become *pedites*, weak and poor.'[113] Similarly in his account of the march of Baldwin of Edessa and Bohemond of Antioch to Jerusalem in the autumn of 1099, Fulcher, who was now an eyewitness, wrote that 'you would see noble *milites*, having lost their horses in some way, become *pedites*.'[114] All of the early crusading historians had no difficulty in envisaging that a body of *milites* could fall to the ranks of *pedites* through hardship.

Robert the Monk provided several more examples of the same theme. When the herald of al-Afdal, vizier of Cairo, came to the camp of the crusaders at the siege of Antioch, early in the spring of 1098, Robert elaborated on the *Gesta Francorum* by reporting the details of the offer that the envoy is supposed to have made. The proposal was to allow the Christians to travel and worship at Jerusalem, 'if you wish to go with the satchel and stave, they will cause you to travel there with the greatest honour and you will be endowed with rich property: from *pedites* will be made *equites*.'[115] It seems that Robert imported the same ideas present in the offer of Kerbogha into this section also. Robert also described an imagined rout of the forces of Duqaq, ruler of Damascus, in which the Christian forces were all able to join the pursuit 'since those who had come as *pedites* were turned into riders (*ascensores equorum efficiebantur*).'[116] It is unusual to have a report of *pedites* mounting horses and perhaps noteworthy that Robert did not write that they thereby became *equites*. It could be that while Robert was willing to write of *pedites* becoming *equites* through the grant of rich property, he was more reluctant to use the same idea for those *pedites* who mounted captured horses.

For the battle against Kerbogha 'Bohemond formed a sixth [squadron] with those *pedites* who were lightly armed for war, and *milites*, who had been compelled by necessity to

---

[111] BD 75, GN 236, RM 826.
[112] C. Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk's History*, p. 166.
[113] FC I, XXI, 3 (249): *Nostros vero milites sciebant effici pedites, debiles, inopes.*
[114] FC I, XXXIII, 13 (331): *Videretis milites nobiles, equis quoquomodo amissis, pedites effici.*
[115] RM 791: *Quod si de cetero in pera et baculo vultis ire, cum honore maximo rerumque opulentia vos illuc facient pertransire: de peditibus equites facient.*
[116] RM 779: *... quoniam qui pedites venerant, ascensores equorum efficiebantur.*

sell their horses.'[117] Here Robert was clear that even though the *miles* was having to fight on foot, he was still a knight, a point which is similarly evident in the description of those *milites* and *armigeri* required to walk like *pedites* due to the difficulty of the mountain terrain when the expedition descended the Anti-Taurus range of mountains early in October 1097.[118]

A very interesting related passage is Guibert's description of Robert Guiscard, duke of Apulia and Calabria, father of Bohemond, whom Guibert introduced as someone who was 'from feeble enough station of birth,'[119] Guibert wrote that Robert Guiscard was sent away 'a *pedes*' from Normandy, perhaps banished, 'to Apulia, where by whatever method, he earned horses and arms to become an *eques*.'[120] This is an extraordinary statement. Factually it is dubious, in that no other source mentions banishment and while Tancred, Robert's father, was a poor lord with twelve sons, of whom Robert was the sixth, it seems unlikely he would have been so impoverished as to journey to Italy as a footsoldier.[121] Guibert's report does, however, testify to contemporary experience of the fluidity of social classes. In his comments on Robert Guiscard's early career Guibert seems to be echoing the idea that is present in Kerbogha's offer to the Christian forces in Antioch, that a knight impoverished to the point of being a *pedes* could restore his status as an *eques* by regaining a mount and arms. Guibert continued his account of the career of Robert Guiscard by reporting that the Norman *eques* took over certain castles, laid siege to wealthy cities and in short 'this new man (*novus homo*) extended his territory of domination.'[122] This idea of the creation of a 'new man' was sustained in Guibert's comment that 'anyone who wishes today may see the power of [Robert's] son Bohemond who, having obliterated the worthlessness of his forbears, married the daughter of Philip, King of France.'[123] The phrase *novus homo* is the key to understanding Guibert's intent here. He was echoing the classical descriptions of those families who through their military and political successes were able to thrust themselves into the ranks of the Roman elite.[124] Just as, very rarely, new families were reported as entering the political arena of the late Roman Republic, so Guibert considered it possible for someone of relatively low birth and the equipment of a *pedes* to rise to the status of an *eques* through the acquisition of a horse, castles and cities. Humble parentage, while not completely forgotten, could be obliterated through a successful military career. This whole passage unequivocally concerns

---

[117] RM 828: *Boamundi fuit sexta, cum quo expeditiores ad bellum pedites fuerunt, et milites qui equos suos, necessitate compulsi, vendiderant.*
[118] RM 770: *Milites et armigeri collo suo arma dependentia gestabant, omnes aequaliter pedites, quia nulli eorum equitabant.*
[119] GN 137: *... et tenui satis loco natus.*
[120] GN 137: *Pedes in Apuliam abiit; ibi equos et arma, quibus eques fieret, qua potuit arte, commeruit.*
[121] G. A. Loud, *The Age of Robert Guiscard: Southern Italy and the Norman Conquest* (Harlow, 2000), p. 2.
[122] GN 137: *... novus homo suae loca dominationis extendit.*
[123] GN 138: *Videat qui vult hodie filii eius Boemundi potentiam, qui veterum oblitterata vilitate parentum Philippi regis Francorum filiam duxit in coniugium.*
[124] For the classical '*novus homo*' see R. Syme, *The Roman Revolution*, p. 11.

status, not function, and throughout Guibert used the term *eques*. Here, at least, there can be no other meaning to the term than 'knight.'

Although Raymond of Aguilers occasionally drew on parts of the *Gesta Francorum*, his work, the *Historia Francorum*, represents a very different tradition. Nevertheless, through several independently recorded examples, he also provides evidence for the importance that *milites* attached to horses. Outside the walls of Antioch on the evening of 29 December 1097, Raymond observed the eagerness of certain *milites* to chase a horse in mid-battle, even to the point of incurring a defeat for the Christian forces.[125] This pursuit by the *milites* resulted in the footsoldiers thinking that a flight had begun and in the confusion the besieging army sustained many casualties. It is highly significant that one horse should be the source of undisciplined pursuit by *milites*. The incident is best understood within the context of the considerable loss of horses that had seen many *milites* numbered among the *pedites* due to the loss of their mount. Under such circumstances a healthy Arab horse was of immense value.[126] The same context makes clear the importance of a council of the Provençals in January 1098, at which Count Raymond granted 500 marks of silver, 'so that if any of the *milites* should lose his horse, he should be restored from the 500 marks and the rest that had been given up to the fraternity.'[127] This agreement addressed the problem that the *milites* were reluctant to defend foraging expeditions due to their horses being in no fit state.[128] At the fall of Antioch, the chronicler noted with pleasure that fleeing Turkish riders were intercepted and in their panic were thrown down to their deaths, 'but we were grieved that more than three hundred horses came to naught in that place.'[129] While trapped in Antioch by the arrival of Kerbogha, famine was so severe that 'the majority of *milites* lived through the blood of their horses, but anticipating the mercy of God, they were unwilling to kill them.'[130] No sooner did the *milites* and wealthier *plebs* obtain booty than they rushed to Caesarea and Camela [Homs] to buy Arab horses.[131]

A full discussion of the military importance of the mounted knight in the First Crusade can be found in John France's *Victory in the East*.[132] Here the evidence has been gathered with a view to the connection between being mounted and social status. One clear conclusion is that owning a mount was a necessary, although not sufficient, condition for

---

[125] RA 39.
[126] J. France, *Victory in the East*, p. 281 – 2.
[127] RA 49: *...ut, si quis militum suorum equum deperderet, de illis quingentis marchis illi restauraretur, ac de aliis quae fraternitati concessa sunt.* See also J. Richard, 'La confrérie de la première croisade', *Etudes de Civilisation Médiéval: Mélanges Offerts à E. R. Labande*, ed. B. Jeannau (Poitiers, 1974), pp. 617 –22.
[128] RA 50. See also J. France, *Victory in the East*, p. 242.
[129] RA 80: *Sed de equis plusquam tercentis inibi decollatis doluimus.*
[130] RA 116: *Plerique milites sanguine suorum equorum vivebant; exspectantes Dei misericordiam, nolebant eos occidere adhuc.*
[131] RA 188.
[132] J. France, *Victory in the East*, pp. 122 – 142.

being numbered among the *milites*. The descriptions of oxen and asses being ridden are strong testimony to the determination of *milites* not to fall to the ranks of *pedites*. All the sources indicate a surprising willingness to envisage both the fall of a *miles* to the state of a *pedes* and the possibility that through the acquisition of wealth *pedites* could become *milites*. One interpretation of this could be that the terms were purely functional for the author and thus the status of the *miles* or the *pedes* simply reflected whether they were mounted or not. Thus the relative rapid transformation of their fortunes is easily explained. This view, however, jars with the previous conclusion that the sources generally did mean to include an aspect of status in their use of the terms *milites*, *equites* and *equestres*. Moreover, when the particular passages in which the issue of change in status arises are looked at closely, the information given is more complex than the 'functional' explanation can encompass. It is not the offer of horses, but land and cities, which all the sources see as essential in making *pedites* into *equites*. There are several examples where the historian saw *milites* as being 'numbered among' or 'fighting with' the *pedites*, suggesting that they retained some aspect of a former status despite the loss of their mount. A second explanation is therefore preferred here, that the early crusading histories reveal a willingness to accept rapid changes of social status, particularly with the downward movement of *milites* to *pedites*. The problem with *milites* becoming *pedites* is a great one if those terms have a social content and society at large has a strict understanding of that content. But if the lower level of knighthood was still relatively undefined, then social fluidity seems less remarkable. Having abandoned their lands, the less distinguished knights were no longer anchored in a lordly social position; furthermore they could easily lose their distinguishing accoutrements during the periods of great hardship experienced by the Christian forces of the First Crusade: the horse and their arms. Then all that would distinguish them from the footsoldiers was their previous training and their desire to regain their lost status. The force of Kerbogha's offer should be understood as being particularly directed at these former knights, rather than *pedites* in general. A *pedes* who gained a horse or temporary wealth did not become a knight (although Guibert was willing to write about the exceptional case of Robert Guiscard in that manner); a *miles* who fell to becoming a *pedes*, however, ran the risk that this loss of status could become permanent.

Milites, *equites* and *equestres* in the early crusading histories were, by and large, members of the social class of knights; membership of this class, however, was not firmly fixed, particularly in the context of a three-year expedition. For the poorer knight their status was at times a precarious one.

II.3. *Iuvenes* in early crusading sources

'It is obvious that it was the bands of "youths", excluded by so many social prohibitions from the main body of settled men, fathers of families and heads of houses, with their prolonged spells of turbulent behaviour making them an unstable fringe of society, who created and sustained the crusades.'[1]

In a single sentence, as part of his study of the *iuventus* of France in the twelfth century, Georges Duby speculated with characteristic insight that they must have played a key role in the crusading movement. Duby's definition of an individual *iuvenis,* or the collective substantive *iuventus*, was precise and has been a lasting one. *Iuvenes* were warriors at a particular stage of their careers, adults who had taken up arms, been received into a company of warriors and had been dubbed, thus becoming knights. But they were knights who had yet to be married and therefore yet to become heads of households. As Duby summarised: 'the stages of "youth" can therefore be defined as the period in a man's life between his being dubbed a knight and his becoming a father.'[2] It was from his observation that this particular category of knights was obliged to wander in order to advance their careers, often grouped together in bands, that Duby deduced they must have been an important social grouping in the promotion and conduct of the crusades.

It is possible to follow this suggestion in a number of ways, one of which is to narrow down the conjecture to look at the appearance of *iuvenes* in the writings of the early crusading historians. In this regard the work of Gilo of Paris and Ralph of Caen can also supplement that of Robert the Monk, Guibert of Nogent, Raymond of Aguilers and Albert of Aachen. These are the authors who most evidently used the term *iuvenes* in its technical sense and not simply as an adjective for 'youth'.

Robert the Monk, Guibert of Nogent and Gilo of Paris had a great deal in common. They were all based in northern France, all wrote at about the same time, around the first decade of the twelfth century, and they all based their work on the popular eyewitness account, the anonymous *Gesta Francorum*. The other three writers bring a broader perspective to the survey, being independent of the *Gesta Francorum* and widening the geographical spread of sources. Within the works of all six sources it is necessary to distinguish between those passages in which they use the term *iuventus* in a broad sense, meaning young persons in general and those that refer to a specific contingent of crusading knights. Given, for example, that Ralph of Caen was fond of the poetic juxtaposition of

---

[1] Georges Duby, *The Chivalrous Society*, trans. C. Postan, University of California Press (Berkely, 1977), p. 120 originally published as 'Les "jeunes" dans la société aristocratique dans la France du Nord-Ouest au XII[e] siècle,' *Annales: Economies, Sociétés, Civilisations* 19 (5), 1964, pp. 835-846.
[2] *Ibid*., p. 113.

iuvenes and *senes* to mean the whole range of age of a person it is necessary to exclude from the investigation instances of the use of *iuvenes* such as that in which the poet describes Tancred, the Norman prince and nephew of Bohemond, prince of Taranto, as exceeding 'youths in agility of arms and the aged in dignity.'[3] Similarly, the historian and chaplain to King Baldwin I of Jerusalem, Fulcher of Chartres, reported the arrival at Joppa of Sigurd Jorsalafarer around August 1100. He described the prince as a very handsome *iuvenis*.[4] The fact that Fulcher gave a physical description of Sigurd suggests that *iuvenis* here almost certainly simply meant 'youth.' But it is not impossible that Fulcher had in mind the technical meaning of the term, for a knight yet to establish himself as the head of a family. The Norwegian prince at the time had given up a share in the kingdom of Norway in order to follow the wishes of those warriors intending to make the journey to Jerusalem.[5]

The first of these six sources, Robert, was a monk in the Benedictine abbey of St-Rémi, Rheims, writing his *Historia Iherosolimitana* circa 1106-7[6] at the behest of his abbot, and with the anonymous eyewitness account known as the *Gesta Francorum* before him. Although a witness to the Council of Clermont, 1095, at which the expedition to Jerusalem was launched, Robert was not an eyewitness to the other events he described. Like other crusading historians, however, for whom the *Gesta Francorum* was their *fons formalis*, Robert revised what he felt to be a crudely written work, and in so doing, as part of his attempt to give more precision to the history, he gave descriptions of social textures that are lacking in his main source. One of the social groupings that are not identifiable in the *Gesta Francorum*, but appear in the work of Robert, is the *iuventus*, with whom he clearly was familiar from the structure of society in Northern France in the first decade of the twelfth century.

The first description of the *iuventus* in Robert's history occurs shortly after his account of a great success for the crusading army during the siege of Antioch. A sortie from the city had ended disastrously for the Turkish garrison when they were thrown back and their retreat had been blocked by the narrowness of the bridge in their path (6 March 1098). The following day, said Robert, the Turks left the city at dawn and buried those bodies they could find. On hearing this the *iuvenes* of Christ's army hastened to the cemetery. At the cemetery they dug up the bodies and cut the heads off, in order to calculate the Turkish losses wrote Robert, following the *Gesta Francorum*.[7] There is a suggestion in both sources

---

[3] RC 605: *iuvenes agilitate armorum, morum gravitate senes transcendebat*. See also RC 699. For Tancred see R. L. Nicholson, *Tancred: a study of his career and work in their relation to the First Crusade and the Establishment of the Latin States in Syria and Palestine*, (Chicago, 1940).
[4] FC II, XLIV, 1 (544): *Erat iuvenis forma valde speciosus.*
[5] For Sigurd Jorsalafarer (the Crusader), jointly king of Norway (1103-1130), see Snorre Sturlason, *Heimskringla*, ed. E. Monsen, trans. A. H. Smith (New York, 1990), pp. 606 – 643.
[6] See above p. 128 - 9.
[7] RM 788.

that this action was motivated not so much by the excuse of counting heads but for plunder, since the digging up of the bodies follows the point in the *Gesta Francorum* that they were buried with cloaks, gold and other items.[8] Whether Robert or another later scribe wrote the heading for his version of the chapter, disapproval is evident: 'Chapter XXII. Concerning the grave of the Turks being disgracefully destroyed by the Christians.'[9]

Not long after this event an Egyptian embassy sent by al-Afdal, the vizier of the boy Caliph, al-Mustali, arrived at the crusader camp. This was another occasion for Robert to describe the actions of the *iuventus*. 'The tents were beautified with various kinds of ornaments; shields were attached to stakes in the ground on which the knight's game of quintain was to be played out the next day. There were not absent games of dice, chess and the rapid charges of horses, turning in a circle with taut reins, there were warlike charges and there were the shakings of spears by both sides, by which acts they demonstrated that those who performed such deeds did not fear. Indeed it was the *iuventus* who so participated but those who were elder and experienced sat together as one and discussed the matter with good sense and prudence.'[10] The contrast between the activities of the youth and the more experienced crusader is explicit and clear, as is Robert's approval of the latter.

