

Chapter Title: THE LEADERSHIP OF THE FIRST CRUSADE

Book Title: The Social Structure of the First Crusade

Book Author(s): Conor Kostick

Published by: Brill. (2008)

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1163/j.ctt1w8h1gw.13>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



This book is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>. Funding is provided by Knowledge Unlatched.



JSTOR

Brill is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Social Structure of the First Crusade*

CHAPTER EIGHT

THE LEADERSHIP OF THE FIRST CRUSADE

The historians of the First Crusade were struck by the fact that the expedition had no sole commander to lead it. For Guibert of Nogent and Baldric of Dol, this fact was turned into a source of religious pride. It was precisely because the crusaders were humble that they earned God's favour. Like the Children of Israel, who would be without king, without prince before returning to God (Osee 3: 4–5), the Christian forces were 'without king, without emperor' (Baldric);¹ 'without prince, without king', under God alone (Guibert).² Similarly, for Robert the Monk it was extraordinary that while those princes who normally ruled and supported their people were far off back in Europe, a few humble individuals had seen the defeat of kings.³ In reporting a speech by Bohemond, which tells us more about his own views than that of the Norman prince, Robert the Monk had Bohemond compare the inspiration that had led so many nobles to gather at Constantinople for the expedition with that which led the Children of Israel from Egypt.⁴

The biblical parallel with the Children of Israel being led out of Egypt occurred to the participants of the crusade as well as to the Benedictine historians. Fulcher, in a prologue to his work written c. 1118, thought that the Frank's suffering for Christ and their willingness to undergo martyrdom did not differ from the Israelites and Maccabees (the followers of Judas Maccabeus who, c. 170–160 B.C. led a Jewish following against Antiochus IV Epiphanes of the Seleucids).⁵ Another crusading cleric, Arnulf of Chocques, evoked the legend of the Israelites to a large assembly of the Christian army. After the Holy Lance had been discredited by the death of Peter Bartholomew, 20 April 1099, Arnulf of Chocques and another Arnulf, the bishop of Mirtirano, advocated that a golden image of the saviour made, so that

¹ BD 9.

² GN 312.

³ RM.

⁴ RM 747.

⁵ FC *Prologus* (116–7).

they should spend as much on their devotion as did the Israelites.⁶ This might well have been the golden cross and image of Christ that was placed as a talisman in the siege tower of Duke Godfrey during the final assault against Jerusalem.⁷ If the clergy of the First Crusade and those writing about the expedition soon afterwards saw the movement as analogous with that of the Children of Israel from Egypt, who did they see as the equivalent to the figure of Moses, the divinely inspired religious and military leader of the Israelites? The obvious candidate was Adhémar, bishop of Le Puy and papal legate. As far as it is possible to tell, the initial model of the crusade held by Pope Urban II was that the enterprise was to be directed by the papacy, with Adhémar acting in place of Urban himself.⁸ This perspective was echoed, faithfully, by the clerical sources.

Robert the Monk, an eyewitness, reporting the meeting of the clergy at Clermont after the departure of the laity, wrote that Urban sought their view as to who should be at the head of so many pilgrims, given that they had no notable princes. All unanimously chose the Bishop of Le Puy, as someone very suitable both in secular and divine matters. 'Although reluctant, he undertook, like a second Moses, the generalship and direction of the people of the Lord.'⁹ Raymond of Aguilers also described Adhémar as being a second Moses,¹⁰ as did the Norman historian, Ralph of Caen.¹¹

Early in his work, Fulcher described Adhémar as wisely ruling (*regere*) the entire army of God.¹² But all the sources, including Fulcher later in his history, indicate that the role played by the papal legate was a more ambiguous one than simply being the leader of the crusade. In practice, while Adhémar seems to have been in charge of religious matters, he was by no means the overall commander of the expedition, rather he was seen as one prince among several. In fact, very soon after the Council of Clermont, as soon as it emerged that several princely contingents were embarking on the crusade, it seems that even pope

⁶ RC 683.

⁷ AA vi.16 (422).

⁸ Urban II, To the faithful in Flanders: Hagenmeyer, *Epistolae et Chartae*, pp. 136–7.

⁹ RC 731: *Ille itaque, licet invitus, suscepit, quasi alter Moyses, ducatum ac regimen dominici populi.*

¹⁰ RA 351 (301).

¹¹ RC 673.

¹² FC Liv.1 (138–9).