The reference to quintain is significant. This was a sport of knights, in which the rider tilted at a target that could swing around on a counter-weighted arm. It was an activity that would be consistently associated with the 'youth' throughout the Middle Ages. Even one and half centuries later the chronicler Matthew Paris assumed that quintain was the sport of *iuvenes*, as in his annal he wrote that in 1253, 'the London *iuvenes*, tested their bravery and the pace of horses at the exercise which is commonly called quintain, a peacock having been established for a prize.'[11] The description by Robert of the 'less prudent' knights showing their prowess before the Egyptian delegation seems to be the earliest medieval writing to mention the exercise explicitly.[12]

Antioch eventually fell due to the betrayal of Firuz, commander of three towers along a stretch of the city wall. On the morning of 3 June 1098 sixty *homines* climbed up a

---

[8] GF 42.
[9] RM 788: *De sepultura Turcorum a Christianis turpiter destructa.*
[10] RM 791: *Tentoria variis ornamentorum generibus venustantur; terrae infixis sudibus scuta apponuntur, quibus in crastinum Quintanae ludus, scilicet equestris, exerceretur. Aleae, scaci, veloces cursus equorum flexis in gyrum frenis non defuerunt, et militares impetus; hastarumque vibrationes in alterutrum ibi celebratae sunt. In quibus actibus monstrabatur quia nullo pavore trepidabant qui talia operabantur. Talia quippe iuventus excolebat; sed aetate sensuque seniores in unum consederant, causaque consilii et prudentiae conferebant.*
[11] Mathew Paris, *Chronica Maiora*, V, *Rerum Britannicarum medii aevi Scriptores* (London, 1880) 1253: *Juvenes Londinenses statuto pavone pro bravio, ad stadium, quod vulgariter quintana dicitur, vires proprias et equorum cursus sunt experti.*
[12] C. F. Du Cange, *Glossarium mediae et infimae Latinitatis*, VI, (Paris, 1938), p. 614. See also, L. Clare, *La quintaine, la Course de Bague et le Jue des Têtes* (Paris, 1983), pp. 37-41, 170-1; G. Duby, *William Marshall* (London, 1986) p. 70; J. Barker, *The Tournament in England 1100 – 1400*, (Woodbridge, 2003).

ladder and on to the wall, said the *Gesta Francorum*.[13] Robert's version was more detailed: 'meanwhile Fulcher, who had climbed up with sixty armed *iuvenes*, had captured the towers of Firuz, had seized three others with warlike skill, and in these had killed two brothers of Firuz.'[14] The appearance of the name Fulcher is a divergence from the *Gesta Francorum* by Robert, which shows that his additions to the text were based on accurate information as other sources corroborate the role of Fulcher of Chartres in the incident.[15] Gilo of Paris and Ralph of Caen also attested to the prominence of this *iuvenis*.[16]

The *iuvenes* next appeared in the critical battle against Kerbogha, emir of Mosul (28 June 1098), where Robert praised their deeds in a passage that is not in the *Gesta*. 'What famous feats the illustrious *iuventus* performed there neither tongue can say, nor the hand write, nor the page can receive.'[17] In the same battle, Robert identified a particular grouping of *iuvenes* in the contingent of Hugh the Great, count of Vermandois: 'Because they saw that they were closing on [the enemy force], Everard [III] of Le Puiset, Payen of Beauvais, Drogo [of Nesle], Thomas [of Marle] and Clarembald [of Vendeuil], and the rest of the *iuventus* of Hugh the Great, did not hesitate to dash in amongst them.'[18] Those here identified as *iuvenes* were significant nobles with something of a career behind them already, indicating Robert was not using *iuvenes* to make a statement about the age of these men. Once more a taint of irresponsibility is associated with Robert's use of the term, as among this particular group of knights, Thomas, Drogo and Clarembald had once been part of the contingent of Count Emicho of Leichingen, one of the few nobles associated with the Peoples' Crusade of 1096. This army was notorious for its attacks on the Jewish communities of Speyer, Worms, Mainz and Cologne. Albert of Aachen described them as an 'intolerable company.'[19] Emicho's army had been dispersed as it entered Hungary, following its failure to take Wiesselburg (September 1096), but some of the knights continued with the expedition, and Robert was not the only historian to indicate that they subsequently attached themselves to Hugh the Great. Both Gilo of Paris and Ralph of Caen

---

[13] GF 46.
[14] RM 800: *Interea Fulcherius, qui cum LX^ta iuvenibus armatis ascenderat, exceptis turribus Pirri, tres alias bellica virtute occupaverat, et in eis duo fratres Pirri occiderat.*
[15] Fulcher of Chartres in this incident is not to be confused with the chronicler of the same name. See C. Sweetman, *Robert the monk's History of the First Crusade*, p. 145 n. 24.
[16] See below pp. 263, 274.
[17] RM 831-2: *Quid clara iuventus ibi egerint, nec lingua dicere, nec manus scribere, nec pagina suscipere.*
[18] RM 833: *Quod ut viderent qui eum vicinius subsequebantur, Edwardus scilicet de Puteolo, Paganus Belvacensis, Drogo et Thomas, et Clarenbaldus, ceteraque juventus Hugonis Magni, nil haesitantes in illos irruunt.* For these knights see J. Riley-Smith, *The First Crusaders, 1095-1131* (Cambridge, 1997), p. 205 (Everard), see also below pp. 263 – 4, 266, 275; p. 216 (Payen); p. 223 (Thomas) see also below p. 270 - 1; p. 203 (Clarembald). For Drogo of Nesle see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem* (Oxford, 2000), p. 191. For references to the Peoples' Crusade see above p. 190 n.1.
[19] AA 128: *intolerabilis societas.*

also associated this group of *iuvenes* with Hugh the Great.[20] Moreover, according to Albert of Aachen, the leader of the *iuvenes* in the storming of Antioch, the knight Fulcher of Chartres, was prominent in the contingent of Peter the Hermit that marched through Hungary, and he later associated himself with Drogo of Nesle.[21] The key point here is that a prosopographical assembly of evidence from a variety of crusading sources identifies a very distinct band of Northern French *iuvenes* as having been present on the First Crusade.

The occasion for Robert's next mention of the *iuventus* was when the expedition attacked the city of Ma'arrat-an-Nu'man, a well-defended city that had been gathering Turkish forces for some time. With great risk a breakthrough was gained for the Crusading forces when Gouflier, lord of Lastours, was the first to climb a ladder onto the walls of the town (11 December 1098). Robert described how the *iuventus* was spurred to action by the incident: 'when the famous *iuventus* saw Gouflier with a few men, fighting on the top of the city walls, forgetful of themselves but mindful of their companions, they climbed up forthwith and overwhelmed part of the wall with their weight of numbers.'[22]

The last reference to the *iuvenes* by Robert occurs in his description of what was a critical moment in the direction of the crusade. Around Christmas 1098 the bitter conflict between Bohemond and Count Raymond IV of Toulouse over the ownership of Antioch had seen the movement stall entirely. The 'poor' (*pauperes*) on the crusade were the most greatly affected by this, having had to resort to cannibalism in the siege of Ma'arrat and its aftermath.[23] As a result a mutiny took place that saw the *pauperes* dismantle the walls of the recently captured city, making it defenceless and obliging Count Raymond to continue the expedition. Raymond of Aguilers, an eyewitness and chaplain to Count Raymond, reported the detail of this incident in his history.[24] The *Gesta Francorum* and Robert the Monk skip the events at Ma'arrat, and follow the perspective not of the *pauperes* but of those knights and princes who met at Chastel-Rouge, probably on 4 January 1099, and were unable to resolve their differences, the news of this failure triggering the revolt at Ma'arrat. Robert wrote: 'there remained [at Chastel-Rouge] with the count [Raymond] not only his own men, but also many *iuvenes*, who were on fire to complete the journey.'[25] In Robert's eyes the *iuvenes* were a social grouping that were among the most fervent in wishing to press on to Jerusalem.

---

[20] See below p. 263 – 4, 270 – 1, 274.
[21] AA 391-2. For Drogo of Nesle see above p. 260 n. 18.
[22] RM 847:*Quod quum vidisset clara iuventus nostrorum, Gulferium scilicet cum paucis pugnare super pinnacula murorum, immemor sui, sed memor sociorum, confestim ascendunt, partemque muri sua multitudine cooperiunt.* For Goulfier of Lastours see J. Riley-Smith, *The First Crusaders*, p. 209.
[23] RA 181, GF 80.
[24] RA 40-41. See above p. 225.
[25] RM 837: *Remanserunt cum comite non solum sui, set et multa iuventus, cui inerat ardor viam perficiendi.*

In these examples from Robert the *iuvenes* can be seen to be a distinct social grouping of knights on the crusade, references to them ranging from named figures of some seniority to the anonymous mass, the *iuventus*. The *iuvenes* display bravado and a genuine bravery in battle, yet they also have the more negative quality of being associated with rashness to the point of indiscipline. In Robert's version of events *iuvenes* were indeed significant in the key military and political events of the First Crusade. They were the first to break into Antioch and Ma'arrat, fought bravely against Kerbogha and helped drive the movement on to Jerusalem after it had stalled.

The *Historia Vie Hierosolimitane* of Gilo of Paris was a poetical reworking of the *Gesta Francorum* that has a close connection with the narrative history of Robert the Monk. The exact relationship between the two has not been decisively established, but the generally accepted view is that they share a now missing common source.[26] Gilo's work is one of those texts excluded from analysis in Part 1 of this work due to its subordination of vocabulary to metre. It is nevertheless introduced here for it's important corroborative material. Gilo was a Cluniac monk from Toucy in Auxerre who subsequently became cardinal-bishop of Tusculum.[27] His poetic history was written at some point before 1120, the suggestion of his most recent editors being that it was written in the first decade of the century.[28]

The *iuventus* first appear in Gilo's account of the winter of 1097-1098 at a point where the participants in the First Crusade were besieging Antioch. Gilo wrote that: 'It is appropriate to enumerate the deeds of the famous *iuventus* of *Gallia* but who will be able to narrate so many bitter battles, narrow escapes, fasting, cold and anxieties.'[29] On the 5 April 1098, during the siege, a fort was built opposite the Gate of St. George and for the sum of four hundred marks Tancred took charge of it. Of this Gilo stated that: 'Here also a certain fortress was renovated and an old rampart was repaired where the *iuvenes* could keep their plunder.'[30] The implication of this statement is that there was a distinct body of *iuvenes* willing to serve at the fort, and that they had sufficient plunder from raids and forays to require it as a holding place.

Like Robert, Gilo gave the *iuvenes* a major role in the capture of Antioch. The poet attributed the following address to Bohemond, given to those assembled for the assault on

---

[26] GP lx. Sweetman, *Robert the monk's History of the First Crusade*, p. 34.
[27] GP xviii. For further discussion of Gilo's career see GP xix-xxii and R. Hüls, *Kardinäle, Klerus and Kirchen Roms* (Tübingen, 1977), p. 142 - 3.
[28] GP xxiv.
[29] GP 102: *Quos tulit euentus Gallorum clara iuuentus,*
Enumerare licet; sed quis tot acerrima dicet
Praelia, pressuras, jejunia, frigora, curas?
[30] GP 123: *Hic quoque, quo iuuenes predam cepere, nouatur*
Quoddam castellum uallumque uetus reparatur.
See below p. 266.

the walls of the city (3 June 1098): 'And you, swift *iuvenes*, climb the walls at once.'[31] In Gilo's account Bohemond waited anxiously, while the *iuvenes* rushed into action. 'The *iuvenes* hastened forward, with Fulcher pressing on ahead.'[32] The poet's description continued: 'Standing in the midst of the rest, one of the young ones spoke these words: "*iuvenes* do not disdain the gift that is offered. Rise up! I shall be first." They obeyed and that Fulcher, born in Chartres, was not afraid to go in front of the 1000 *proceres* and hastened to the walls of the unconquered town.'[33] Fulcher here again was identified as the foremost of the *iuvenes* who responded to the appeal. It is worth noting that the poet presumed that the body of *iuvenes* were nobles (*proceres*), although there is a strain on Gilo's choice of vocabulary arising from his rhyming schemes. This association is consistent with Duby's definition of a *iuvenis* as a knight, and his belief that c. 1100 in France, knights were, by definition, noble.[34]

Gilo continued his description of the fall of Antioch to the crusaders by describing how once the gates of the city had been opened, the rest of the army was spurred to action, 'the horses were bridled and the *iuventus* clamoured for arms.'[35] The very next day (4 June 1098), some advance forces from Kerbogha's army arrived before Antioch and a rash sortie by Roger of Barneville eventually saw him chased back to the gates of the city where he was killed in full sight of those on the walls.[36] This was a particularly difficult moment for the *iuvenes* who were watching, said Gilo, 'The *iuventus* on the walls were assailed by confusion and shame.'[37] Trapped by Kerbogha's army inside Antioch, the crusading army suffered from starvation, and the poet illustrated this with the following description: 'Even [a dying horse] was devoured by the *iuventus*, and that sort of food was welcome to the people, though it was dearly bought.'[38]

In a manner very similar to Robert's account of the battle with Kerbogha, Gilo wrote of the vigorous role played by the *iuvenes* in the contingent of Hugh the Great: 'Everard [III] of Le Puiset and the impetuous *iuventus*, looked for a battle in the battle itself, and raised their swords... Then [Hugh the Great] said: "What you desire, *iuvenes*, is here!

---

[31] GP 162: *Vosque, citi iuuenes, muros superate repente.*
[32] GP 164: *Accelerant iuvenes. Fulcherius imminet ante.*
For Fulcher of Chartres see above p. 260 n. 15.
[33] GP 164-6: *stans in medio reliquorum iunior unus,*
Sic ait: 'oblatum, iuuenes, ne spernite munus.
Surgite! Primus ero.' Parent, Fulcherius ille
Natus Carnoti proceres precedere mille
Non timet invicte properans ad menia uille.
[34] Georges Duby, *The Chivalrous Society*, pp. 78 – 80.
[35] GP 168: *Impediuntur equi frenis, fremit arma iuuentus.*
[36] For Roger of Barneville see J. Riley-Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 221.
[37] GP 178: *Estuat in muris confusa pudore iuuentus.*
[38] GP 180: *Deuorat hunc etiam prestans uirtute iuuentus,*
Et cibus iste placet populis caro licet emptus.

The iron field bristles with spears, let us turn to them and lay on with huge strength.'"[39] In his description of the same battle Gilo added a further detail after writing of the death of Odo of Beaugency, standard-bearer to Hugh the Great, 'William of Benium immediately took his place, and raised the standard, his sword cut a pathway for this *iuvenis*.'[40] The association between *iuvenes* and defending a standard is a recurrent one.[41]

Gilo's next reference to the *iuventus* occurs in his description of a substantial raiding expedition led by Raymond Pilet.[42] After some initial successes Raymond Pilet's forces were defeated in an attempt to storm Ma'arrat (27 July 1098), giving rise to Gilo's poetic observations on the encumbrance of armour during retreat, 'Sonorous shields and helmets gave out a crash, helms slipping obscured the eyes, the *iuvenes*, bent to receive blows, hate their coats of mail.'[43]

The united expedition was more successful and Gilo wrote of the renewed siege of Ma'arrat: 'The honourable *iuvenes* were awoken by the loud noise of the trumpets, and forgetful of their bodies but not forgetful of their souls they ran to the walls.'[44] When the city fell, Gilo attributed the success of the assault to the destruction of a wall by the *iuvenes*; in doing so he again agreed with Robert the Monk. 'Meanwhile, the wall which our *iuvenes* had undermined, protected by their castle, was breached, and the knights were no longer held back by the solid rock.'[45] The final appearance of the *iuvenes* in Gilo of Paris was a reference to the expedition as it made its way towards Jerusalem (May 1099). 'From [al-Batrũn], the *iuventus*, afflicted by the heat followed the shore of the sea.'[46]

---

[39] GP 188: *Eurardus de Puteolo fervensque iuuentus,*
In bello querunt bellum, gladiosque leuabant
... Tunc ita fatur:
'Quod iuvenes optatis adest! Huc ferreus hastis
Horret ager, uertamur ad hos, incumbite uastis
Viribus!'
For Everard see above p. 260 n. 18. See also below pp. 266, 275.

[40] GP 190: *Mox succedit ei signumque leuat Beniensis*
Guillelmus, fecitque uiam iuveni suus ensis.
For Odo of Beaugency see J. Riley-Smith, *The First Crusaders*, p. 205. Benium is given as Bény-sur-Mer by the editors of Gilo (GP 190), Robert describes the same person as William of Belesme (RM 831), J. Riley-Smith lists him as William of Bohemia, *The First Crusaders* p. 225.

[41] See below p. 268.

[42] For further references to Raymond Pilet see J. Riley-Smith, *The First Crusaders* p. 220.

[43] GP 198: *Tinnitum reddunt clipei galee que sonore,*
Obtenebrant oculos lapsi de uertice coni,
Loricas odiunt iuuenes ad uerbera proni.

[44] GP 204: *Excitique probi iuuenes clangore tubarum,*
Corporis immemores, haud immemores animarum
Ad muros properant.

[45] GP 210: *Soluitur interea murus, quem nostra iuuentus*
Castro tecta subit, solida nec rupe retentus
Est eques.

[46] GP 232: *Inde maris littus uexata calore iuuentus*
Radit.

In general the *iuvenes* were important figures in the crusade as described by Gilo of Paris. They were to the fore in eagerness to give battle, and the more senior leaders of the crusade were given speeches appealing to this sense of valour, or shame should they fail to seek battle. Gilo identified a group of *iuvenes* as being attached to Hugh the Great at the key battle against Kerbogha, but he also indicated that *iuvenes* were prominent in Raymond Pilet's expedition made up of troops gathered from those on crusade not already among the following of a major prince. There is less a suggestion of unruly behaviour among the *iuvenes* in the work of the poet than in the narrative of Robert of the Monk.

Our third author, Guibert, abbot of Nogent, also wrote his history, *Gesta Dei per Francos,* in northern France in the first decade of the century, and also based his text on a reworking of the *Gesta Francorum*. Guibert included in his history additional details obtained from returned crusaders. Written with the goal of providing the monastic reader with a set of moral standards, the work has many commentaries and observations that diverge considerably from the *Gesta Francorum*.[47] Guibert himself was an eyewitness to the departure of the expedition and the first appearance of the *iuventus* in his book is found in the verses he wrote to illustrate the perspective of the many non-combatants who joined the expedition. 'Everyone sang of warfare, but did not say that they would fight. They promised martyrdom, being about to give their necks to the sword, "You *iuvenes*," they said, "will draw swords with your hands, but we are permitted to deserve Christ by supporting this."'[48] *Iuvenes* were here used to encapsulate the perspective of crusading combatants as opposed to that of the non-combatants of the expedition; it is good evidence that for a contemporary the milieu of *iuvenes* were understood to be at the heart of the fighting body of the First Crusade. Guibert gave a more nuanced description of the setting forth of knights on crusade when he described a three-fold hierarchy in the Lotharingian army: the senior princes, knights and the *iuventus*. In his description of the departure of Duke Godfrey of Lotharingia and his brothers Baldwin and Eustace of Boulogne, 15 August 1096, Guibert wrote, 'Together with a noble procession of knights and a notable throng of very brave *iuvenes* they entered the land of the Hungarians.'[49]

Guibert next returned to the term in writing about Tancred, 'who in the Lord's wars, and up to this time, has earned and deserves the title of most sagacious *iuvenis*.'[50] Tancred was a major figure in the events of the First Crusade: he took command of

---

[47] See above p. 147 - 8.
[48] GN 120: *Bella canunt omnes; nec se pugnare fatentur,*
Martirium spondent, gladiis vel colla daturos:
'Vos iuvenes', aiunt, 'manibus tractabitis enses
At nos hic liceat Christum tolerando mereri.'
[49] GN 129: *Cum nobili igitur rerum equestrium pompa et spectabili fortissimorum iuvenum frequentia Hungarorum ingrediuntur terram.*
[50] GN 194: *Qui in bellis dominicis titulum sagacissimae iuventutis nunc usque meretur et meruit.*

Bohemond's contingent in the absence of their lord in Greece; he led a sizeable Norman force into Cilicia (15 September 1097), and he led a group of Norman knights in the later stages of the crusade. It might seem inconsistent with the other examples given that he was termed a *iuvenis*, not just by Guibert but also by Albert of Aachen and Ralph of Caen.[51] But until his establishment of a principality in Galilee, late 1099, Tancred was an unmarried knight still in search of his fortune and position, acting largely under the direction of Bohemond, the brother-in-law of his mother Emma.[52] In this regard Tancred was the epitome of a *iuvenis* during the expedition.

Guibert of Nogent entitled Tancred as a *iuvenis* in connection with his leading of the garrison of the castle that was built during the siege of Antioch opposite the Gate of St George. Here there is a connection with Gilo's report of the same initiative, with both authors indicating that the hazardous task of forming the garrison of this castle was one associated with the *iuvenes*.[53]

The next use of *iuvenis* by Guibert was for a person who also does not initially seem to fit well with the definition provided by Duby. During a truce at the siege of Antioch, c. May 1098, Guibert wrote that the lull in fighting ended due to an ambush. 'There our men lost an excellent *iuvenis*, who had been constable for the King of France and his name was Walo.'[54] Walo II of Chaumont-en-Vexin was married to Humberge, the sister of Everard III le Puiset.[55] Everard himself was identified by Robert, Gilo and Ralph as a prominent *iuvenis* among the band that included Thomas de Marle and Drogo of Nesle.[56] Unlike the case of Tancred, Walo was married and already had a notable role at the French court. But he and Humberge, who accompanied him on the expedition, were without children. This, together with his leaving of a settled position at the court of the Phillip I of France, and Walo's association with the troublesome band of *iuvenes* through his brother-in-law, seems to have led Guibert to describe Walo as a *iuvenis* rather than a *miles* or *nobilis*.

Thereafter the term does not appear until Guibert's account of the storming of Jerusalem. 'Several of the Frankish *iuvenes*, whom pious audacity had already made more pre-eminent, threw themselves forward ... and together they climbed to the top of the wall. I would identify them by name on this page, if I had not known that after their return they

---

[51] See below pp. 270, 274.
[52] R. L. Nicholson, *Tancred,* pp. 3-15
[53] See above p. 262.
[54] GN 332: *Ibi quemdam nostri egregiae indolis iuvenem qui apud regem Francorum comes stabuli fuerat, nomine Walonem, amittunt.*
[55] For Walo II of Chaumont-en-Vexin see J. Riley-Smith, *The First Crusaders*, p. 224.
[56] For Everard see p. 260 n. 18. See also above pp. 260, 263 – 4 and below p. 275.

incurred the infamy of wickedness and crime.'[57] A clue to the identity of the unnameable persons is to be found in Guibert of Nogent's autobiography. Here Thomas of Marle looms large as a rebellious and sadistic lord in the 1110s, the most wicked man of his generation, making it likely that he and his troublesome associates were among those indicated by Guibert's use of the term *iuvenes* at this point.[58] Guibert may also have been familiar with the case of Raimbald Croton, whom Ralph of Caen described as a *iuvenis*,[59] and who was one of those to lead the breakthrough into Jerusalem. On his return to Chartres Raimbald Croton became embroiled in a dispute with Bonneval abbey in the course of which he castrated a monk. As a result Raimbald was given fourteen years' penance by Bishop Ivo of Chartres.[60] Jonathan Riley-Smith has briefly examined the later turbulent careers of these two members of the First Crusade, but it is worth noting that both these knights participated in the expedition as *iuvenes* – suggesting a line of enquiry on the connection between those who journeyed on the First and later crusades as *iuvenes* and the more rebellious of returnees.[61]

Guibert's next reference to *iuvenes* was his description of the battle of Ascalon (12 August 1099). Guibert imagined the reaction of al-Afdal, Shah an-Shah, vizier of Egypt, on seeing the weary crusader forces, 'And he looked upon the ... *iuventa* weakened by long hunger, swords turned rusty, lances darkened, the slender military equipment of *milites*, their strength worn out; all those who seemed to be more distinguished than the rest rendered inactive by the bitterness of want.'[62] Here again Guibert drew a tripartite picture of the crusader fighting forces, youths (Guibert used the collective term *iuventa*), knights and princes.

Finally, Guibert gave the *iuvenes* a role in the vanguard of the army, in the storming of Caesarea by Baldwin I (17 May 1101): 'Therefore the king, supported by the choicest of his *iuventus*, fiercely attacked the inhabitants.'[63] According to Guibert of Nogent therefore, to be a *iuvenis* on the First Crusade was almost entirely praiseworthy, *iuvenes* were depicted as the keenest warriors of the expedition, the embodiment of the fighting knight. Certain individual *iuvenes*, however, were so loathed by Guibert that he declined to give them the credit he considered was their due for being to the fore at the storming of Jerusalem.

---

[57] GN 278: *Quique iuvenum Francicorum, quos pia jam dudum reddiderat illustriores audacia, sese proripiunt ... murorum pariter suprema conscendunt. Quos etiam nominatim huic insererem paginae, nisi scirem post reditum tantorum eos flagitiorum ac scelerum infamiam incurrisse.*
[58] Guibert of Nogent, *Monodiae*, III.7, 11, 14.
[59] See below p. 275.
[60] Ivo of Chartres, Letter 135 to Paschal II, *PL* 162 col. 144D.
[61] J. Riley-Smith, *The First Crusaders*, p. 156.
[62] GN 299: *At intuebatur... profligatam diutina fame iuventam, rubiginosis ensibus, lanceis nigrantibus, exilem destitutis militum viribus armaturam, cunctis qui pre ceteris videbantur insignes acri egestate torpentibus.*
[63] GN 347: *Igitur ..., cum rex, fretus iuventute lectissima, oppidanos graviter urgeret.*

All three sources considered so far were connected by their location in northern France and their use of the *Gesta Francorum*. Turning then to the *Historia Francorum qui ceperunt Iherusalem* of Raymond of Aguilers considerably broadens the scope of this enquiry. The *Historia Francorum* was begun during the siege of Antioch and was updated by the author, an eyewitness, during the course of the events it describes. Raymond, a canon of Le Puy, had a social vocabulary only slightly more sophisticated than that of the anonymous author of the *Gesta Francorum*, and a vocabulary moreover heavily influenced by the Old Testament. Despite his generally archaic social language Raymond nevertheless referred to *iuvenes* on four occasions.

The first mention of a *iuvenis* occurs in Raymond's history during a description of a skirmish during the siege of Antioch (29 December 1097): 'The standard bearer of the bishop [Adhémar of Le Puy] was killed there, and his standard was captured. There perished a certain very noble *iuvenis*, Bernard Raimund of the land of Béziers [Bernard Ato, viscount of Béziers].'[64] As with Gilo's reference to William of Benium's raising of the banner of Hugh the Great, there seems to be a connection between defending the standard and being a *iuvenis*.[65]

A further very striking example of a *iuvenis* who was also a standard bearer occurs in the next reference to the *iuventus* given by Raymond of Aguilers, namely his account of a vision of St George. Raymond wrote that when the priest and visionary Peter Desiderius discovered the relics of an unknown saint, the crusading clergy decided to leave them behind, but 'in the night which followed a certain *iuvenis*, about fifteen years old, truly most beautiful, was present with him as he kept vigil.'[66] In seeking the identity of this *iuvenis*, Peter Desiderius was asked by the vision to name the standard bearer of the army and learned that he was in the presence of St George. The cult of St George was to grow, considerably accelerated by the success of the First Crusade, until by the fifteenth century he was the personification of chivalry. It is very significant that the embodiment of the highest ideal of a crusading warrior and standard-bearer of the whole expedition should be described as a *iuvenis* by a participant of the First Crusade. Another eyewitness, the anonymous author of the *Gesta Francorum,* provided evidence that St George was considered to be intervening on behalf of the expedition in his description of the battle

---

[64] RA 40 - 1: *Interfectus est ibi vexillifer episcopi, et captum est vexillum ejus. Interiit ibi quidam nobilissimus juvenis Barnardus Raimundus, patria Bitterensis.* This was not the better-known standard bearer, Heraclius I of Polignac, for whom see J. Riley-Smith, *The First Crusaders*, p. 211. For Bernard Ato see J. Riley-Smith, *The First Crusaders* p. 201.

[65] See above p. 264.

[66] RA 291-3: *In nocte quae secuuta est, astitit ei vigilanti quidam iuvenis, quasi quindecim annorum, pulcherrimus valde.* In contemporary thinking beauty was one of the attributes of persons in the stage of youth, see R. M. Karras, *From Boys to Men* (Philadelphia, 2003), p. 12 - 13.

against Kerbogha, where St George was described as being among the resplendent saints who rode into battle with the crusading forces.[67]

The third mention of a *iuvenis* in Raymond of Aguiler's history was made with regard to a detachment of knights under Count Galdmar Carpenel of Dargoire, who were sent from the siege of Jerusalem (18 June 1099), to make contact with six Christian vessels that had arrived at Jaffa. This expedition ran into a troop of Arab and Turkish riders, dispersing them after some losses, 'of the following of Galdmar there died three or four knights, and Achard of Montemerle, a noble *iuvenis*, and renowned knight.'[68]

The last reference to *iuvenes* in the work of Raymond of Aguilers occurs, significantly, with regard to the storming of Jerusalem (15 July 1099). Although Raymond did not describe them as being first on to the wall, he described a *iuvenis* as playing a key role at the point where the breakthrough occurred: 'Moreover a certain *iuvenis* devised arrows, and he discharged them at the coverings which protected ramparts that the Saracens had made to face the wooden tower of the duke [Duke Godfrey of Lotharingia].'[69]

A second early crusading history with a perspective different from those of the three northern French historians is the *Historia Hierosoloymitana* of Albert of Aachen. Recent work, especially that of Peter Knoch and Susan B. Edgington, has led to a reappraisal of Albert as a source for the First Crusade, and in particular, to a re-dating of the first six books of the history, those which contain the narrative of the First Crusade, to the early 1100s.[70] Since Albert was a cleric at Aachen in Lotharingia he had a great deal of information and interest in the German contingents and therefore considerably supplements the overall picture of the crusade as portrayed by the French sources. Importantly for this discussion, although Albert may well have had access to a copy of the *Gesta Francorum*, Albert's work has an independent structure and perspective.[71] He also had a more sophisticated vocabulary for social structure than any other crusading source earlier than 1184 and the appearance of William of Tyre's *A History of Deeds Done Beyond The Sea*.

Two other terms occur in Albert's work that are nearly always used to indicate someone from the same social grouping as a *iuvenis*, namely *adolescens* and *tyro*. There are two crusaders described by Albert as *adolescens*, both clearly knights. The first is Gerard of

---

[67] GF 69. For further discussion of St George and the First Crusade see C. Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, trans. M. W. Baldwin and W. Goffart (Princeton, 1977), pp. 6, 54, 87, 135, 273-81.

[68] RA 318-9: *Ceciderunt ibi de parte Galdemari tres vel quatuor milites, et Acardus de Monte Merulo, nobilis iuvenis, et miles inclitus*. For other references to Galdmar Carpenel and Achard of Montemerle see J. Riley-Smith, *The First Crusaders*, p. 206 and p. 197, RA p. 318 note A.

[69] RA 343: *Praeterea quidam iuvenis innexuerat sagittas, et sagittaverat culcitras, quibus muniebatur propugnaculum quod Sarraceni fecerant, contra turrem ligneam ducis.*

[70] P. Knoch, *Studien zu Albert von Aachen* (Stuttgart, 1966), pp. 82-90. S. B. Edgington, 'The First Crusade: reviewing the evidence', *The First Crusade, Origins and Impact*, ed. J. Phillips (Manchester, 1997), pp. 55-77, 61.

[71] P. Knoch, *Studien zu Albert von Aachen*, pp. 69-71.

Avesnes, a knight of Hainault who was given as a hostage to the Arabs of Arsuf by Duke Godfrey as part of an agreement that was subsequently broken. When Duke Godfrey besieged Arsuf, early in December 1099, Gerard was held spread-eagled on ropes outside of the battlements of the town. Undeterred Duke Godfrey pressed the siege and Gerard was eventually pulled back up riddled with the arrows of his own companions. Surprisingly Gerard reappeared on 25 March 1100, released as a peace offering from the townspeople. Albert wrote that, 'when the duke, saw and received the beloved *miles* and excellent youth *adolescens* Gerard unharmed, he rejoiced exceedingly.'[72] The other *adolescens* in Albert's work was the less fortunate Arnulf of Aldenard, killed while searching for his horse on the return of a raiding expedition to Jerusalem in 1106. Arnulf is described at various times as a *nobilissimus iuvenis*, a *princeps*, an *illustris miles* and *adolescens*.[73]

Another apparent synonym for *iuvenes* in the *Historia Iherosolimitana* is *tyrones*. The classical meaning of the term was for a recruit, a beginner or a novice.[74] Albert, however, was not given to classical allusion and it is clear from those he applied the term to that they were fully trained knights. Those who were named and described as a *tyro* were: Tancred, his brother William, Guy of Possesse, Rainald of Beauvais, Engelrand, son of count Hugh of Saint-Pol, Franco I and Sigemar of Maasmechelen on the river Meuse, blood relations, and Otto surnamed Altaspata, son of the sister of Albert of Biandrate.[75] A Venetian was termed *tyro* by Albert at the siege of Haifa (25 July 1100), when he was the only one of his companions not to abandon a siege machine.[76] Of these, Tancred, William and Engelrand were also termed *iuvenes* by Albert.[77] In fact the description of William makes the close connection between *iuvenes* and *tyrones* clear: 'William, most audacious *iuvenis*, and most beautiful *tyro*, brother of Tancred.'[78] The appearance of the epithet *pulcher* seems inappropriate for a knight, but was a medieval convention when discussing youth.[79]

With regard to Rainald there is a valuable agreement between the sources discussed so far. Albert invariably referred to Rainald in association with Walo II of Chaumont, who we have seen termed a *iuvenis* by Guibert of Nogent and who was brother-in-law to the

---

[72] AA 529: *Dux itaque, viso et incolumi recepto Gerardo dilecto milite, et egregio adolescente, gavisus est vehementer.*
[73] AA 718-20.
[74] C. T. Lewis and C. Short, *A Latin Dictionary* (new impression: Oxford, 1987).
[75] AA 164 (Tancred), 165 (Guy), 192 (William), 248 (Rainald), 265 (Engelrand), 343 (Franco and Sigemar) and 685 (Otto). For other references to these knights see J. Riley-Smith, *The First Crusaders*, p. 210 (Guy); p. 225 (William); p. 218 (Rainald). See also see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom*, p. 192 – 3 (Engelrand); p. 196 (Franco); p. 228 (Sigemar); p. 218 (Otto).
[76] AA 540.
[77] AA 208 (Tancred), AA 192 (William), AA 193 (William), AA 268.
[78] AA 192: *Willelmus iuvenis audacissimus et tyro pulcherrimus, frater Tancredi.*
[79] R. M. Karras, *From Boys to Men* (Philadelphia, 2003), pp.12 - 13.

prominent *iuvenis* Everard III of Puiset.[80] Furthermore Rainald of Beauvais was listed by Gilo of Paris as being among the group of knights who were attached to the contingent of Hugh the Great for the battle against Kerbogha, the same group (that which included Thomas de Marle and Drogo of Nesle) whom as we have seen Robert the Monk included under the label *iuventus*.[81] Albert's evidence that Rainald was a *iuvenis* strengthens the case that a distinct social group of *iuvenes* coalesced around the following of Hugh the Great during the crusade.

In Albert's assigning of epithets to these individual knights there is no doubting the similarity of meaning of *iuvenis* and *tyro*. The connection is also strengthened by noting the etymological root of the term *tirocinium*, which came to mean a joust or tournament, and the verb *tirocinare*, to be in training as a knight.[82] The two terms could be considered synonymous for Albert but for a description of the crusading princes at the battle of Dorylaeum (1 July 1097). Albert wrote that 'a great ruin of the Turks was brought about by these distinguished *tyrones* and their associates.'[83] Here it might be the case that *tyrones* is being used in a slightly different sense to *iuvenes*, the princes being cast in the role of God's individual champions.[84] Alternatively, in three of the manuscript traditions of Albert's *Historia*, *viri* is substituted for *tyrones* at this point, removing the one exceptional use of the term, and thus suggesting that Albert himself, or a later correcting hand, was entirely consistent in equating the *tyro* with the *iuvenis*.[85] So, including the *adolescens* and, with caution, the *tyrones*, what did Albert say about the role of the knightly youth on the crusade?

Albert was much more explicit than Robert that the *iuvenes* were an unruly body. They first appear as a distinct social grouping within the movement in his description of the People's Crusade of Peter the Hermit. At the town of Nish (now Niš, in South Eastern Serbia) on the fringes of the Byzantine Empire, on or around 4 July 1096, a dispute arose between Nicetas, governor of Bulgaria, and the crusading forces. 'A thousand irrational men, *iuventus* of extreme frivolousness, of stiff neck, an untamed and headstrong people, without cause, without prudence, rushed beyond the aforementioned bridge of stone with a serious attack on the town walls and gate of the city, to whom were joined a thousand of the same frivolous *iuventus* running across the fords and bridge with mighty shouts and fury in

---

[80] AA 166, 196, 361 – 2. See above p. 266.
[81] GP 190-2. For Thomas de Marle see above p. 260 n. 18.
[82] J. F. Niermeyer, *Medival Latin Dictionary, 2* (Leiden, 2002) II, 1342.
[83] AA 173: *Non modica Turcorum ruina ab hiis egregiis tyronibus et eorum sociis facta est.*
[84] J. F. Niermeyer, *Medival Latin Dictionary,* 2, 1342.
[85] *RHC Oc.* 4, 320.

order to help.'[86] In response to this attack Nicetas unleashed his full force, scattering the crusaders, who eventually reformed with the loss of about a quarter of their number.

Similarly, the final disaster to meet the People's Crusade, their defeat and slaughter at Civitote (21 October 1096) by the forces of Kilij Arslan, sultan of Rũm, was precipitated, says Albert, by the rash advances of the *iuvenes* on a raid near Nicea. Despite warnings from their more experienced leaders, 'it seemed to the stormy and fickle *iuvenes*, that they might pillage and carry off plunder from the meadows and pastures before the walls of Nicea in sight of the Turks.'[87]

Some of the individual *iuvenes* were also associated with indiscipline. Albert commented that while Bohemond prudently portrayed himself as loyal to the Byzantine Emperor, Alexius I Comnenus, Tancred, was frequently troublesome.[88] There is also a suggestion of rashness in the action of the above-mentioned Arnulf of Aldenard for leaving the army in order to search the unknown territory for his horse.[89] On a raid of Baldwin I's near Hebron (November 1100), forty *iuvenes* are described as secretly forming a plan to hasten ahead in order to obtain money and booty.[90]

As with Robert the Monk, this negative aspect of the *iuvenes* is only one part of the picture, for Albert frequently praised them as a body and individually for their warlike prowess. *Iuvenis* was clearly not a negative term in the description of Rothold son of Godfrey, 'a most famous *iuvenis*.'[91] A similar positive description is given for Baldwin of Le Bourcq, 'a splendid *iuvenis*,'[92] as well as for Tancred, William and Engelrand above. When Engelrand died in Ma'arat-an-Numan (10 December 1098), he was described as 'an uncommonly daring *iuvenis*.'[93] Among the many favourable epithets for Tancred was the term, 'illustrious *tyro*.'[94] At the first battle of Ramlah, 6 September 1101, where he was in charge of the third division, Hugh of Saint-Omer was called 'a warlike *iuvenis*.'[95] Roger of Salerno, before he became prince of Antioch (December 1112), was described as an, 'illustrious *iuvenis* and knight.'[96] To be a *iuvenis* was not to detract from a knight's valour.

---

[86] AA 102: *Mille insensatorum hominum, iuventus nimie levitatis et dure cervicis, gens indomita et effrenis, sine causa, sine ratione, trans predictum pontem lapideum ad menia [moenia – Niermeyer] et portam civitatis in gravi assultu vadunt, quibus mille eiusdem levitatis iuventus trans vada et isum pontem concurrentes ingenti vociferatione et furore in auxilium iunguntur.*

[87] AA 111: *Visum est animosis et ventosis iuvenibus, quatenus assumpta manu, de exercitu predam in pratis et pascuis ante muros civitatis Nicee in aspectu Turcorum raperent et abducerent.*

[88] AA 160.

[89] AA 719.

[90] AA 567.

[91] AA 166: *Rothardus filius Gosfridi, iuvenis clarissimus*. His father, an otherwise unknown Godfrey, is not to be confused with Duke Godfrey of Lotharingia.