Urban II found it necessary to appoint two other legates for the other armies leaving France. Arnulf of Chocques and Alexander, the chaplains of Robert of Normandy and Stephen of Blois both appear to have been legatine authority.¹³ This indicates, as I. S. Robinson points out, that the crusading princes from a very early stage did not accept Urban's original model of an undertaking consisting of a single army led by the pope's representative.¹⁴

Guibert of Nogent wrote that Urban entrusted the care (*cura*) of the expedition to the bishop of Le Puy.¹⁵ This formulation is in keeping with that in the *Gesta Francorum* regarding those people who remained in Antioch following the defeat of Kerbogha, rather than disperse to nearby cities. Adhémar was described as being their *rector et pastor*: both terms for a leader in an ecclesiastical sense.¹⁶ Similarly, Ralph of Caen described the dying Adhémar as saying 'Pope Urban handed me to you to give instruction.'¹⁷ The letter of the crusading princes to pope Urban after the death of Adhémar described him as 'the father committed to us' and 'vicar' of the pope.¹⁸ The formulation of Adhémar himself was that the pope had given to him the *cura* of the Christian army.¹⁹ In all these cases the language emphasises the spiritual side of Adhémar's leadership role, while leaving ambiguous the extent to which he was considered a secular ruler. The obscurity of the precise meaning of these formulations has, as a consequence, given rise to a debate among modern historians as to the importance of Adhémar's leadership role.²⁰

¹³ I. S. Robinson, *The Papacy 1073–1198 Continuity and Innovation* (Cambridge, 1990), p. 351 n. 154.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 351.

¹⁵ GN 117.

¹⁶ GF 74.

¹⁷ RC 673:

'Sic me doctrinae vobis quum papa ministrum

'Tradit Urbanus.'

¹⁸ Letter of Bohemond and the other princes to pope Urban II: Hagenmeyer, *Epistolae et chartae*, p. 164.

¹⁹ Letter of Patriarch Simeon and Adhémar of Le Puy: Hagenmeyer, *Epistolae et chartae*, p. 141.

²⁰ J. H. Hill and L. Hill, 'Contemporary accounts and the later representation of Adhémar, Bishop of Puy', *Medievalia et Humanistica* 8 (1955), pp. 30–8. J. A. Brundage, 'Adhémar of Puy: The Bishop and his Critics', *Speculum* 34 (1959), pp. 201–212. H. E. Mayer, 'Zur Beurteilung Adhémar's von Le Puy', *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 16 (1960), pp. 547–52.

There is little question that the legate reigned supreme in ecclesiastical matters, some of which would have had quite a strong impact on the overall direction of the crusade. If there was one contingent that was likely to baulk at Adhémar's authority, it was that of Duke Godfrey. The Lotharingian clergy included figures who had been supporters of the imperial side of the conflict between Pope Gregory VII and King Henry IV, most notably Bishop Otto of Strasbourg.²¹ Otto was brother of Henry IV's son-in-law, Duke Frederick I of Swabia. His adherence to the crusade seemed to represent a submission to the Gregorian party.²² Otto's obituary notice by Bernold of St Blaisen (Constance) in 1100 suggests, however, that this was temporary: 'the schismatic Otto of Strasbourg, having returned from the journey to Jerusalem, but, it was believed, still with his schism uncorrected, reached the end of his life.'²³

That Adhémar's authority in spiritual affairs was, regardless of the former loyalties of the Lotharingian clergy, nevertheless deferred to is evident from an incident where a nun from the convent of St Maria in Oeren (Trier) was released from a period of captivity in Nicea, during which time she had been ravished. Seeking 'purification', she had initially appealed to Henry of Esch, a Lotharingian nobleman whom she had recognised, who in turn took her case to Duke Godfrey. Godfrey sought for advice from Adhémar, who gave instruction as to the necessary penance.²⁴

There are several other clear examples that indicate Adhémar's ecclesiastical authority on the crusade. Firstly, after an earthquake took place during the siege of Antioch, 30 December 1098, Adhémar announced three days of fast, with a procession, prayers and alms-giving to the people. He ordered that the priests perform mass and prayers, and the clergy, psalms.²⁵ This was probably the occasion described by Guibert of Nogent and Albert of Aachen, as being one where a council of

²¹ For references to Otto, bishop of Strasbourg see J. Riley-Smith, *The First Crusaders*, p. 216.

²² I. S. Robinson, *Henry IV of Germany, 1056–1106* (Cambridge, 1999), p. 292.