[92] AA 206: *Baldwinus de Burch iuvenis preclarus.*

[93] AA 410: *iuuenis mire audacie.*

[94] AA 164: *tyro illustris.*

[95] AA 595: *iuuenis bellicosus.*

[96] AA 828: *illustrissimum iuuenem et militem.*

Although many of the knights named individually in his chronicle were termed *iuvenis*, as a collective body influencing events the *iuventus* appear less in Albert's work than the other histories under discussion. Aside from the rash behaviour of the forces of the People's Crusade, *iuvenes* were identified only cursorily and only in the form *tyrones*. In battle with the forces of Kerbogha, '[Duke Godfrey] with the Christian *tyrones* were violently pursuing and cutting them down.'[97] According to Albert the body of scouts sent ahead when the First Crusade approached Ramlah (3 June 1099), included 500 *tyrones*.[98] In 1100 the Armenian town of Melitene was successfully defended against the forces of Malik Ghazi Ghumushtekin, the Danishmend emir of Sebastea, by troops posted there by Count Baldwin of Edessa (soon to be King Baldwin I of Jerusalem), which included 50 *tyrones*.[99] And at the unsuccessful siege of Tyre by Baldwin I (November 1111), certain *tyrones* were picked to occupy the siege towers and keep up a bombardment of missiles.[100]

Albert's use of *iuvenes* then, gave them much less of a collective role in his description of events, except where they were behaving rashly. For him it seems that this characteristic was decisive in his use of the term for certain bodies of knights. By contrast, when referring to individuals, Albert associated positive and warlike epitaphs with the term *iuvenes*.

The final source under consideration for this discussion is the *Gesta Tancredi in expeditione Jerosolymitana* of Ralph of Caen. Ralph had served with Bohemond in 1107 before journeying to Syria in 1108, where he took service with Tancred. Shortly after Tancred's death, around 1113, Ralph wrote a history in the form of a panegyric to his former lord. The text survives in one manuscript only, incomplete and with lacunae. It is independent of the *Gesta Francorum* tradition and its value is enhanced by the fact that it was written in the knowledge that it would be read by participants in the First Crusade, and in particular by Arnulf, the chaplain to Robert I, duke of Normandy who became patriarch of Jerusalem in 1099 and again from 1112 until his death in 1118.[101]

The first reference to the *iuventus* as a distinct social group occurs in a rallying speech of Duke Robert II of Normandy to those who, including Bohemond, were described

---

[97] AA 368: *Duce cum Christianis tyronibus atrociter insequente et caedente.*
[98] AA 429: *Robertus vero Flandriensis et Gastus militaris homo de Bederz, assumptis quingentis tyronibus a societate premissi, ad portas et explorandos muros precesserunt.*
[99] AA 547: *Sed viriliter a quinquaginta predictis tyronibus a Baldwino ibidem constitutis urbs defensa ab hostibus intacta et invicta remansit.* The *tyrones* are called *milites* in the previous paragraph.
[100] AA 823: *In hac ergo idem Eustachius cum electis manens tyronibus, Tyrios mane, meridie, vespere per urbem gradientes omni genere iaculorum alios interimebant, alios vulnerabant, per turres, menia et omnia urbis loca speculantes.*
[101] RC 604. For Arnulf of Chocques see R. Foreville, 'Un chef de la première croisade: Arnulf Malecouronne,' *Bulletin Philologique et Historique du Comité des Travaux Historiques et Scientifiques* (1953 –4), pp. 377 – 90. See also B. Hamilton, *The Latin Church in the Crusader States* (London, 1980), pp. 12 – 13.

by Ralph as wavering at the battle of Dorylaeum. '"Therefore be active, o *iuvenes*, let us charge into the middle of the force and die." Admonished by these words, the rest of the *iuvenes* joined themselves to the leaders and were more ready for death than for flight.'[102]

Once battle was joined, Ralph, as with Robert and Albert, described the *iuventus* as being intemperate and a dangerously undisciplined force. 'While the minds of the *iuvenes* boiled over in passion [Bohemond] forbade them to depart to a hostile encounter lest the guilty rashness of a few throw the whole order into confusion.'[103]

Ralph was yet another source who associated a following of *iuvenes* with the contingent of Hugh the Great, in this instance at the battle of Dorylaeum: in other words, a year earlier than the battle against Kerbogha in which they are grouped with Hugh by Robert and Gilo. Ralph wrote: 'Thus spoke the great man [Hugh of Vermandois], and under his leadership the supporting *iuventus* circled around him, ardently smiting whatever fell before them, and the slain enemy fell.'[104]

According to Ralph, Tancred was accompanied by *iuvenes* during his expedition through Cilicia. At a battle outside Tarsus c. 20 September 1097 they were described as following Tancred in a charge, 'The faithful *iuventus* firstly cut to pieces the breasts of the Turks, next the backs.'[105]

Similarly Count Baldwin of Boulogne was able to attract some Norman *iuvenes* to his foray into the same region, on or around 15 September 1097, by obtaining the services of their leader, Cono of Montaigu.[106] The description of Baldwin's following by Ralph has a strong ring of authenticity when the Norman chronicler expressed almost a sense of betrayal that Norman troops should have joined this contingent, as it fought against the followers of Tancred. Ralph wrote that count Cono of Montaigu joined with Baldwin, and, 'in addition [Cono's] *iuventus* were not absent from him.'[107]

As with the other sources under discussion, Ralph assigned to the *iuventus* the key role in the capture of Antioch on the morning of 3 June 1098. 'The flying winged *iuventus*, well girded with swords, flew by means of the ropes. Gouel of Chartres was the first, like an eagle calling forth its young to fly, and flying over them. This noble man since boyhood

---

[102] RC 622: '*Ergo agite, o juvenes, moriamur, et in media arma ruamus.' His admoniti agglomerant sese ducibus caetera juventus, morti deinceps quam fugae paratior.*
[103] RC 623: *Aestuantibus juvenum animis ad congressum egressum negabat, ne forte paucorum temeritas rei ordinem turbaret universum.*
[104] RC 625: *Sic vir magnanimus, et eo duce freta juventus*
Innumeros ardens se circumflectit in orbes,
Et quaecumque ruit caedens, caesus ruit hostis.
[105] RC 631: *juventus fida: Turcorum caedunt primo pectora, mox terga.*
[106] For further references to Cono of Montaigu see J. Riley-Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 203
[107] RC 632 – 3: *Praeterea sua sibi juventus non deerat.*

hungered and thirsted for nothing more eagerly than praise, and to live for praise.'[108] Gouel of Chartres has been understood to be that Fulcher of Chartres described by Robert and Gilo who led the *iuvenes* on to the walls of the city.[109] Ralph's version of the event supplements that of the other sources; between them the fact that it was the *iuvenes* who took the risk of being first to lead the breakthrough is conclusively established.

Ralph next mentioned the *iuventus* as coming up to join the advance forces of the crusade, before the city of Jerusalem, probably on 7 June 1099. 'Meanwhile numerous forces had arrived, the welcome reinforcement, the fiery *iuventus*.'[110] On 15 July 1099 the crusaders stormed Jerusalem. More in keeping with the account of Raymond of Aguilers than that in the *Gesta Francorum*, Ralph's description of the day's events included phases of the struggle where the attackers became weary and disheartened. It is during the storming of the city that Ralph assigned the epithet *iuvenis* to Tancred, the hero of his poem.[111]

Ralph further wrote that the first on to the wall of Jerusalem was the *iuvenis* Raimbald Croton,[112] 'I am not silent concerning the name of the brave knight who is deserving of applause. The name of the *iuvenis* was Raimbald, the land was France, the surname Croton, a nobleman born in Chartres.'[113] According to Ralph, Raimbold's lead was followed up by *iuvenes*.[114] Ralph named another knight as leader of this party, Bernard of St. Valéry: 'First among them, the *iuvenis* shone forth with drawn sword.'[115]

Ralph's final reference to the *iuventus* occurs towards the end of the conquest of Jerusalem, where he described some of the citizens as having made a stand, throwing the attackers into confusion. He praised Everard III of Le Puiset for 'attacking a thousand and moving the *iuventus* to follow him.'[116] This is very strong independent evidence for the conjecture that Thomas de Marle and Drogo of Nesle were indeed the leaders of a band of *iuvenes* who were the shock troops in the storming of Jerusalem, those whom Guibert of

---

[108] RC 654-5: *juventus volucris pennata corpora accincti gladiis per funes volant: Gouel Carnotensis primus, 'sicut aquila provocans pullos suos ad volandum, et super eos volitans'* [Deut 32:2], *vir ille nobilis, et a puero nihil esuriens ut laudem neque sitiens, non propter vitam laudari, sed propter laudem vivere cupiebat.*

[109] C. Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade*, p. 145; J. Riley-Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 206 and see also above pp. 260, 263.

[110] RC 686: *Interea frequentes copiae, subsidium libens, juventus fervida adventaverant.*

[111] RC 688.

[112] For Raimbald Croton see J. Riley-Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 218.

[113] RC 689: *Neve tacito nomine audaciam militis meritus non remuneret favor. Nomen erat juveni Raibaldus, Francia tellus, agnomen Cremium, Carnotum nobilis ortus.*

[114] RC 693: *Sed et pontis instar trajecta palma, cives hostibus continuat, lignum saxis, murum machinae: hac quoque ope in urbem repit juventus avida manibus pedibus a procellis in portum tranans.*

[115] RC 693: *Primus in his stricto juvenis praefulgurat ense,*
Gloria militiae, generis quoque gloria clari.
For other references to Bernard of St. Valéry see J. Riley-Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 202.

[116] RC 698: *Unus mille viros invadit Martius heros:*
Voce satis, sed mota magis duce strage juventus.
For Everard III of Le Puiset see below p. 260 n. 18. See also below pp. 260, 263 – 4, 266.

Nogent declined to name. For as we have seen, both Robert and Gilo group those *iuvenes* with Everard III of Le Puiset as part of Hugh the Great's contingent at the battle of Antioch.

Between them, these historians serve to show that in the eyes of contemporaries, a large body of *iuvenes* was present on the First Crusade, ranging from the well-known Tancred to an anonymous body of rash but brave knights, keen to prove their valour. A very distinct band of northern French *iuvenes* appears to have formed during the crusade, those grouped around Thomas de Marle and Everard III of Le Puiset. The most important turning points of the expedition were the battle at Dorylaeum; the capture of Antioch; the battle against Kerbogha; the decision to leave Ma'arrat and push on to Jerusalem and the storming of Jerusalem. From the evidence of these early crusading historians a picture emerges that places these *iuvenes* to the fore at each of these moments. The *iuvenes* of the First Crusade were, however, only one stratum of the different social layers present. Therefore the initial conjecture of George Duby that we began with has to be amended. They were not the social grouping who alone created and sustained the First Crusade. But the spirit of Duby's comment, which was, after all, a passing remark, seems to be correct. These were the shock troops of the movement. Nor does the work of these early crusading histories exclude the likelihood that the *iuvenes* played a greater role as the practice of going on crusade evolved. After all, these early twelfth century works are among the first in general to give special attention to the social grouping of *iuvenes*, which is consistent with the fact that at the start of the twelfth century the distinct social grouping of the *iuventus* was itself only beginning to appear on a trajectory that took it to the heart of aristocratic life and culture a hundred years later.

II.4. Women and the First Crusade: Prostitutes or Pilgrims?

The general view of the First Crusade is that it was an entirely male affair, and this is not surprising given that even eminent experts in the history of the Crusade can begin articles by saying that 'the history of the First Crusade is, in large part, the history of mass movements of men'.[1] Yet the sources for the Crusade give ample and overwhelming evidence that 'innumerable'[2] women joined the movement. A typical, if rather salacious, comment for example occurs in the history of Albert of Aachen as he talks about the setting forth of the Crusade:

> Crowds from different kingdoms and cities gathered together, but in no sense turning away from illicit and sexual intercourse. There was unbridled contact with women and young girls, who with utter rashness had departed with the intention of frivolity; there was constant pleasure and rejoicing under the pretext of this journey.[3]

Albert of Aachen's description of the immorality and licentiousness of the Crusade is coloured by the morality of a celibate male infused with the characteristic misogyny of monasticism. But it is nevertheless a striking passage by an eyewitness to the departure of the First Crusade that raises interesting questions. What motivated women to join the First Crusade? Was the undertaking an opportunity for them to escape a sexually restrictive society? Did they see themselves as participants or were they camp followers?

Firstly, to establish that there were indeed thousands of women involved in the Crusade, and that their presence is well attested, the sources can quickly be surveyed. Orderic Vitalis, who wrote his *Ecclesiastical History* between 1125 and 1141, noted that the determination to either go

---

[1] J. A. Brundage, *The Crusades, Holy War and Canon Law*, (Aldershot, 1991), II, 380. An unfortunate beginning to his 1960 article, which is more than redressed in the pathbreaking 'Prostitution, Miscegenation and Sexual Purity in the First Crusade' *Ibid.* XIX, 57-65.

[2] Bernold of St Blaisen (Constance), *Chronicon*, 1096, *Die Chroniken Bertholds von Richenau und Bernolds von Konstanz 1054-1100*, ed. I. S. Robinson, *MGH Scriptores Rerum Germanicorum nova series* 14 (Hanover, 2003), p. 529: *innumerabiles*.

[3] AA 125: *Hiis itaque per turmas ex diuersis regnis et ciuitatibus in unum collectis, sed nequaquam ab illicitis et fornicariis commixtionibus auersis, inmoderata erat commessatio cum mulieribus et puellis, sub eiusdem leuitatis intentione egressis, assidua delectatio, et in omni temeritate sub huius uie occasione gloriatio.*

to Jerusalem or to help others who were going there affected 'rich and poor, men and women, monks and clerks, townspeople and peasants alike. Husbands arranged to leave beloved wives at home, the wives, indeed, sighing, greatly desired to journey with the men, leaving children and all their wealth.'[4] That many women acted on this inclination is clear. Guibert, abbot of Nogent's history, written to provide the monastic reader with a set of moral standards[5] is full of (usually derogatory) references to women and is an important source more generally for the theological and moral view of women in the early twelfth century. Guibert was another eyewitness to the departure of those participating in the expedition and described how 'the meanest most common men and even unworthy women were appropriating to themselves this miracle [the mark of the cross].'[6] Ekkehard, abbot of Aura and crusader on the 1101 expedition alongside many of those who had participated in 1096, wrote that of the common people, 'a great part of them were setting out with wives and offspring and laden with the whole household.'[7] In a manner very similar to that of Albert of Aachen, Ekkehard condemned the 'degraded women' (*inhonestas feminei sexus*) who had joined the Lord's host under the guise of religion.[8] The Anglo-Saxon chronicler, writing in Peterborough, had very little to say about the Crusade, but he did think it noteworthy that countless people set out, with women and children (*wifan and cildan*).[9] The near contemporary Annals of Augsburg say that along with warriors, bishops, abbots, monks, clerics and men of diverse professions, 'serfs and women' (*coloni et mulieres*) joined the movement.[10]

The epic poem, the *Chanson d'Antioche*, which, it is generally accepted, contains eyewitness material, has the lines: 'There were many ladies who carried crosses, and the (freeborn) French maidens whom God loved greatly went with the father who begat them.'[11] Anna Comnena, the daughter of the Byzantine Emperor, Alexius I, writing in the 1140s gave a brief description of the People's Crusade whose unusual make-up must have been a striking feature. She remembered seeing 'a host of civilians, outnumbering the sand of the sea shore or the

---

[4] OV 5, 17: *Diuitibus itaque et pauperibus, uiris et mulieribus, monachis et clericis, urbanis et rusticis, in Ierusalem eundi aut euntes adiuuandi inerat voluntas mirabilis. Mariti dilectas coniuges domi relinquere disponebant, illae uero gementes relicta prole cum omnibus diuitiis suis in peregrinatione uiros suos sequi ualde cupiebant.*

[5] J. G. Schenk, *The Use of Rhetoric, Biblical Exegesis and Polemic in Guibert of Nogent's 'Gesta Dei per Francos'* (unpublished M. Phil thesis: TCD, 2001).

[6] GN 330: *... quilibet extremae vulgaritatis homines et etiam muliebris indignitas hoc sibi tot modis, tot partibus usurpavere miraculum.*

[7] EA 140.

[8] EA 144.

[9] *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicles*, ed. Michael Swanton (London, 2000), p. 323.

[10] *Annales Augustani*, *MGH SS* 3, 134.

[11] *Chanson d'Antioche*, II.2, 9-12: *Des dames i ot maintes qui ont les crois portées; Et les frances pucieles que Diex a moult amées O lor pères s'en vont quit les ont engenrées.* See also S. B. Edgington, '*Sont çou ore les fems que jo voi la venir?* Women in the *Chanson d'Antioche*', in *Gendering the Crusades*, ed. S. B. Edgington and S. Lambert (Cardiff, 2001), pp. 154-62, here p. 155.

stars of heaven, carrying palms and bearing crosses on their shoulders. There were women and children too, who had left their countries.'[12] In his description of the disastrous aftermath of the battle of Civetote, 21 October 1096, Albert of Aachen wrote of the Turks who came to the camp of the crusaders: 'Entering those tents they found them containing the faint and the frail, clerks, monks, aged women, young boys, all indeed they killed with the sword. Only delicate young girls and nuns whose faces and beauty seemed to please the eye and beardless young men with charming expressions they took away.'[13] This description by Albert is particularly important in that it draws attention to the previously barely noticed fact that nuns (*moniales*) came on the crusade.

Even after the slaughter at Civetote, many women were assimilated into the Princes' Crusade. It is clear, indeed, that large numbers of women were travelling with the Princes' contingents. In Brindisi the first ship of those sailing with Robert of Normandy capsized (5 April 1097). Fulcher of Chartres wrote of the incident that four hundred 'of both sexes' perished by drowning.[14] Fulcher described the united army at Nicea as containing women and children.[15] The *Chanson d'Antioche* indicated that the camp of the crusaders had a particular women's section, which was raided by the Turks shortly after the siege of Nicea:

> 'Firstly, turning their violence on the ladies,
> Those who attracted them they took on horseback,
> And tearing the breasts of the old women,
> When the mothers were killed their children cried out,
> The dead mothers suckled them, it was a very great grief,
> They climbed up on them seeking their breasts,
> They must be reigning [in heaven] with the Innocents.'[16]

The anonymous author of *Gesta Francorum* reported that at the battle of Dorylaeum (1 July 1097), the women in the camp were a great help, for they brought up water for the fighting

---

[12] Anna Comnena, *The Alexiad*, X.5, trans. E. R. A. Sewter (Middlesex, 1979) p. 309.
[13] AA 119: *tentoria vero illorum intrantes quosquos repererunt languidos ac debiles, clericos, monachos, mulieres gradeuas, pueros, sugentes, omnem vero etatem gladio extinxerunt. Solummodo puellas teneras et moniales quarum facies et forma oculis eorum placere videbatur, iuvenesque inberbes et vultu venustos abduxerunt.*
[14] FC I,VIII,2 (169).
[15] FC I, X, 4 (183).
[16] *Chanson d'Antioche*, III.4, 15-21: *Premièrment aus Dames vont leur regne tournant, Celes qui lor contequent es sieles vont montant, Et aus vieilletes vont les mamelles torgant. Quant les mères sont moretes, si crient li enfant, Sor les pis lor montoient, les mameles querant, La mère morte alaitent; ce fu dolor moult grant, El regne aus innocents doivent estre manans.* See also Susan B. Edgington, 'Women in the *Chanson d'Antioche*', p. 155.

men to drink and bravely always encouraged them, fighters and defenders.[17] The *Chanson d'Antioche* has a description of the same scene:

> 'The baronage was thirsty, it was greatly oppressed;
> The knights of Tancred strongly desired water.
> They were greatly served by them who were with them.
> The ladies and maidens of whom there were numerous in the army; Because they readied themselves, they threw off their cloaks,
> And carried water to the exhausted knights,
> In pots, bowls and in golden chalices.
> When the barons had drunk they were reinvigorated.'[18]

During the battle, Turkish horsemen were sent to cover a possible line of retreat, and the near contemporary *Historia Vie Hierosolimitane* recorded that they 'cruelly put to the sword almost a thousand men, women, and unarmed, common folk.'[19] Further along the march in the arid stretches of Asia Minor, in July 1097 William of Tyre noted the presence of women on the crusade, and their suffering: 'Pregnant women, because of the rigours of both thirst and of the intolerable heat were forced to expel the foetus before the time decreed by nature. Through sheer mental distress they cast them out in coverlets, some of them alive, some half dead. Others with more humane feelings embraced their offspring. They fell down along the route and forgetful of their feminine sex exposed their secret parts. To a great extent they were more apprehensive about the immediate risk of death than about the preservation of the reverence that was due to their sex.'[20] Albert of Aachen referred to there being thousands of women and children at the siege of Antioch that began 21 October 1097.[21] The *Gesta Francorum* had a description of a woman in the camp of Bohemond being killed by an arrow during that siege.[22] In the plague that followed the capture of the city women were notably more likely to be victims.[23] At the climactic

---

[17] GF 19.

[18] *Chanson d'Antioche*, III.11, 3-10: *Li barnages ot soif, si fu moult oppressés; Forment desirent l'aigue li chevalier Tangrés. Mestier lor ont éu celes de leur regné, Les dames et pucieles dont il i ot assés; Quar eles se rebracent, les dras ont jus jetés, Et portèrent de l'aigue aus chevaliers lassés, As pos et as escueles et as henas dorés: Quant ont bu li baron tout sont resvigorés.* See also Susan B. Edgington, 'Women in the *Chanson d'Antioche*', p. 155.

[19] GP 86-7: *crudeliter ense necauit, Mille viros ferme, mulieres, vulgus inerme.*

[20] WT 217-18: *pregnantes pre sitis angustia et caloris intemperie ante tempus a natura decretum fetus edere compellerentur, quos pre anxietate spiritus quosdam vivos, extinctos quosdam, alios etiam semineces in strate proiciebant; alie, ampliore habundantes humanitate proles suas circumplexe, per vias volutabantur et sexus oblite feminei archana denudabant, magis pro instante mortis periculo sollicite quam ut sexui debitam conservarent reverentiam.*

[21] AA 252.

[22] GF 29.

[23] WT 344.

denouement of the First Crusade, the capture of Jerusalem (13-15 July 1099), women were still present in considerable numbers, sharing the work and bringing water and words of encouragement to the men. Indeed, according to William of Tyre, who although writing some three generations after the events had access to local traditions in Jerusalem, the women even presumed to take up arms.[24]

This by no means exhaustive selection of references to women on the Crusade, from a range of sources, establishes without a doubt that women were present in large numbers. But is it possible to focus more closely on the women present in the First Crusade and indicate something of their motivation?

One group of women whose presence and role is most easily understood are those who were members of the aristocracy.[25] Because the sources were largely written for the benefit of the aristocracy and because historians such as William of Tyre were interested in the genealogy of the leading noble families in Outremer, we are in a position to name some of the aristocratic women involved in the Crusade. Raymond of Toulouse brought with him on the Crusade his third wife, Elvira, daughter of Alfonso VI of Castile by his mistress, Ximene.[26] Baldwin of Boulogne, later count of Eddessa, also brought his wife, Godehilde of Tosny, 'an illustrious lady of high rank from England' wrote William of Tyre.[27] Godehilde's first cousin, Emma of Hereford came on the crusade with her husband Ralph I of Gael.[28] Bohemond brought his sister with him on Crusade and once he and his nephew[29] Tancred had obtained their impressive landholdings in Outremer, he sought and received suitably prestigious marriage partners. Bohemund married Constance and Tancred her half-sister Cecilia, both daughters of Philip I of France. It is likely that Count Baldwin of Bourcq brought at least one of his sisters with him as she later (12 September 1115) married Roger, prince of Antioch.[30] Walo II, lord of Chaumont-en-Vexin brought his wife, Humberge, daughter of Hugh Le Puiset and sister of the crusader Everard.[31] On the death of Walo, Humberge was described as being supported by a band of mature ladies

---

[24] WT 8.13 (403).
[25] For a full discussion of their presence on the crusade see S. Geldsetzer, *Frauen Auf Kreuzzügen 1096-1291* (Darmstadt, 2003) esp. Appendix 2, pp. 184-7.
[26] FC I, XXXII, 1 (320); GN 134.
[27] AA 139; WT 3. 18 (453). See also S. Geldsetzer, *Frauen Auf Kreuzzügen*, p. 186.
[28] OV 2, IV, 318. See also S. Geldsetzer, *Frauen Auf Kreuzzügen*, p. 185.
[29] The relationship that historians have generally reached consensus upon, see R. L. Nicholson, *Tancred: a Study of his Career and Work in Their Relation to the First Crusade and the Establishment of the Latin States in Syria and Palestine* (Chicago, 1940), p. 3-15, who opts, based on a discussion of the contemporary evidence, for Tancred being the son of Bohemund's half sister Emma, whereas she is shown as a full sister to Bohemund but without supporting evidence in the Hauteville family tree in E. van Houts, *The Normans in Europe* (Manchester, 2000) p. 298.
[30] WT 12. 9 (498).
[31] RM 794 – 6; GP 127. See also S. Geldsetzer, *Frauen Auf Kreuzzügen*, p. 186.

(*matres*).[32] In all likelihood the wives and sisters of many other lesser nobles intending to stay in the newly won crusader states were present, but by and large they did not come to the attention of the chroniclers of the Crusade. We know that Hadvide of Chiny, for example, journeyed with her husband Dodo of Cons-la-Grandville only due to charter evidence.[33] Emeline, wife of Fulcher a knight of Bullion, only appears in the historical record as a crusader, due to Albert of Aachen taking an interest in the story that although she was captured, because of her beauty an illustrious Turkish knight, a general of Omar, lord of Azaz fell in love with her. At the suggestion of Emeline, this Turkish general contacted Duke Godfrey of Lotharingia with a view to leading a revolt against Ridwan of Aleppo.[34] Other than this example, aristocratic women seem to have played no independent role in the Crusade. Their actions or words are not mentioned. This is hardly surprising given that for an aristocratic woman to have a measure of authority c.1100 she would have had to be a widow with a sizeable patrimony or a mother with significant influence over powerful sons. It was the next generation of aristocratic women who controlled property in the Kingdom of Jerusalem, who were able to wield some political power, or indeed those women left behind by their noble husbands. The women of the nobility present on the initial expedition were brought to generate families should the conquest be successful and were not in a position to play an independent political role during the campaign. Indeed if their male guardian died on the crusade such aristocratic women could be placed in a difficult position; Humberge was given a speech on the death of Walo that includes the question: 'other than with a man, can a woman live following the camp?'[35] Although dependent on Ovid for the phrase, Gilo posed the question in the contemporary setting of the Crusade, using the classical reference to indicate the dependency of the position of aristocratic women on their guardians.

Beyond the aristocratic women there were far greater numbers of women of the other social orders. There is no possibility of finding out their names or much detail concerning their backgrounds. Eyewitness descriptions of the gathering of forces for the First Crusade, however, have important information to offer. It is clear, first of all, that women from the social order of *pauperes*, both urban and rural poor, came with their husbands and children on the crusade. Guibert of Nogent, for example, was amused at the setting forth of entire families of the poor from southern France: 'There you would have seen remarkable things, clearly most apt to be a joke; you saw certain *pauperes*, whose oxen had been fitted to a two-wheel cart and iron-clad as

---

[32] GP 126.
[33] *Chartres de l'abbaye de St-Hubert-en-Ardenne*, ed. G. Kurth, I (Brussels, 1903), p. 81. For Dodo of Cons-la-Grandville see J. Riley-Smith, *The First Crusaders,* p. 203.
[34] AA 380. See also S. Geldsetzer, *Frauen Auf Kreuzzügen*, p. 185.
[35] GP 128 – 9.

though they were horses, so as to carry in the cart a few possessions together with small children. And these infants, when coming to a castle or a city, inquired if this were the Jerusalem to which they strained.'[36]

From Pope Urban II's letter to the clergy and people of Bologna of September 1096, it is clear that the unexpected departure of large numbers of non-combatant forces was a concern and a development to be restrained.[37] But it is hardly surprising that peasants undertaking the crusade with the expectation of finding a better life moved in entire families. As Ekkehard disapprovingly observed, 'the farmers, the women and children, roving with unheard of folly, abandoned the land of their birth, gave up their own property and yearned for that of foreigners and go to an uncertain promised land.'[38] There can be no question of describing such women as prostitutes or camp followers. These married women were non-combatant participants like the elderly, the clergy and the children on the crusade.

In addition to married women of urban and rural poor families, there is also evidence that unattached women participated in the Crusade. For this there are five important and interesting sources. The first has already been presented: Albert of Aachen's anger that what should have been a chaste undertaking in the manner of all pilgrimages was contaminated by licentiousness.[39]

The second was a description of the recruiting activities of Peter the Hermit by Guibert of Nogent. Peter was an enormously influential figure in generating support for the Crusade and led the People's Crusade: '[Peter the Hermit] was liberal towards the poor showing great generosity with the goods that were given to him, making wives of prostitutes [*prostitutae mulieres*] through his gifts to their husbands.'[40]

Guibert's use of the term *prostitutae* needs to be put in context. In contemporary ideology, particularly that of a monk, for a woman to fail to give an appearance of modesty, let alone for her to engage in sexual activity outside the bonds of marriage, meant she was considered a prostitute.[41] In fact canonists found it very difficult to define prostitution. A letter by Jerome (ca.342-420) contained the definition that 'a whore is one who lies open to the lust of many men'. In the same letter Jerome clarifies this by saying that 'a woman who has been

---

[36] GN 120: *Videres mirum quiddam et plane ioco aptissimum, pauperes videlicet quosdam, bobus biroto applicitis eisdemque in modum equorum ferratis, substantiolas cum parvulis in carruca convehere et ipsos infantulos, dum obviam habent quaelibet castella vel urbes, si haec esset Jherusalem, ad quam tenderent rogitare.*

[37] Urban II, letter to the clergy and people of Bologna, H. Hagenmeyer ed. *Die Kreuzzugsbriefe aus den Jahren 1088 – 1100* (Innsbruck, 1901), p. 137-8.

[38] EA 140.

[39] See above p. 277.

[40] GN 121: ... *dilargitione erga pauperes liberalis, prostitutas mulieres non sine suo munere maritis honestans*. For Peter the Hermit see above p. 96 n. 56. See also above pp. 198 – 201.

[41] As summarised in J. A. Brundage, *Sex, Law and Marriage in the Middle Ages* (Aldershot, 1993) I, 378.

abandoned by many lovers is not a prostitute.'[42] It was the first formulation that was to be used by Gratian for his widely distributed *Decretum* (ca.1140).[43] In other words, the early twelfth-century concept of *prostitutae* was far broader and much more detached from financial exchange than the modern term prostitute. The term was used by Church reformers to refer to priests' wives, women who would have considered themselves entirely respectable. Given this context, it seems reasonable to understand Guibert's *prostitutae mulieres* as wandering women – his sense of proper place being offended in a manner similar to his attitude towards runaway monks – rather than their literally being 'prostitutes'.

In an article unrelated to the Crusade, G. Duby made a comment that is extremely helpful in analysing the description given by Guibert of the activities of Peter the Hermit. In discussing the consequences of the drive to reform the church from 1075-1125, Duby wrote: 'Prostitution flourished in the rapidly expanding towns, thronging with uprooted immigrants. Above all, there were those women without men that the reform movement had itself thrown out onto the street, the wives abandoned by husbands because they were priests, or if laymen, because they were bigamists or had contracted an incestuous union. These women were to be pitied, but they were also dangerous, threatening to corrupt men and lead them astray...'[44]

The fact that Peter the Hermit was providing dowries to 'prostitutes' has been noted by E. O. Blake and C. Morris as showing that his was an urban audience.[45] But it seems possible to draw a further conclusion, that Peter the Hermit was using his gifts to gather a following amongst marginalised women. Those who accompanied him on crusade should therefore, once more, not be considered camp followers in the conventional sense. In the period of the First Crusade these women were *prostitutae* only in the sense that they were unmarried and as such a cause for concern, particularly to the clergy who were anxious at the potential social disorder they might cause and the contamination of the purity of the pilgrimage. The reforming concept of pilgrimage was closely related to that of the Truce of God, a clerically led peace movement that emphasised chastity and abstinence during the period of peace.

The third source, Raymond of Aguilers, gave very detailed accounts of the speeches of peasant visionaries, from which it is possible to detect elements of the political programme of the poor crusader. In one vision of St Andrew to Peter Bartholomew (30 November 1098), we have

---

[42] Jerome, *Epistula*, 64.7, *PL* 22, col. 611: *Meretrix, quae multorum libidini patet*; col. 612: *Non meretricem, quae multis exposita est amatoribus*.
[43] Gratian, *Decretum*, C.XVI. See J. A. Brundage, *Sex, Law and Marriage in the Middle Ages*, p. 827.
[44] G. Duby, *Women of the Twelfth Century*, I: *Eleanor of Aquitaine and six others*, trans. J. Birrell (Cambridge, 1997), p. 36.
[45] E. O. Blake and C. Morris, 'A hermit goes to war: Peter and the origins of the First Crusade', *Studies in Church History* 22 (1984), pp. 79-107.

evidence that the body of unmarried women was still a cause for concern, as the saint says 'amongst your ranks is a great deal of adultery, though it would please God if you all take wives.'[46] This idea seems remarkably similar to the aims of Peter the Hermit who was closely linked to the *pauperes,* for whom, in part, Peter Bartholomew was speaking. Guibert of Nogent, writing for the edification of his congregation of monks, says that the measures taken on the Crusade against unmarried women were far more severe than desiring they be married off. Having made the point that those requiring the protection of God should not be subject to lustful thoughts, he wrote that 'it happened there that neither a mention of harlot nor the name of a prostitute was tolerated... because if it was found that any of those woman was found have become pregnant, who was proven to be without a husband, she and her procurer were surrendered to atrocious punishments.... Meanwhile it came to pass that a certain monk of the most famous monastery, had left the cloister of his monastery and undertaken the expedition to Jerusalem, being inspired not by piety but by shallowness, was caught with some woman or other. If I am not mistaken he was found to be guilty by the judgement of red-hot iron, and finally the Bishop of Le Puy and the others ordered that the miserable woman with her lover be led naked through all the corners of the camps and be most fearfully lashed by whips, to the terror of the onlookers.'[47] That Guibert is particularly vehement on this point is unsurprising given his purpose. As Brundage has noted, the incident is likely to have some basis in fact given that Albert of Aachen tells a similar story.[48]

Fourthly, a more precisely observed episode of relevance occurred at a moment of great strain for the Crusade, January 1098, during the siege of Antioch, when famine was causing the movement to disintegrate. During this crisis the higher clergy managed to gain an influence over the movement, which they were not subsequently able to maintain. Their argument that to weather the crisis, particularly devout behaviour was required carried the day and therefore their hostility to the presence of unmarried women on the crusade surfaced in the form of a decision that women should be driven from the camp. Fulcher – at the time in Edessa – wrote that 'the Franks, having again consulted together, expelled the women from the army, the married as well as the unmarried, lest perhaps defiled by the sordidness of riotous living they should displease the

---

[46] RA 171: *Inter vos caedes et... plurima adulteria: quum Deo placitum sit, si uxores vos omnes ducatis.*
[47] GN 196: *Unde fiebat ut ibi nec mentio scorti nec nomen prostibuli toleraretur haberi...quod si gravidam inveniri constitisset aliquam earum mulierum, quae probantur carere maritis, atrocibus tradebatur cum suo lenone suppliciis. Contigit interea quemdam predicatissimi omnium coenobii monachum, qui monasterii sui claustra fugaciter excesserat et Iherosolimitanam expeditionem non pietate sed levitate provocatus inierat, cum aliqua femina ibi deprehendi, igniti, nisi fallor, ferri iudicio convinci ac demum Podiensis episcopi ceterorumque precepto per omnes castrorum vicos miseram illam cum suo amasio circumduci et flagris nudos ad terrorem intuentium dirissme verberari.*
[48] AA 261-2.

Lord. These women then sought shelter for themselves in neighbouring towns.'[49] William of Tyre described the same incident as being a more limited purge of solely 'light foolish women' (*leves mulierculae*).[50] This incident reveals the presence of significant numbers of unmarried women on the Crusade and that when given the opportunity the senior clergy moved to drive them away and give the movement a character more in keeping with the reforming military pilgrimage that Pope Urban II had envisaged.

Finally, the fifth piece of direct evidence for the presence of large numbers of unmarried women on the crusade, an excerpt from the chronicle of Bernold of St Blaisen (Constance): 'At this time a very great multitude from Italy and from all France and Germany began to go to Jerusalem against the pagans in order that they might liberate the Christians. The Lord Pope was the principal founder of this expedition ...an innumerable multitude of poor people leapt at that journey too simple-mindedly and they neither knew nor were able in any way to prepare themselves for such danger... It was not surprising that they could not complete the proposed journey to Jerusalem because they did not begin that journey with such humility and piety as they ought. For they had very many apostates in their company who had cast off their monastic habits and intended to fight. But they were not afraid to have with them innumerable women who had criminally changed their natural clothing to masculine clothing with whom they committed fornication, by doing which they offended God remarkably just as had also the people of Israel in former times and therefore at length, after many labours, dangers and death, since they were not permitted to enter Hungary they began to return home with great sadness having achieved nothing.'[51]

The importance of Bernold's work is that it is the most contemporary eyewitness account of the setting forth of the Crusade. He did not wait for the end of the year to write up his chronicle and therefore it is particularly valuable in recording the immediate response to events. It is

---

[49] FC I, XV, 14 (223): *tunc facto deinde consilio, eiecerunt feminas de exercitu, tam maritatas quam immaritatas, ne forte luxuriae sordibus inquinati Domino displicerent. Illae vero in castris adfinibus tunc hospitia sibi adsumpserunt.*

[50] WT 4. 22 (264).