²³ Bernold of St Blaisen (Constance), *Chronicon*, ed. I. S. Robinson, *Die Chroniken Bertholds von Reichenau und Bernolds von Konstanz, MGH Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum nova series* 14 (Hanover, 2003), p. 540: *Otto Strazburgensis scismaticus, de Ierosolimitano itinere reversus, sed de scismate, ut putabatur, non emendatus, diem clausit extremum.*

²⁴ AA ii.37 (127).

²⁵ RA 48 (245): *Praedicavit eo tempore episcopus triduanum [Col.0602B] jejunium, et cum processione, orationes, et elemosynas ad populum; ad presbyteros autem mandavit ut vacarent missis et orationibus, et clerici, psalmis.*

the clergy was held to regulate the spiritual conduct of the Christian army. The council appointed judges to flog, brand and shave the heads of miscreants.²⁶ A couple found guilty of adultery were subsequently whipped through the whole camp as an example, by order of Adhémar.²⁷ Writing approvingly of this incident, Guibert of Nogent added that the legate let no Sunday or holiday go by without preaching and enjoining every cleric to do the same.²⁸

Secondly, because there was a danger that Christians would attack each other on the fall of Antioch, Adhémar ordered everyone to shave and to wear a cross.²⁹ Thirdly, before the battle against Kerbogha, Adhémar led the way in attempting to earn God's approval for the Christian army.³⁰ The ecclesiastical activity which was organised at that time was described in the *Gesta Francorum*: three days fasting; processions from one church to another; confession; absolution; communion; the giving of alms and the celebration of masses.³¹ It has seemed strange to modern historians that soldiers were asked to fast before battle, but the practical side of the idea was to give as much grain as possible, no matter how precious, to strengthen the mounts of the Christian army.³²

Adhémar was responsible for leading services, such as the burial rituals for the much-admired knight Roger Barneville.³³ The legate also took responsibility for the distribution alms and tithes of captured booty to the poor.³⁴ Rather gruesomely, at the siege of Antioch he offered a reward for Turkish heads and, after Tancred presented him with a 'tithe' of heads, had them mounted on long poles facing the city.³⁵ To demoralise the garrison in Antioch, Adhémar organised the Christian farmers to demonstratively plough and seed the land around the Christian camp.³⁶ The legate also played the central role in oath-taking ceremonies, such as that of the Christian princes who swore that Bohemond would be ruler of the city if he could find a way to

²⁶ AA iii.58 (228).

²⁷ GN 196; AA iii.58 (228).

²⁸ GN 196–7.

²⁹ GN 206.

³⁰ FC I.xxii.1 (201–2).

³¹ GF 67–8.

³² FC I.xxii.2 (202). For the desperate state of horses at this time see J. France, *Victory in the East*, pp. 286–7.

³³ AA iv.28 (290).

³⁴ PT 100.

³⁵ GN 311–12; RC 644.

³⁶ GN 312.

capture it.³⁷ Similarly, when the leaders took an oath not to abandon the expedition in the face of the arrival of Kerbogha with an appallingly large army, Adhémar was central to the occasion.³⁸ Naturally, also, he was the judge of the validity of visions and miracles, such as those presented by Stephen of Valance and Peter Bartholomew.³⁹ With regard to the latter and the Holy Lance, Adhémar initially voiced his disbelief in the relic, but appreciating the connection between the discovery of the Lance and the heightened desire for battle with Kerbogha among the Christians, he later went so far as to have the relic associated with his Provençal following as they marched out to the conflict.

In all these matters, Adhémar was the most prominent leader by far. But some modern historians have questioned whether, outside of clerical affairs, he played much of a role at all.⁴⁰ In the context of the crusade, it is probably mistaken to underestimate the importance of Adhémar's direction of the religious rituals of the entire army in creating a sense of authority around the legate. But it is true that in the more secular and military decision-making of the crusade, Adhémar was clearly not the overall leader of the expedition. He was, nevertheless, a prominent figure, one among several princes.

As the various contingents set out, Fulcher wrote a list of their respective leaders and included Adhémar among them.⁴¹ When the Christian army neared Antioch, Albert of Aachen wrote that Duke Godfrey of Lotharingia, Bohemond, Count Raymond of Toulouse, Count Robert of Flanders, Duke Robert of Normandy and Adhémar governed it equally.⁴² They may have been equals in authority, but Adhémar seems to have been seen as something of a co-ordinator for the leadership of the crusade, because at least one council of the princes at the siege of Antioch took place in his 'house'.⁴³

The legate was described as playing a leading role in a number of military affairs: he lead his men to outflank the Turkish army at

³⁷ RC 653.