[51] Bernold of St Blaisen (Constance), *Chronicon*, 1096, pp. 527-9: *His temporibus maxima multitudo de Italia et omni Gallia et Germania Ierosolimam contra paganos, ut liberarent christianos, ire cepit. Cuius expeditionis domnus papa maximus auctor fuit... Nimium tamen simpliciter innumerabilis multitudo popularium illud iter arripuerunt, qui nullomodo se ad tale periculum praeparare noverunt vel potuerunt...Non erat autem mirum, quod propositum iter ad Ierosolimam explere non potuerent, quia non tali humilitate et devotione, ut deberent, illud iter adorsi sunt. Nam et plures apostatas in comitatu suo habuerunt, qui abiecto religionis habitu cum illis militare proposuerunt. Sed et innumerabiles feminas secum habere non timuerunt, quae naturalem habitum in virilem nefarie mutaverunt, cum quibus fornicati sunt; in quo Deum mirabiliter, sicut et Israheliticus populus quondam offenderunt. Unde post multos labores, pericula et mortes, tandem, cum Ungariam non permitterentur intrare, domum inacte cum magna tristicia ceperunt repedare.*

notable that he shared with Guibert of Nogent and Albert of Aachen a sense that women leaving their allocated social position are similar to monks casting off their habits. Bernold's description of women dressing as men in order to go on crusade is supported by an entry in the Annals of Disibodenberg which states that news of the expedition depopulated 'cities of bishops [and] villages of dwellers. And not only men and youths but even the greatest number of women undertook the journey. Wonderful indeed was the spirit of that time in order that people should be urged on to this journey. For women in this expedition were going forth in manly dress and they marched armed.'[52]

It is possible to see women taking men's clothing as a form of protection for their journey. Their action could also be a form a social statement, indicating a desire to be considered pilgrims. Both ideas are present in a twelfth century saint's life, that of St Hildegund, who is disguised by her father, a knight, during their travels on crusade to Jerusalem and who retains her garb to become a famous monk whose secret is only revealed upon her death.[53]

The prescriptions against women wearing men's clothes would have been well known at the time of the First Crusade, for example that in Burchard of Worms' widely disseminated *Decretum*: 'if a woman changes her clothes and puts on manly garb for the customary female clothes, for the sake, as it is thought, of chastity, let her be anathema.'[54] Guibert of Nogent also told an interesting story in his autobiography in which men and women overcame their fear and distaste of cross-dressing in order to disguise themselves for an escape.[55] Nevertheless by this time there was an almost respectable tradition of pious women disguising themselves as men to escape persecution or to live like monks, for example, Pelagia, Thecla, Anastasia, Dorothea, Eugenia, Euphrosyne, Marina and Theodora.[56] Whether these tales had any influence over the cross-dressing crusaders is entirely speculative, but it is possible to draw at least one unambiguous conclusion from the description in Bernold and the Annals of Disibodenberg, which

---

[52] *Annales S. Disibodi*, *MGH SS* 17, 16: *regna rectoribus, urbes pastoribus, vici vastantur habitatoribus; et non tantum viri et pueri, sed etiam mulieres quam plurimae hoc iter sunt aggressae. Mirabilis enim spiritus illius temporis homines impulit ad hoc iter aggrediendum. Nam feminae in hanc expeditionem exeuntes virili utebantur habitu et armatae incedebant.*

[53] A. Butler, *Butler's Lives of the Saints*, *April* (London, 1999), p. 141-2. See also V. L Bullough and B. Bullough, *Cross Dressing, Sex and Gender* (Philadelphia, 1993), p. 54.

[54] Buchard of Worms, *Decretum*, VIII.60, *PL* 140, col. 805A: *Si qua mulier propter continentiam quae putatur, habitum mutat, et pro solito muliebri amictu virilem sumit, anathema sit.*

[55] Guibert of Nogent, *Monodiae*, III.9.

[56] D. Farmer, *Oxford Dictionary of Saints* (Oxford, 1997), p. 396 (Pelagia), p. 462 (Thecla). J. Coulson ed., *The Saints – a concise biographical dictionary* (London, 1958), p. 28 (Anastasia), p. 160 (Eugenia), p. 177 (Euphrosyne), p. 300 (Marina), p. 428 (Theodora). See also V. L Bullough and B. Bullough, *Cross Dressing, Sex and Gender*, p. 51.

is that these women did not attach themselves to the movement as prostitutes – male attire and the bearing of arms being completely inappropriate for such a role.

Insofar as historians have considered the role of women on the First Crusade they have tended to make the assumption that the majority of women were associated with the movement as camp followers, prostitutes. A closer examination of the evidence suggests that this is an error and that the thousands of women who went on the Crusade – to find a promised land, or to get away from the towns in which many of them had been abandoned – did so as participants, as pilgrims.

Conclusion

The major findings of Part One are the new insights that this study gives to the work of the early crusading historians. The anonymous author of the *Gesta Francorum* clearly had the most limited social vocabulary of any of the other early crusading historians. His attention to the condition of the *milites* did, however, provide particularly valuable material for a discussion of the meaning of that term as it was applied to participants of the First Crusade. Since the *Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere* of Peter Tudebode was so heavily dependent on the *Gesta Francorum* it added only a few new passages containing extra information that distinguish between the various social orders of the First Crusade. Although the quantity is limited, the additional material is in fact relatively rich in social information and there is sufficient to discern a difference in outlook between the two authors, in particular through Peter Tudebode having shown a greater interest in the presence of the poor.

The language and perspective of Raymond of Aguilers with regard to social structure was very different from all of the other early crusading sources. His theological outlook placed a much greater emphasis on the deeds of the 'poor' than did any of the other accounts. The consequence of Raymond's belief that he was recording the events of a people chosen by God was not a history of irrational mysticism but a valuable insight into the outlook of the poor on the First Crusade.

Fulcher of Chartres was a relatively terse author, given to succinct accounts of events without significant literary flourishes; nevertheless his work did convey a considerable amount of social information concerning the First Crusade and the early period of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem. It is notable that Fulcher had a more sophisticated and consistent vocabulary for the higher social orders than the poor. He was unusual in the early crusading sources in lumping together the non-combatant poor with the footsoldiers as *minores*. Fulcher's interest in writing about the condition of the poor was particularly directed towards illustrating to potential settlers in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem that the lower orders had benefited from their participation in the First Crusade.

Albert of Aachen was unusual among the early crusading historians in that his reports were evenly spread across all the social orders. Whereas Raymond of Aguilers paid particular attention to the activities of the *pauperes*, the anonymous author of the *Gesta Francorum* the *milites* and Fulcher the nobility, Albert was much more balanced. His vocabulary was rich and nuanced, with a straightforward style largely unadorned by classical allusion or biblical citation. His uses of the terms *ordo* and *manus* for hierarchical social strata are important for showing an alternative schema at work to that of the famous 'three orders' based on the functional grouping of those who pray, work and labour.

As a source of information concerning the events of the First Crusade the *Historia Hierosolymitana* of Baldric of Dol is limited, as a source for how a senior member of the northern French clergy framed their understanding of the First Crusade some ten years later it is extremely rich. In the process of investigating Baldric's language of social class his major themes can be seen, namely the parallel between the Children of Israel and the participants of the First Crusade; their behaviour mirroring that of the primitive Church; the responsibility of the seniors to the poor and as a result the harmony that existed between the social classes.

Robert the Monk's most important contribution to an understanding of the social dynamics of the First Crusade was almost certainly his descriptions of the activities of the *iuvenes*. From the raw material provided by the *Gesta Francorum* he identified a distinct layer of knights, to whom he attributed characteristics, such as playing the game of quintain, which must have existed in society around him. In other respects his departures from his *fons formalis* seem to be exaggerations to suit a theological purpose, namely to portray the First Crusade as the greatest event since creation. In his acceptance of the reports in the *Gesta Francorum* that *miles* fell to the state of *pedes* and that *pedes* could be promoted to *miles* he did, however, provide corroboration for the relative fluidity of those boundaries.

From the point of view of drawing out the nuances of social differentiation that are barely present in the *Gesta Francorum*, Guibert of Nogent's work is by far the most important. His rich vocabulary and sense of social order led him to write a history full of social texture. His awareness of 'middle ranks', both in society as a whole, and also within the nobility was perhaps his most important contribution, not only to the history of the First Crusade but to sociological writing generally.

William of Tyre had a rich and sophisticated language of social order. His writings represent an evolution in social thinking that shows a great leap forward compared to the work of all the earlier crusading historians, even that of Guibert of Nogent. Most importantly William adopted the term *classis* from the writings of Livy and applied it as a broad label for social strata in his day. It is from William's awareness of layers of middle ranking people between the *maiores* and the *minores* that the most interesting interpretations of events depicted in the earlier works arise. In that regard, his are useful eyes through which to view the material provided by the contemporary and near contemporary sources for the First Crusade.

All the studies made in Part One stand alone as useful additions to an understanding of each of the authors. But a comprehensive assessment of the social vocabulary of the early crusading authors allows for a reassessment of the narrative of events of the First Crusade. Part Two of this dissertation offered four studies that synthesise the understanding and material gained in Part One.

Women are shown to have been present in hitherto unsuspected numbers on the First Crusade and it is shown here for the first time that the evidence of the sources points to their being present not as camp followers but as participants, pilgrims.

There exists an important debate on the nature of knighthood in the early twelfth century. Were the terms *milites* and *equites* used simply for those functioning as mounted soldiers or did they convey a sense of social status, of nobility? This dissertation enters into the debate by showing that in main the early crusading sources did treat *milites* and *equites* as nobles, but that this status was a precarious one, subject to change.

There have been several previous attempts to understand the role of the *pauperes* in the First Crusade, but as none of them are based on a clear understanding of how the terms *inferiores, ignobiles, parvi, minores, egeni, vulgus, rustici,* and *pauperes* were used by the sources, they are somewhat unsatisfactory. This dissertation offers the first complete study of the role of the lower social orders in the First Crusade. It offers original insights into the political perspective of the poor and how that was given expression through the emergence of popular visionaries, especially in the emergence of Peter Bartholomew as their most influential spokesperson. This study shows that the poor were decisive in forcing the expedition on to Jerusalem and demonstrates that the poor had asserted themselves on the question of captured property to such an extent that by the fall of Jerusalem (15 July 1099) they had established an *ius*, a law, that guaranteed them possession of the property that they seized.

Perhaps the most original contribution of this dissertation to an understanding of the First Crusade is the discovery that the sources depict the existence of a distinct body of bachelor knights, the *iuvenes*. The role played by these knights is described here for the first time.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Albert of Aachen, *Historia Iherosolimitana*.
Historia Iherosolimitana, RHC Oc. 4, 265 - 713.
Albert of Aachen's *Historia Iherosolimitana,* ed. S. B. Edgington (unpublished PhD. thesis: University of London, 1991).

Albric of Trois-Fontaines, *Chronicon*, *MGH SS* 23, 631 – 950.

The Anglo-Saxon Chronicles, ed. and trans. Michael Swanton (London, 2000).

Anna Comnena, *The Alexiad*, trans. E. R. A. Sewter, (Middlesex, 1979).

Annales Altahenses maiores, *MGH SS*, 4, 38.

Annales Aquenses, *MGH SS* 24, 33 – 9.

Annales Augustani, *MGH SS* 3, 123 – 36.

Annales Blandinienses, *MGH SS* 5, 20 – 30.

Annales Brunwilarenses, *MGH SS* 16, 724 – 8.

Annales Colonienses, *MGH SS* 17, 723 – 847.

Annales Dorenses, *MGH SS* 27, 514 – 31.

Annales Laubienses, *continuatio*, *MGH SS* 4, 20 – 8.

Annales Leodienses, *continuatio*, *MGH SS* 4, 28 – 30.

Annales Mellicenses, continuatio auctarium Gerstense, *MGH SS* 9, 541 – 569.

Annales Neresheimenses, *MGH SS* 10, 19 – 25.

Annales Ottenburani, *pars altera genuina*, *MGH SS* 5, 6 – 9.

Annales Porchensis, *MGH SS* 16, 598 – 608.

Annales Ratisbonensis, *MGH SS* 17, 570 – 90.

Annales Sancti Blasii, *MGH SS* 17, 276 – 8.

Annales Sancti Disibodi, *MGH SS* 17, 4 – 30.

Annales Sancti Petri Erphasturdenses, *MGH SS* 16, 15 – 25.

Annales Sancti Trudperti, *MGH SS* 17, 285 – 94.

Annales Veronenses, *MGH SS* 19, 1 – 8.

Annales Wirziburgenses, *MGH SS* 2, 238 – 247.

Annales Zwifaltenses, *MGH SS* 10, 53 – 4.

Annales Zwifaltenses maiores, *MGH SS* 10, 54 – 5.

Annalista Saxo, MGH SS 6, 542-777.

Annals of the Four Masters, ed. J. O'Donovan (Dublin, 1856).

Anonymous, *Principia Rhetorices*, *PL* 32, cols. 1439 - 1449.

Anonymous, *Syriac Chronicle,* trans. A. S. Tritton, *The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 92 (1933), pp. 69-103 and 273-306.

Arnold of Lübeck, *Chronica Slavorum*, *MGH SS*, 21, 101 - 250.

Bahā' al-Dīn Ibn Shaddād, *The Rare and Excellent History of Saladin*, trans. D. S. Richards (Aldershot, 2002).

Baldric of Dol, *Historia Hierosolymitana, RHC Oc.* 4, 1 – 111.

Bernold of St Blaisen (Constance), *Chronicon*, ed. I. S. Robinson, *Die Chroniken Bertholds von Reichenau und Bernolds von Konstanz*, *MGH Scriptores Rerum Germanicorum nova series* 14 (Hanover, 2003), pp. 383 - 540.

Berthold of Zwiefalten, *Liber de Constructione Monasterii Zwivildensis*, *MGH SS* 10, 93 - 124.

J. Bongars, *Gesta Dei per Francos* (Hanover, 1611).

Bonizo of Sutri, *Liber ad Amicum*.
Liber ad Amicum, *MGH Libelli de Lite Imperatorum et Pontificum I, 568 - 620.*
Bonizo of Sutri, 'to a friend', trans. I. S. Robinson, *The Papal Reform of the Eleventh Century* (Manchester, 2004), pp. 158 - 261.

Burchard of Worms, *Decretum*, *PL* 140, cols. 337A – 1058C

Caffaro, *Annales Ianuenses*, ed. L.T. Belgrano, *Annali Genovesi di Caffaro e de' suoi continuatori*, (Rome, 1890).

Canso d'Antioca, ed. C. E. Dewberry (unpublished PhD. thesis: University of Oxford, 1988).

La Chanson d'Antioche
P. Paris, ed. 2 (reprint: Geneva, 1969).
S. Duparc-Quioc, ed. 2 (Paris, 1977).

La Chanson de Jérusalem, ed. Nigel R. Thorpe, (Tuscaloosa, 1991).

Charta Pacis Valencenensis, *MGH SS* 21, 605 – 6.

Chartres de l'abbaye de St-Hubert-en-Ardenne, ed. G. Kurth, I (Brussels, 1903).

Chronica Reinhardsbrunnensis, *MGH SS* 30, 490 – 656.

Chronica Sancti Petri Erfordensis moderna, *MGH SS* 30, 335 – 437.

Chronica Sigeberti Gemblacensis continuatio auctorium Aquicinense, *MGH SS* 6, 392 – 8.

Chronicon Elwacense, *MGH SS* 10, 34 – 51.

Chronicon St Andreae Castri Camaracensii, MGH SS 7, 526-550.

Cicero, *In Catilinam I – IV. Pro Murena. Pro Sulla. Pro Flacco,* ed. and trans. C. Macdonald (Cambridge Mass., 1976).

(Cosmas of Prague, *Chronica Boemorum*, *MGH SS* 9, 1 – 209.

Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils, *1. Nicea to Lateran V*, ed. N. P. Tanner (London, 1990).

Decreta Claromontensia, ed. R. Somerville, *The Councils of Urban II*, I (Amsterdam, 1972).

Eadmer, *Historia Novorum in Anglia*, ed. Martin Rule, Rolls Series (London, 1884).

Ekkehard of Aura, *Chronicon*.
Hierosolymita, *RHC Oc*. 5, 1 - 40.
Chronicon Universale, *MGH SS* 6, 33-231.
Frutolfs und Ekkehards Chroniken und die Anonyme Kaiserchronik, ed. F-J Schmale and I. Schamle-Ott (Darmstadt, 1972).

Eusebius, *The History of the Church from Christ to Constantine*, trans. G. A. Williamson (London, 1965).

Fulcher of Chartres, *Historia Hierosolymitana*.
Gesta Francorum Iherusalem Peregrinantium, *RHC Oc*. 3, 311 – 485.
Fulcher of Chartres, *Historia Hierosolymitana (1095 – 1127)*, ed. H. Hagenmeyer (Heidelberg, 1913).
Fulcher of Chartres, *A history of the expedition to Jerusalem 1095-1127,* trans. F. R. Ryan, introduction and notes H. S. Fink (Knoxville, 1941).
Fulcher of Chartres: *Chronicle of the First Crusade*, trans. M. E. McGinty (Philadelphia, 1941).

Gellius, *Les Nuits Attiques*, ed. and trans. R. Marache (Paris, 1978).

Gerhoch, *De Investigatione Antichristi Liber I MGH Historica Libelli de Lite Imperatorum et pontificum, Saeculis XI et XII conscripti*, 3 (Hanover, 1897).

Gesta Abbatum Lobbiensium, *MGH SS*, 21, 307 – 33.

Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum.
Anonymi Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum, ed. H. Hagenmeyer (Heidelberg, 1890).
Histoire Anonyme de la première Croisade, ed. L. Bréhier (Paris, 1924).
Anonymi Gesta Francorum, ed. B. A. Lees (Oxford, 1924).
Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum, ed. and trans. R. Hill (London, 1962).

Gilo of Paris and a second, anonymous author, *Historia Vie Hierosolimitane*, ed. C. W. Grocock and J. E. Siberry (Oxford, 1997).

Godshalk of Gembloux, *Gesta Abbatum Gemblacensium continuatio*, *MGH SS* 8, 542 – 557.

Gregory VII, *Registrum*, ed. E. Caspar, *MGH Epistolae selectae* 2 (Berlin, 1920, 1923).

Guibert of Nogent, *Gesta Dei per Francos*, ed. R. B. C. Huygens, *CC* LXXVIIa, (Turnhout, 1996).

Guibert of Nogent, *Monodiae*.
Guibert of Nogent, *Monodiae*, ed. E.–R. Labande (Paris, 1981).
Guibert of Nogent, *The autobiography of Guibert, Abbot of Nogent-Sous-Coucy*, trans. C. C. Swinton Bland (London, 1926).
J. Benton, *Self and Society in Medieval France: The Memoirs of Abbot Guibert of Nogent (1064-c.1125)* (New York, 1970).

H. Hagenmeyer ed., *Die Kreuzzugsbriefe aus den Jahren 1088 – 1100* (Innsbruck, 1901).

Henry of Heimburg, *Annales*, *MGH SS* 17, 711 – 18.

Herman of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, *MGH SS* 5, 67-133.

Herman of Tournai, *Liber de Restauratione Monasterii S. Martini Tornacensis*, *MGH SS* 14, 274 – 317.

Hugo Falcandus, *Il Regno di Guglielmo I in Sicilia*
Il Regno di Guglielmo I in Sicilia, ed. G. B. Siragusa (second edition: Palermo, 1929).
The history of the Tyrants of Sicily, trans. G. A. Loud and T. Wiedemann (Manchester, 1998).

Ibn Al-Qalānisī, *The Damascus Chronicle of the Crusades*, trans. H. A. R. Gibb (New York, 2002).

Joannes Cinnamus, *Epitome rerum ab Ioanne et Alexio Comnenis gestarum.*
Ioannis Cinnami Epitome rerum ab Ioanne et Alexio Comnenis gestarum. Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Bzyantinae (Bonn, 1836).
Joannes Cinnamus, *Deeds of John and Manuel Comnenus by John Kinnamos*, trans. C. M. Brand (New York, 1976).

John of Salisbury, *Metalogicon*, ed. J. B. Hall and K. S. B. Keats-Rohan, *CC* 98 (Brepols, 1991).

John of Salisbury, *Historia Pontificalis*, ed. and trans. M. Chibnall (Oxford, 1986).

Lambert of Hersfeld, *Opera*, ed. O. Holder-Egger (Hanover, 1894).

Livy, *Ab Urbe Condita Tome I and II*, ed. and trans. B. O. Foster (Cambridge Mass., 1976).

Livy, *Ab Urbe Condita Tome IV*, ed. J. Bayet, trans. G. Baillet (Paris, 1946).

Mathew Paris, *Chronica Maiora*, V, *Rerum Britannicarum medii aevi Scriptores* (London, 1880).