³⁸ GF 58–9.

³⁹ GN 100. GF 58. See Chapter Three.

⁴⁰ Especially J. H. Hill and L. Hill, 'Contemporary accounts and the later representation of Adhémar' *passim*; see also H. E. Mayer, 'Zur Beurteilung Adhémar's von Le Puy'.

⁴¹ FC I.vi.3–8 (154–161).

⁴² AA iii.27 (180).

⁴³ RA 54 (246): *domo*.

Dorylaeum;⁴⁴ he advised the whole army that there should be no further breakaway detachments as they approached Antioch; he ordered a shield-roof formation to be drawn up to cope with the resistance of archers at the 'Iron Bridge', 20 October 1098; he planned the order of march by which the Christian army arrived and took up positions at Antioch⁴⁵ and, due to Count Raymond being ill and left in Antioch to guard against a sortie from the Muslim held citadel, he led the Provençal troops in the battle against Kerbogha.⁴⁶

Probably the most accurate assessment of Adhémar's overall role is that given by Raymond of Aguilers in the historian's account of the vision of Stephen of Valance. Christ was reported as appearing to Stephen and among other questions asked, 'who is the commander of the Christian army?' To this Stephen replied, 'Lord, there was never one sole lord, but rather they trust in the bishop [Adhémar].'⁴⁷ In other words, Adhémar was one among several princes, but the person with the most respect across the whole of the various contingents of the Christian army.

Duke Godfrey of Lotharingia was another crusading prince to whom the analogy of Moses was applied. But this was in the very specific context of his election as ruler of Jerusalem, where it seemed appropriate for Albert of Aachen to recall the dream of a local knight, whose spirit was transported to Mount Sinai, from where he saw the Duke ascending the mountain, to be met by two bishops dressed in white. These mysterious figures blessed Godfrey by praying that he be appointed commander of the Christian people, like Moses.⁴⁸ The conclusion that Albert drew from this vision was that, in the spirit of Moses, Godfrey was the preordained prince of the people.⁴⁹

The role of Moses was attributed to Godfrey by a distant author, after the Duke had successfully obtained the sole authority of Jerusalem. There was, however, one other contender for the position of divinely approved leader who self-consciously sought to be seen as such from the very beginning of the expedition. This was Count Raymond IV of Toulouse. Baldric of Dol's eyewitness account of the speech of the

⁴⁴ GF 20.

⁴⁵ AA iii.33 (190); iii.35 (190–2); iii.36 (198).

⁴⁶ GF 68.

⁴⁷ RA 104 (256): *'Domine no fuit ibi unus solus dominus unquam, sed magis episcopo credunt.'*

⁴⁸ AA vi.34 (446).

⁴⁹ AA vi. 35 (448).

envoys of the count at the Council of Clermont has been examined in Chapter Two for what it reveals of Baldric's sociology. But it also offers a very interesting perspective on the leadership of the crusade. The count's envoys are reported as responding to fact that Adhémar had volunteered to go by saying: '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.'⁵⁰

Aaron was the elder brother of Moses and, as high priest of the Israelites, was nearly as important to their journey from Egypt as the prophet. It was a commonplace of medieval writing to refer to them both as the leaders of the Children of Israel.⁵¹ It is quite possible that Baldric was accurately recalling the theme of the followers of Count Raymond. At the time of their address it would not have been clear that several other major contingents would participate in the crusade and the analogy with the divinely inspired biblical brothers might have seemed appropriate to the count. The fact that Urban had met with Adhémar before the Council of Clermont and had travelled through Languedoc, both before and after the council, meeting Count Raymond at Nîmes, has been cited as evidence that there had been an early understanding that the leadership of the expedition would be assigned to the legate and the count.⁵² In this light it would make sense that Raymond would try to portray himself as a divine appointee. In the course of the expedition the count went to great lengths to portray himself as spiritually devout and especially chosen for the enterprise, with a pattern of behaviour that was quite distinct from the other princes.

During the difficult crossing of Anatolia after the crusaders' victory at Doryleum, Count Raymond was so sick that he thought he was dying and, indeed, the Bishop of Orange administered the last rites. A Saxon count in the Provençal contingent comforted the Count Raymond, saying that he would not die of this illness. The Saxon claimed to know this directly from having interceded with God on behalf of the Raymond

⁵⁰ 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.*

⁵¹ For example, they are listed together among the known Biblical 'princes of the people' by Bruno de Segni, *Commentaria in Mattheum*, PL 165, Col. 0152C.