Odo of Deuil, *De Profectione Ludovici VII in Orientem*, ed. and trans. V. G. Berry (New York, 1948).

Orderic Vitalis, *The Ecclesiastical History*, ed. and trans. M. Chibnall, 6 (Oxford, 1969 - 79).

Otto, Bishop of Freising, *The Two Cities – a chronicle of universal history to the year 1146 A. D.* ed. A. P. Evans and C. Knapp, trans. C. C. Mierow (New York, 2002).

Ovid, *Fasti*, ed. F. Bömer 2 (Heidelberg, 1957 – 8).

Ovid, *Metamorphoseon,* ed. D. E. Bosselaar (Leiden, 1959).

Paul of Bernried, *Vita Gregorii VII papae.*
Vita Gregorii VII papae, ed. J. M. Watterich, *Pontificum Romanorum Vitae* 1 (Leipzig, 1862), pp. 474 – 545.
Paul of Bernried, *The Life of Pope Gregory VII*, trans. I. S. Robinson, *The Papal Reform of the Eleventh Century* (Manchester, 2004).

Peter Tudebode, *Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere.*
Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere ed. J. H. Hill and L. L. Hill (Paris, 1977).
Peter Tudebode, *Historia de Hierosolymitana,* trans. J. H. Hill and L. L. Hill (Philadelphia, 1968).

Ralf of Caen, *Gesta Tancredi*, *RHC Oc.* 3, 587 – 716.

Raol, *De Expugnatione Lyxbonensi*, ed. and trans. C. W. David (New York, 2001).

Raymond of Aguilers, *Historia Francorum qui ceperunt Iherusalem.*
Raymond of Aguilers, *Historia Francorum qui ceperunt Iherusalem, RHC Oc.* 3, 235 – 309.
Historia Francorum qui ceperunt Iherusalem, ed. John France (unpublished PhD. thesis: University of Nottingham, 1967).
Le 'Liber' de Raymond d'Aguilers, ed. J. H. Hill and L. L. Hill (Paris, 1969).
Raymond of Aguilers, *Historia Francorum qui ceperunt Jherusalem*, trans. J.H. Hill and L.L. Hill (Philadelphia, 1968).

Robert the Monk, *Historia Iherosolimitana.*
Historia Iherosolimitana, *RHC Oc.* 3, 717 – 882.
Robert the Monk, *History of the First Crusade*, trans. C. Sweetenham (Aldershot, 2005).

Rudolf of St Trond, *Gesta abbatum Trudonensium*, *MGH SS* 10, 227 – 72.

Sallust, *The War With Jugurtha*, ed. and trans. J. C. Rolfe (Cambridge, Mass., 1921).

Seneca, *Ad Lucilium Epistulae Morales*, ed. and trans. R. M. Gummere (London, 1920).

Shlomo Eidelberg ed., *The Jews and the Crusaders: the Hebrew chronicles of the first and second crusaders* (New Jersey, 1996).

Snorri Sturlason, *Heimskringla*, ed. E. Monsen, trans. A. H. Smith (New York, 1990).

Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronographia, MGH SS* 6, 300-374.

A. Thiel, *Epistolae Romanorum pontifcum genuinae*, I (Braunsberg, 1868).

Usámah Ibn-Munqidh, *Memoirs of an Arab-Syrian Gentleman*, trans. P. K. Hitti (Beruit, 1964).

Wace, *Roman de Rou,* trans. G. S. Burgess (Suffolk, 2004).

Walter the Chancellor, *Bella Antiochena.*
Galterii Cancellarii, Bella Antiochena, ed. H. Hagenmeyer (Innsbruck, 1896).
The Antiochene Wars, ed. and trans. T. S. Asbridge and S. B. Edgington (Aldershot, 1999).

William of Tyre, *Chronicon.*
Historia Rerum in Partibus Transmarinis Gestarum, RHC *Oc.* 1, 3 – 702.
William, Archbishop of Tyre, *A history of deeds done beyond the sea*, trans. E. A. Babcock and A. C. Krey 2 (New York, 1943).
Chronicon, ed. R. B. C. Huygens CC 63 (Turnhout, 1986).
William of Malmesbury: Gesta Regum Anglorum I, ed. and trans. R. A. B. Mynors (Oxford, 1998).

Secondary Works

P. Alphandéry, *L'Europe et L'idée de Croisades*, 2 (Paris, 1954).

P. Alphandéry and A. Dupront, *La Chrétienité et l'idée de croisade*, 2 (Paris 1954 – 9).

J. C. Andressohn, *The Ancestry and Life of Godfrey of Bouillon* (Bloomington, 1947).

L. Arbusow, *Liturgie und Geschichtsschreibung im Mittelalter* (Bonn, 1951).

B. Arnold, *German Knighthood 1050 – 1300* (Oxford, 1984).

T. Asbridge, *The First Crusade: A New History* (London, 2004).

N. K. Avallone, *Graindor de Douai and reliquary literature of the First Crusade (France),* (unpublished PhD thesis: University of Michigan, 1995).

D. Baker ed., *Medieval Women* (Oxford, 1978).

M. Balard, B. Z. Kedar and J. Riley-Smith ed. *Dei Gesta Per Francos* (Aldershot, 2001).

P. Bange, 'The image of women of the nobility in the German chronicles of the tenth and eleventh centuries', A. Davids ed., *The Empress Theophano Byzantium and the West at the turn of the first millennium* (Cambridge, 1995), pp.150-169.

M. Barber, *Crusaders and Heretics, 12th-14th Centuries* (Aldershot, 1995).

R. Barber, *Knight and Chivalry* (London, 1970).

J. Barker, *The Tournament in England 1100 – 1400* (Woodbridge, 2003).

R. Bartlett, *Trial by Fire and Water* (Oxford, 1986).

J. S. Beddie, 'The Ancient Classics in the Medieval Libraries', *Speculum* 5, I (1930), p. 3-20.

J. Benton, 'The Personality of Guibert of Nogent,' *Pyschoanalytical Review*, 57, 4 (1970), pp. 563 – 86.

A. Berger, *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Roman Law* (Philadelphia, 1953).

W. Bernhardi, *Konrad III* (Leipzig, 1883).

R. Black, *Humanism and Education in Medieval and Renaissance Italy*, Cambridge University Press, (Cambridge, 2001).

E. O. Blake and C. Morris, 'A hermit goes to war: Peter and the origins of the First Crusade', *Studies in Church History* 22 (1984), pp.79-107.

G. Bois, *The transformation of the year one thousand* (Manchester, 1992).

R. R. Bolgar, *The Classical Heritage and its Beneficiaries* (Cambridge, 1954).

R. R. Bolgar ed., *Classical Influences on European Culture (AD 500 – 1500)* (Cambridge, 1971).

A. Borst, 'Das Ritterum im Hochmittelalter. Idee und Wirklichkeit,' *Saeculum 10* (1959), pp. 213 –231.

A. Borst ed., *Das Rittertum im Mittelalter* (Darmstadt, 1976).

J. Brisco, *A commentary on Livy books XXXI-XXXIII* (Oxford, 1973).

J. A. Brundage, 'Adhémar of Puy: The Bishop and his Critics,' *Speculum* 34 (1959), pp. 201 – 212.

J. A. Brundage, 'An Errant Crusader: Stephen of Blois', *Traditio* 16 (1960), pp. 380 – 95.

J. A. Brundage, *The Crusades, a documentary survey* (Milwaukee, 1962).

J. A. Brundage, 'The army of the First Crusade and the crusade vow', *Medieval Studies* 33 (1971), pp 334-343.

J. A. Brundage, 'Prostitution, miscegenation and sexual purity in the First Crusade', *Crusade and Settlement*, ed. P. W. Edbury (Cardiff, 1985), pp. 57 – 65.

J. A. Brundage, *The Crusades, Holy War and Canon Law* (Aldershot, 1991).

J. A. Brundage, *Sex, Law and Marriage in the Middle Ages* (Aldershot, 1993).

J. A. Brundage, *Medieval Canon Law* (Harlow, 1995).

M. Bull, *Knightly Piety and the Lay Response to the First Crusade: The Limousin and Gascony, c. 970-c. 1130* (Oxford, 1993).

M. Bull, 'The roots of lay enthusiasm for the First Crusade', *History* 78 (1993), pp. 353-72.

M. Bull, 'The Capetian monarchy and the early crusade movement: Hugh of Vermandois and Louis VII', *Nottingham Medieval Studies* 50 (1996), pp. 25-46.

M. Bull and N. Housley ed., *The Experience of Crusading 1: Western Approaches* (Cambridge, 2003).

V. L Bullough and B. Bullough, *Cross Dressing, Sex and Gender* (Philidelphia, 1993).

M. L. Bulst-Thiele, *Sacrae Domus Militiae Templi Hierosolymitani Magistri: Untersuchungen zur Geschichtes des Templeordens 1118/9 – 1314* (Göttingen, 1974), pp. 30 – 40.

J. Bumke, *Studien zum Ritterbegriff im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert* (Heidelberg, 1977).

J. Bumke, *The Concept of Knighthood in the Middle Ages*, trans. W. T. H. and E. Jackson (New York, 1982).

A. Butler, *Butler's Lives of the Saints, April* (London, 1999).

F. Cardini, 'Profilo d'un crociato, Guglielmo Embriaco', *Archivio Storico Italiano*, 136 (1978), pp. 417 – 8.

J. L. Cate, 'A Gay Crusader,' *Byzantion* 16 (1942 – 3), 503 – 26.

J. Charaud, 'La conception de l'histoire de Guiber de Nogent', *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale*, 8 (1965), pp. 381 – 95.

R. Chazan, *European Jewry and the First Crusade* (Berkeley, 1987).

R. Chazan, *In the year 1096: The First Crusade and the Jews* (Philadelphia, 1996).

C. R. Cheney, *A Handbook Of Dates* (Cambridge, 2000).

M. Chibnall, *The World of Orderic Vitalis* (Oxford, 1984).

L. Clare, *La Quintaine, la Course de Bague et le Jue des Têtes* (Paris, 1983)

R. Cohen, 'An introduction to the First Crusade', *Past and Present* 6 (1954), pp. 6-30.

N. Cohn, *The Pursuit of the Millennium* (fifth edition: London, 1970).

G. Constable, 'The structure of medieval society according to the *dictatores* of the twelfth century', *Religious Life and Thought* XIII (London, 1979), pp. 253-296.

G. Constable, 'The Place of the Magdeburg Charter of 1107/08 in the History of Eastern Germany and of the Crusades,' *Vita Religiosa im Mittelalter. Festschrift für Kaspar Elm zum 70 Geburtstag* ed. F. J. Felten and N. Jaspert (Berlin 1999), pp. 283-300.

R. F. Cook, *'Chanson d'Antioche', Chanson de Geste: le Cycle de la Croisade est-il épique?* (Amsterdam, 1980).

Capt. C. Costello, 'Ireland and the Crusades', *Irish Sword* 9, XXXVII (1970), pp. 263-277.

J. Coulson ed. *The Saints – a Concise Biographical Dictionary* (London, 1958).

M. D. Coupe, 'The Personality of Guibert of Nogent Reconsidered,' *Journal of Medieval History*, 9 (1983), pp. 317-29.

M. D. Coupe, 'Peter the Hermit – A Reassessment', *Nottingham Medieval Studies 31* (1987), pp. 37-45.

D. Crouch, *The Birth of Nobility* (Harlow, 2005).

F. Curschmann, *Hungersnöte im Mittelalter* (Leipzig, 1900).

N. Daniel, *The Arabs and Mediaeval Europe* (London, 1979).

H. Darnley Naylor, *Latin and English idiom – an object lesson from Livy's Preface* (Cambridge, 1909).

C. W. David, *Robert Curthose Duke of Normandy* (Cambridge, Mass., 1920).

R. H. C. Davis, *The Medieval Warhorse* (London, 1989).

A. Di Berardino ed., *Encyclopaedia of the Early Church, 1* (Cambridge, 1992).

T. A. Dorey ed., *Livy* (London, 1971).

G. Duby, La Société aux XI[e] et XII[e] siècles dans la région mâconnaise (Paris, 1953).

G. Duby, 'La Noblesse dans la France médiévale. Une enquête à poursuivre,' *Revue Hisorique* 226 (1961), pp. 1 – 22.

G. Duby, 'Les "jeunes" dans la société aristocratique dans la France du Nord-Ouest au XII[e] siècle,' *Annales: Economies, Sociétés, Civilisations* 19, V (1964), pp. 835-846.

G. Duby, 'Les Origines de la chevalerie,' *Ordinamenti militari in occidente nell'alto medioevo*, 2 (Spoleto, 1968).

G. Duby, *Hommes et Structures du Moyen Âge* (Paris, 1973).

G. Duby, *The Chivalrous Society*, trans. C. Postan (Berkley, 1977).

G. Duby, *The Three Orders, Feudal Society Imagined* (London, 1980).

G. Duby, *Women of the Twelfth Century, 1: Eleanor of Aquitaine and six others*, trans. J. Birrell (Cambridge, 1997).

G. Duby, *Women of the Twelfth Century, 3: Eve and the Church*, trans. J. Birrell (Cambridge, 1998).

G. Duby, *William Marshal – The Flower of Chivalry,* trans. R. Howard (London, 1986).

C. Duggan, *Twelfth Century Decretal Collections* (London, 1963).

F. Duncalf, 'The Peasants' Crusade', *American Historical Review* 26 (1920/1), pp. 440-453.

F. Duncalf, 'The councils of Piacenza and Clermont', *A History of the Crusades*, ed. Setton, 1 (Madison, 1969), pp. 220-52.

C. F. Du Cange, *Glossarium mediae et infimae Latinitatis*, VI, (Paris, 1938).

S. Duparc-Quioc, 'La Composition de la *Chanson d'Antioche*', *Romania* 83 (1962), pp. 1 – 29 and 210 – 47.

P. Edbury and J. Phillips, *The Experience of Crusading 2: Defining the Crusader Kingdom* (Cambridge, 2003).

P. W. Edbury and J. G. Rowe ed., *William of Tyre, Historian of the Latin East* (Cambridge, 1988).

P. W. Edbury ed., *Crusade and Settlement* (Cardiff, 1985).

S. B. Edgington, 'Albert of Aachen reappraised', *From Clermont to Jerusalem* ed. A. V. Murray (Turnhout, 1998), pp. 55 – 68.

S. B. Edgington, 'The First Crusade: Reviewing the Evidence', *The First Crusade, Origins and Impact*, ed. J. Phillips (Manchester, 1997) pp. 55 – 77.

S. B. Edgington, '*Sont çou ore les fems que jo voi la venir?* Women in the *Chanson d'Antioche'*, in *Gendering the Crusades*, ed. S. B. Edgington and S. Lambert (Cardiff, 2001), pp. 154-62.

S. B. Edgington and S. Lambert ed., *Gendering the Crusades* (Cardiff, 2001).

L. G. Edwards, 'Joan of Arc: Gender and Authority in the text of the *Trial of Condemnation*', *Young Medieval Women* ed. K. J. Lewis, N. J. Menuge and K. M. Phillips (Stroud, 1999), pp. 133-152.

R. Ellenblum, *Frankish Rural Settlement in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem* (Cambridge, 1998).

V. Epp, *Fulcher von Chartres* (Dusseldorf, 1990).

C. Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, trans. M. W. Baldwin and W. Goffart (Princeton, 1977).

A. Ernout and A. Meillet ed., *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue Latine* (third edition: Paris, 1951).

D. Farmer, *Oxford Dictionary of Saints* (Oxford, 1997).

S. Farmer, 'Persuasive Voices: Clerical Images of Medieval Wives', *Speculum*, 61, III (1986), pp. 517-543.

S. C. Ferruolo, *The Origins of the University* (Standford, 1985).

J. Fleckenstein, 'Zum Problem der Abschliessung des Ritterstandes,' *Historische Forschungen für Walter Schlesinger*, ed. H. Beumann (Köln, 1974), pp. 252 – 71

H. S. Fink, 'The Foundation of the Latin States, 1099 – 1118,' K. M. Setton ed. *A History of the Crusades* 1 (Philadelphia, 1955), pp. 368 – 409

J. Flori, *Pierre l'Ermite et la Première Croisade* (Paris, 1999).

J. Flori, 'Knightly Society', *The New Cambridge Medieval History IV c. 1024 – 1198*, ed. D. Luscombe and J. Riley-Smith, 2 (Cambridge, 2004), I, 148 – 184.

J. Folda, *The Art of the Crusaders in the Holy Land 1098-1187* (Cambridge, 1995).

R. Foreville, 'Un chef de la première croisade: Arnulf Malecouronne,' *Bulletin Philologique et Historique du Comité des Travaux Historiques et Scientifiques* (1953 –4), pp. 377 – 90.

J. France, 'The crisis of the First Crusade: from the defeat of Kerbogha to the departure from Arqa', *Byzantion*, 40 (1970), pp. 276 – 308.

J. France, 'An Unknown Account of the Capture of Jerusalem', *English Historical Review* 87 (1972), pp. 771 – 783.

J. France, 'The election and title of Godfrey de Bouillon', *Canadian Journal of History* 18 (1983).

J. France, *Victory in the East. A military history of the First Crusade* (Cambridge, 1994).

J. France and W. G. Zajac ed., *The Crusades and their sources: Essays Presented to Bernard Hamilton* (Aldershot, 1998).

J. France, 'The Use of the Anonymous *Gesta Francorum* in the Early Twelfth – Century Sources for the First Crusade', *From Clermont to Jerusalem. The Crusades and Crusader Societies 1095 – 1500*, ed. A. V. Murray (Turnhout,1998), pp. 29 – 42.

J. France, *Western Warfare in the Age of the Crusades, 1100 – 1300* (London, 1999).

H. Fuhrmann, *Germany in the High Middle Ages c.1050-1200*, trans. T. Reuter, Cambridge University Press (Cambridge, 1986).

F. Gabrieli, *Arab Historians of the Crusades* (London, 1969).

S. Geldsetzer, *Frauen auf Kreuzzügen, 1096-1291* (Darmstadt, 2003).

M. Gervers and J. M. Powell ed., *Tolerance and Intolerance – Social Conflict in the Age of the Crusades* (New York, 2001).

E. Gibbon, *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, 6 (Everyman's Library reprint: London, 1994).

S. D. Goitein, 'Contemporary Letters on the Capture of Jerusalem by the Crusaders', *The Journal Of Jewish Studies*, 3, No.4 (1952), pp. 162-177.

M. Goodich, S. Menache and S. Schein, ed. *Cross Cultural Convergences in the Crusader Period* (New York, 1999).

A. Grabois, 'Anglo-Norman England and the Holy Land', *Anglo-Norman Studies* 7, ed. R. Allen Brown (Woodbridge, 1985), pp. 132-141.

A. Gransden, *Historical Writing in England c.550-1307* (London, 1974).

A. Gywnn, 'Ireland and the continent in the eleventh century', *Irish Historical Studies* 9, XXXI (1953), pp. 193-216.

H. Hagenmeyer, *Peter der Eremite* (Leipzig, 1879).

H. Hagenmeyer, *Chronologie de la Première Croisade 1094-1100*, (Hildesheim, 1973).

B. Hamilton, 'The Elephant of Christ: Reynald of Châtillon', *Studies in Church History* 15 (Oxford, 1978), pp. 97 – 108.

B. Hamilton, 'Women in the Crusader States: the Queens of Jerusalem (1100 – 1190)', *Medieval Women*, ed. D. Baker (Oxford, 1978).

B. Hamilton, *Monastic Reform, Catharism and Crusades* (London, 1979).

B. Hamilton, *The Latin Church in the Crusader States* (London, 1980).

B. Hamilton, *Religion in the Medieval West* (London, 1986).

B. Hamilton, *The Leper King and His Heirs* (Cambridge, 2000).

B. Hamilton, *The Christian World of the Middle Ages* (Stroud, 2003).

N. M. Häring, 'Hilary of Orleans and his letter collection', *Studi Medievali*, Series 3a XIV (1973), pp. 1069-1122.

A. Havercamp ed., *Juden und Christen zur Zeit der Krezzüge* (Sigmaringen, 1999).

D. Hay, 'Gender Bias and Religious Intolerance in Accounts of the "Massacres" of the First Crusade', in *Tolerance and Intolerance – Social Conflict in the Age of the Crusades*, ed. M. Gervers and J. M. Powell (New York, 2001), pp. 3 – 10.

J. H. Hill and L. L. Hill, *Raymond IV, Count of Toulouse* (Syracuse, 1962).

N. Hodgson, 'The Role of Kerbogha's Mother in the *Gesta Francorum* and Selected Chronicles of the First Crusade', *Gendering the Crusades*, ed. S. B. Edgington and S. Lambert (Cardiff, 2001), pp. 163 – 176.

N. Hodgson, 'Nobility, Women and Historical Narratives of the Crusades and the Latin East', *Al-Masāq*, 17, 1, (2005), pp. 61 – 85.

P. M. Holt, *The Crusader States and Their Neighbours* (Harlow, 2004).

E. Van Houts, *The Normans in Europe* (Manchester, 2000).

R. Hüls, *Kardinäle, Klerus and Kirchen Roms* (Biblothek des Deutschen Historischen Instuits in Rom 48: Tübingen, 1977).

R.B. C. Huygens, 'Guillaume de Tyre étudiant. Un chapitre (xix.12) de son *Histoire* retrouvé', *Latomus* xxi (1962), pp. 811 – 829.

R. B. C. Huygens, 'Editing William of Tyre', *Sacris Erudiri* 27 (1984), pp. 461-473.

P. Ch. Jacobsen, *Albert von Aachen*, *Lexicon des Mittelalters 1*, (Munich, 1977), pp. 286-7.

C. S. Jaeger, *The Envy of Angels: Cathedral Schools and social ideals in Medieval Europe 950-1200* (Philadelphia, 1994).

P. Jaffé, ed., *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum* (second edition: Leipzig, 1885).

C. Jöckle, *Encyclopaedia of Saints* (London, 1997).

J. Johrendt, *Milites und Militia im 11. Jahrhundert. Untersuchung zur Frühgeschichte des Rittertums in Frankreich und Deutschland* (unpublished PhD. dissertation: Erlangen-Nürnberg, 1971).

A. Jotischky, *Crusading and the Crusader States* (Harlow, 2005).

R. M. Karras, *From Boys to Men* (Philadelphia, 2003).

H. Kennedy, *Crusader Castles* (Cambridge, 1994).

M. M. Knappen, 'Robert II of Flanders in the First Crusade,' *The Crusades and Other Historical Essays Presented to Dana C. Munro*, ed. L. J. Paetow (New York, 1928), pp. 79 – 100.

P. Knoch, *Studien zu Albert von Aachen* (Stuttgart, 1966).

V. A. Kolve, '*Ganymede/Son of Get*ron: Medieval Monasticism and the Drama of Same-Sex Desire', *Speculum*, 73, IV, (Oct. 1998), pp. 1014-1067.

C. Kostick, 'William of Tyre, Livy, and the Vocabulary of Class,' *Journal of History of Ideas*, 65,3 (2004), pp. 353-368.

C. Kostick, 'Women and the First Crusade: prostitutes or pilgrims?' *Studies on Medieval and Early Modern Women 4: Victims or Viragos?* ed. C. Meek and C. Lawless (Dublin, 2005), pp. 57 – 68.

A. C. Krey, *The First Crusade: The Accounts of Eyewitnesses and Participants*, (Princeton, 1921).

A. C. Krey, 'A neglected passage in the Gesta and its bearing on the literature of the First Crusade', *The Crusades and other historical essays presented to Dana C. Munro*, ed. L. J. Paetow (New York, 1928), pp. 57 – 76.

A. C. Krey, 'William of Tyre, the making of an historian in the Middle Ages', *Speculum*, 16, II (April 1941), pp. 149-166.

B. Kugler, *Studien zur Geschichte des Zweiten Kreuzzuges*, Adolf M. Hakkert (reprint of 1866 edition: Amsterdam, 1973).

M. Lambert, *Medieval Heresy - Popular Movements from the Gregorian Reform to the Reformation* (third edition: Oxford, 1992).

J. L. La Monte, *Feudal Monarchy in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem 1100-1291* (Cambridge Mss., 1932).

J. L. La Monte, 'The Lords of Le Puiset on the Crusades', *Speculum*, 17, I (1942), pp. 100 – 118.

J. Le Goff, *Time, Work and Culture in the Middle Ages*, trans. A. Goldhammer (Chicago, 1980).

A. Leon, *The Jewish Question* (New York, 1970).

C. T. Lewis and C. Short, *A Latin Dictionary* (new impression: Oxford, 1987).

K. J. Lewis, N. J. Menuge and K. M. Phillips ed., *Young Medieval Women* (Stroud, 1999).

K. Leyser, 'Money and Supplies on the First Crusade,' *Communications and Power in Medieval Europe: the Gregorian Revolution and beyond*, ed. and trans. T. Reuter (London, 1994), pp. 77 – 96

G. A. Loud, *The Age of Robert Guiscard: Southern Italy and the Norman Conquest* (Harlow, 2000).

D. Luscombe and J. Riley-Smith ed., *The New Cambridge Medieval History IV c. 1024 – 1198*, 2 (Cambridge, 2004).

P. Van Luyn, 'Les Milites du XI^{e} Siècle', *Le Moyen Âge*, 77, 1 and 2 (1977), pp. 5 – 51 and 193 –238.

A. Maalouf, *The Crusades through Arab Eyes* (London, 1984).

T. F. Madden, *The Crusades – The essential readings* (Oxford, 2002).

C. T. Maier, 'The role of women in the crusade movement: a survey,' *Journal of Medieval History*, 30, I (2004), pp. 61 – 82.

D. Malkiel, 'Destruction and Conversion: Intention and Reaction, Crusaders and Jews in 1096', *Jewish History* 15 (2001), pp. 257 – 80.

D. Malkiel, 'The underclass in the First Crusade: a historiographical trend,' *Journal of Medieval History*, 28, II (2002), pp. 169 – 197.

D. Malkiel, 'Jewish – Christian relations in Europe, 840 – 1096', *Journal of Medieval History* 29, I (2003), pp. 55 – 83.

E. Matthews Sanford, 'The Study of Ancient History in the Middle Ages', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 5, I (Jan, 1944), pp. 21-43.

H. E. Mayer, *The Crusades* (seventh edition: Oxford, 1993).

W. F. Marmion, 'Were there any Irish Names among the First Crusaders?', *Irish Roots* 29 (1999), pp. 18-19.

M. McMullen and C. Stoltenow, *Ergot* (Fargo, 2002).

C. E. Meek and M. K. Simms ed., *The fragility of her sex? – Medieval Irish Women in their European Context* (Dublin, 1996).

C. E. Meek and C. Lawless ed., *Studies on Medieval and Early Modern Women 4: Victims or Viragos?* (Dublin, 2005).

H. Melberg, *Origin of the Scandinavian Nations and Languages* (Halden, 1951).

G. Miccoli, 'Ecclesiae primitivae forma' *Studi Medievali*, II, 3a (1960), pp. 470 – 498.

J.S. Moore, 'Domesday Slavery', *Anglo-Norman Studies XI* (1989), pp. 191-220.

R. I. Moore, *The Birth of Popular Heresy* (London, 1975).

R. I. Moore, *The formation of a persecuting society* (Oxford, 1987).

R. I. Moore, *The First European Revolution* (Oxford, 2000).

M. R. Morgan, *The Chronicle of Ernoul and the Continuations of William of Tyre* (Oxford, 1973).

C. Morris, *The Discovery of the Individual 1050-1200* (London, 1972).

C. Morris, 'Policy and Visions – The case of the Holy Lance at Antioch' *War and Government in the Middle Ages: essays in honour of J.O. Prestwich*, ed. J. Gillingham and J. C. Holt (Woodbridge, 1984), pp. 33-45.

C. Morris, 'The aims and spirituality of the crusade as seen through the eyes of Albert of Aix', *Reading Medieval Studies*, 16 (1990), pp. 99 – 117.

C. Morris, 'The *Gesta Francorum* as narrative history', *Reading Medieval Studies*, 19 (1993), pp. 55 – 71.

D. C. Munro, 'The speech of Pope Urban II at Clermont, 1095', *American Historical Review* 11 (1905-6), pp. 231-42.

D. C. Munro, 'A Crusader', *Speculum* 7 (1932), pp. 321-335.

D. C. Munro, 'Papal Proclamation of the Crusade', *The Crusades* ed. J. A. Brundage, (Milwaukee, 1964), pp. 7-11.

D. C. Munro, *Urban and the Crusaders, Translations and Reprints from the Original Sources of European History, 1, II* (Philadelphia, 1985).

B. Munk Olsen, *L'Étude Des Auteurs Classiques Latins Aux XI^e Et XII^e Siècles* (Paris, 1985).

P. Munz, *Frederick Barbarossa – A Study In Medieval Politics* (New York, 1969).

A. V. Murray, 'The Title of Godfrey of Bouillon as Ruler of Jerusalem,' *Collegium Medievale*, 3 (1990).

A. V. Murray, 'The Army of Godfrey of Bouillon', *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire*, 70 (1992), pp. 301 – 29.

A. V. Murray, 'Bibliography of the First Crusade', *From Clermont to Jerusalem. The Crusades and Crusader Societies 1095 – 1500*, ed. A. V. Murray (Turnhout,1998), pp. 267-310.

A. V. Murray ed., *From Clermont to Jerusalem. The Crusades and Crusader Societies 1095 – 1500* (Turnhout,1998).

A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem, A Dynastic History 1099-1125* (Oxford, 2000).

H. Nicholson ed., *The Crusades* (Basingstoke, 2005).

R. L. Nicholson, *Tancred: a study of his Career and Work in their Relation to the First Crusade and the Establishment of the Latin States in Syria and Palestine* (Chicago, 1940).

J. F. Niermeyer, *Medival Latin Dictionary*, 2 (second edition: Leiden, 2002).

D. Nirenberg, *Communities of Violence* (Princeton, 1996).

S. P. Oakely, *A Commentary on Livy books 6 –10*, Oxford University Press (Oxford, 1997).

R. M. Ogilvie, *A Commentary on Livy books 1-5*, Clarendon Press (Oxford, 1965).

M. Pacaut, *Frederick Barbarossa*, trans. A. J. Pomerans (London, 1970).

L. J. Paetow ed., *The Crusades and Other Historical Essays presented to Dana C. Munro by his Former Students* (New York, 1928).

D. W. Packard, *A concordance to Livy* (Cambridge Mass., 1968).

N. L. Paul, 'Crusade, memory and regional politics in twelfth-century Amboise', *Journal of Medieval History*, 31.2 (June 2005), pp. 127 – 41

E. Peters ed., *The First Crusade: The Chronicle of Fulcher of Chartres and other source material* (Pennsylvania, 1998).

J. Phillips ed., *The First Crusade: Origins and impact* (Manchester, 1997).

J. Phillips, *Defenders of the Holy Land - Relations between the Latin East and the West (1119-1187)* (Oxford, 1996).

J. Phillips and M. Hoch, ed., *The Second Crusade – Scope and Consequences* (Manchester, 2001).

J. Phillips, *The Crusades, 1095-1197* (Edinburgh, 2002).

W. Porges, 'The Clergy, the Poor and the Non-Combatants on the First Crusade,' *Speculum* 21 (1946), pp. 1-21.

J. Prawer, *The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem: European Colonisation in the Middle Ages* (London, 1972).

J. Prawer, *Crusader Institutions* (Oxford, 1980).

J. Prawer, 'Social classes in the crusader states: the "minorities"', *A history of the crusades* ed. K. M. Setton, 5: *The impact of the Crusades on the Near Eas*t ed. N. P. Zacour and H. W. Hazard (second edition: Madison 1985), pp. 59-115.

J. Prawer, 'Social classes in the Latin Kingdom: the Franks, *A history of the crusades* ed. K. M. Setton, 5: The impact of the Crusades on the Near East ed. N. P. Zacour and H. W. Hazard (second edition: Madison 1985), pp. 116-192.

J. O. Prestwich, 'War and Finance in the Anglo-Norman State,' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th Series, 4 (1954), pp.19 - 44.

F. J. E. Raby, *A History of Secular Latin Poetry in the Middle Ages*, 2 (Oxford, 1997)

R. S. Rail, *Life in the Medieval University* (Cambridge, 1912).

W. M. Ramsay, *The Historical Geography of Asia Minor* (London, 1890).

S. Reynolds, *Medieval Reading* (Cambridge, 1996).

J. Richard, 'La confrérie de la première croisade', *Etudes de Civilisation Médiéval: Mélanges Offerts à E. R. Labande*, ed. B. Jeannau (Poitiers, 1974), pp. 617 –22.

J. Richard, *The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem*, trans. J. Shilley (Amsterdam, 1979).

J. Richard, *The Crusades c.1071-c.1291* (Cambridge, 1999).

H. de Ridder – Symoens, ed., *A History of the University in Europe, 1, Universities in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1992).

S. H. Rigby, 'Historical Materialism: Social Structure and Social Change in the Middle Ages', *The Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 34, III (2004), pp 473 – 522.

J. Riley-Smith, *The Feudal Nobility and the Kingdom of Jerusalem 1174-1277* (London, 1973).

J. Riley-Smith, *What were the crusades?* (London, 1977).

J. Riley-Smith, 'The title of Godfrey of Bouillon', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 52 (1979).

J. Riley-Smith, 'The motives of the earliest crusaders and the settlement of Latin Palestine, 1095-1100', *English Historical Review* 98 (1983), pp. 721-736.

J. Riley-Smith, 'The First Crusade and the Persecution of the Jews', *Studies in Church History 21* (1984), pp. 51-72.

J. Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading* (London, 1986).

J. Riley-Smith, *The First Crusaders 1095-1131* (Cambridge, 1997).

J. Riley-Smith, *The Oxford History of the Crusades* (Oxford, 1999).

J. Riley-Smith, 'The Crusades 1095 – 1198', *The New Cambridge Medieval History IV c. 1024 – 1198*, ed. D. Luscombe and J. Riley-Smith, 2 (Cambridge, 2004) I, 534 - 563.

L. and J. Riley-Smith, *The Crusades, Idea and Reality, 1095-1274* (London, 1981).

I. S. Robinson, *Authority and resistance in the Investiture Contest* (Manchester, 1978).

I. S. Robinson, 'Eine unbekannte Streitschrift über die Salevamento von Exkommuniziesten im Münchener Kodex lat. 618', *Studi Gregoriani* 11 (1978), pp. 297 – 395.

I. S. Robinson, *The Papacy 1073-1198 Continuity and Innovation* (Cambridge, 1990).

I. S. Robinson, *Henry IV of Germany, 1056-1106* (Cambridge, 1999).

I. S. Robinson, *The Papal Reform of the Eleventh Century* (Manchester, 2004).

R. Rogers, 'Peter Bartholomew and the Role of "The Poor" in the First Crusade', *Warriors and Churchmen in the High Middle Ages*, ed. T. Reuter (London, 1992), pp. 109-122.

L Roos, *'God Wants It!', The Ideology of Martyrdom of the Hebrew Crusade Chronicles and Its Jewish and Christian Background* (Uppsala, 2003).

M. Rouche, 'Cannibalisme sacré chez les croisés populaires', Y. M. Hilaire ed. in *la Réligion Populaire* (Paris, 1981), pp. 56 – 69.

P. Rousset, *Les Origines et Les Caractéres de la Première Croisade* (Geneva, 1945).

J. Rubenstein, 'Putting History to Use: Three Crusading Chronicles in Context', *Viator* 35 (2004), pp. 131 – 168.

S. Runciman, *A History of the Crusades*, 3 (fifth edition: London, 1991).

S. Runciman, 'The Holy Lance Found At Antioch', *Analecta Bollandiana* 68 (1950), pp. 197-205.

J. G. Schenk, *The Use of Rhetoric, Biblical Exegesis and Polemic in Guibert of Nogent's 'Gesta Dei per Francos'* (unpublished Masters thesis: TCD, 2001).

K. M. Setton gen. ed., *A History of the Crusades*, 6 (second edition: Madison, 1969 - 1989).

S. Shahar, *Childhood in the Middle Ages* (London, 1992).

A. N. Sherwin-White, *The Roman Citizenship* (Oxford, 1939).

E. Siberry, *Criticism of Crusading, 1095 – 1274* (Oxford, 1985).

M. A. Signer and J. Van Engen ed. *Jews and Christians in Twelfth Century Europe* (Notre Dame, 2001).

B. Smalley, *Historians in the Middle Ages* (London, 1974).

R. Somerville, *The Councils of Urban II, 1, Decreta Claromontensia* (Amsterdam, 1972).

R. Somerville, 'The council of Clermont and the First Crusade', *Studia Gratiana* 20 (1976), pp. 323-37.

R. Somerville, *Pope Alexander III and the Council of Tours* (Los Angeles, 1977).

L. A. M. Sumberg, 'The 'Tafurs' and the First Crusade', *Mediaeval Studies 21* (1951), pp. 224-246.

J. Sumption, *Pilgrimage* (paperback edition: London, 2002).

R. Syme, *The Roman Revolution*, (Oxford, 1939).

G. Tellenbach, *The Church in Western Europe From the Tenth to the Early Twelfth Century* (Cambridge, 1993).

R. Thomson, 'William of Malmesbury, historian of Crusade', *Reading Medieval Studies 23* (1997), pp 121-134.

H. Tillmann, *Pope Innocent III* (Amsterdam, 1980).

C. Tyerman, *The Invention of the Crusades* (London, 1998).

C. Tyerman, *Fighting for Christendom* (Oxford, 2004).

W. Ullmann, *The Papacy and Political Ideas in the Middle Ages* (London, 1976).

D. W. T. C. Vessey, 'William of Tyre and the Art of Historiography' *Mediaeval Studies*, 35 (1973), pp. 433 - 455.

W. Wattenbach, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter* 1 (Tübingen, 1948).

C. C. J. Webb, *John of Salisbury* (New York, 1971)

J. M. van Winter, *Ridderschap. Ideal en werkelijkheit* (Bussum, 1965).

I. Wood and G. A. Loud ed., *Church and Chronicle in the Middle Ages* (London, 1991).

K. B. Wolf, 'Crusade and narrative: Bohemond and the *Gesta Francorum*', *Journal of Medieval History* 17, II (1991), pp. 207 – 216.

R. B. Yewdale, *Bohemond I, Prince of Antioch* (New York, 1924).

W. G. Zajac, 'Captured property on the First Crusade', *The First Crusade, Origins and Impact*, ed. J. Phillips (Manchester 1997), pp. 153 – 180.

B. Z. Zedar, J. Riley-Smith & R. Hiestand ed., *Montjoie: Studies in Crusade History in Honour of Hans Eberhard Mayer* (Aldershot, 1997).