⁵² J. H. Hill, 'Raymond of Saint Gilles in Urban's Plan of Greek and Latin Friendship', *Speculum*, 26, 2 (1951), pp. 265–276, here p. 266.

and promised to always be beside the Provençal count. Count Raymond believed this divine intervention to be true and, reported his chaplain, ‘divine mercy, which had made him leader of his army, immediately relieved him from death and restored him to health.’⁵³

In a public display of piety, Count Raymond walked barefoot from Ma’arra when the crusade departed that city, 8 January 1099.⁵⁴ He was accompanied by the recently appointed Bishop of Albara and his clerics, who were also barefoot. In a similar spirit of devotion, when the Count reached the river Jordan, he did not rush to immerse himself in it, as did the other crusaders, but first rowed across in a boat, wearing a linen shirt and breeches, after which he was splashed with water from the river; the garments dried and kept with the Holy Lance. Raymond of Aguilers, the chaplain of the Count who reported this, did not know the significance of these rituals, but they were adhered to as having been the instruction of the visionary, Peter Bartholomew.⁵⁵

In a further demonstration of his spiritual convictions, this time with an initiative all of his own, Raymond made himself guardian of the Church of Mount Zion his arrival at the walls of Jerusalem, 6 June 1099. This was perhaps a conscious echo of the deeds of Judas Maccabeus, who restored the sanctuary on Mount Zion and built a sanctuary there.⁵⁶ As noted above, Judas Maccabeus was a Jewish commander who campaigned on behalf of his people against the Seleucid Empire; he was seen by papal reformers of the eleventh century as a model *miles Christi*.⁵⁷ Even the count’s own army were less than impressed by this undertaking; most of them refused to follow Raymond up the hill and remained in an earlier camp, those that did attend him having to be paid with large sums of money.⁵⁸

Count Raymond’s championing of the Holy Lance was perhaps the most striking example of his attempt to associate himself with miraculous and divinely ordained events. Despite the fact that Adhémar’s first response to the approach of Peter Bartholomew was to ‘reckon

⁵³ RA 28 (241): *Sed divina clementia quae eum ducem praefecerat exercitus sui, de morte eum illicite relevavit, et sospitali reddidit.*

⁵⁴ GF 81; RA 185 (272).

⁵⁵ RA 356–7 (301–2).

⁵⁶ I Machabees 4: 36–61.

⁵⁷ C. Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, trans. M. W. Baldwin and W. Goffart (Princeton, 1977). Also I. S. Robinson, *The Papal Reform of the Eleventh Century* (Manchester, 2004), p. 45.

⁵⁸ RA 307 (293).

the words to be nothing', Count Raymond believed the lowly servant and brought him in to his chaplaincy.⁵⁹ The count himself joined the group of twelve clerics and nobles who, with everyone else locked out of the church of St Peter, dug all day to try to find the promised relic. It was after Count Raymond's departure that Peter Bartholomew leapt down into what must have been quite a deep pit to discover the Lance.⁶⁰ No doubt appreciating St Andrew's message on the night following the discovery of the Lance, that God had reserved the relic for Count Raymond and decreed him standard-bearer (*vexilliferum*) of this army,⁶¹ the count had the relic wrapped in precious purple cloth and it was displayed with great enthusiasm to the Christian army.⁶²

The seemingly miraculous victory of the Christian forces over Kerbogha enhanced the authority of the visionaries and, as discussed in Chapter Four, Peter Bartholomew in particular. But it also brought a new surge of popular approval for Count Raymond, whose purse filled from gifts to the Lance, whose spirit rose and whose army became overbearingly proud.⁶³ This renewed sense of divine purpose seems to have evoked a desire in the count to assert himself as leader of the entire expedition, because at a council at Chastel-Rouge on 4 January 1099, part way between Antioch and the recently captured town of Ma'arra, he offered Duke Godfrey and Robert of Normandy ten thousand solidi each to join his following; Robert of Flanders six thousand, Tancred five thousand and smaller amounts proportionate to the strength of other leaders. Again at Tripoli, 19 May, Count Raymond once more offered the nobles of the army entreaties and rewards, this time to attack the city.⁶⁴

Brought back down to earth with a bump by the mutiny described in Chapter Four, Count Raymond discovered that his attempts to utilise popular religious enthusiasm in support of the idea he was a divinely appointed figure to lead the expedition had failed. He had unleashed social forces, which he could not control.

Other than an incident reported by Albert of Aachen, of Duke Godfrey taking a barefoot walk around the city after the fall of Jerusalem,⁶⁵ Count

⁵⁹ RA 100 (247): *Episcopus autem nihil esse, praeter verba putavit.*

⁶⁰ RA 109–10 (257).

⁶¹ RA 110 (257).

⁶² AA iv.44 (316).

⁶³ RC 677.

⁶⁴ RA 282 (289). 19 May, FC 271 n. 25.

⁶⁵ AA vi.26 (437).

Raymond's pattern of behaviour was exceptional among the princes. He went to greater lengths than any of the others to publicly demonstrate his piety and belief in God's miraculous interventions. In this context it is worth looking again at Count Raymond's obduracy in resisting making an act of homage to the Greek Emperor. The report of Raymond of Aguilers, the chaplain of the count, was that the oath was refused on the ground that Raymond had not taken the cross to pay allegiance to any other lord or be in the service of any other than He for whom he had abandoned his native land. This has been dismissed as a 'pretty phrase' composed by the historian based on what the count would be expected to say,⁶⁶ but it might well have formed the substance of the reply by someone who did genuinely did see themselves as a potential Moses (or Aaron) for the expedition.

Another prince whose role as a possible overall leader of the First Crusade deserves attention is Stephen, count of Blois and Chartres, husband of Adela, daughter of William the Conqueror.⁶⁷ In a letter to Adela, Stephen reported that he had been made *dominus* and director and governor of all the acts of the princes.⁶⁸ That he had been given a special leadership role is confirmed by Raymond of Aguilers, who wrote that before Stephen abandoned the expedition, he had been chosen as *dictator* of the other princes.⁶⁹ Similarly, the *Gesta Francorum* confirms that Stephen was elected *ductor nostrum* by all the *maiores*.⁷⁰ Again, Albert of Aachen described him as *caput et primus consilio* in the whole army.⁷¹

Just when this decision had been reached cannot be ascertained with any precision, it took place sometime after the victory of the Christian forces at Dorylaeum, 1 July 1097, and before Stephen abandoned the crusade, around 3 June 1098. The information about Stephen being

⁶⁶ Raymond of Aguilers, *Historia Francorum qui ceperunt Jherusalem*, trans. J. H. Hill and L. L. Hill (Philadelphia, 1968), p. 23, n. 7. For the substance of the oath that Count Raymond did swear to, see J. H. Hill and L. L. Hill, 'The Convention of Alexius Comneus and Raymond of Saint-Giles', *American Historical Review*, 58 (1953), pp. 322–7.

⁶⁷ For Stephen of Blois, see J. A. Brundage, 'An Errant Crusader, Stephen of Blois', *Traditio* 16 (1960), pp. 380–95.

⁶⁸ Letter II of Stephen of Blois to his wife Adela: Hagenmeyer, *Epistulae et Chartae*, p. 149.

⁶⁹ RA 117 (258).

⁷⁰ GF 63.

⁷¹ AA ii.23 (96).

lord of the army is, as John France puts it, ‘very odd.’⁷² Stephen played no particularly prominent role in any of the military events, nor in any of the appointments decided upon by the leaders of the crusade, or in the deployment of the army at Antioch. The conclusion that John France reached, was that perhaps Stephen functioned as chair of the meetings of the leaders.⁷³ That this might well have been the sense in which Stephen was leader of the princes is suggested by Guibert of Nogent’s comment that Stephen’s performance in council was sober, steady and mature, thus placing his leadership qualities in the context of councils.⁷⁴

Despite the initial model of Urban II, the spiritual efforts of Count Raymond and the diplomatic skills of Stephen of Blois, the crusade lacked an overall commander. Or rather, for most of the expedition there was never such a figure. The qualification is needed because for a period of about two months, May and June 1097, Alexios I, the Byzantine Emperor, does seem to have managed to direct affairs. After the various regional armies arrived at Constantinople and the respective leaders, with the exception of Count Raymond, swore homage to him, the Byzantine emperor exerted a certain authority over the combined forces of the Latin princes. Albert of Aachen described Tatakios, the general appointed to the Christian forces by Alexios, as being *ductor Christiani exercitus* at the time of the siege of Nicea, because he was familiar with the region.⁷⁵ When Fulcher described the departure of the First Crusade from Nicea at the end of June 1097, he wrote that ‘*nostri barones*’ received permission from the Byzantine Emperor to leave.⁷⁶

Clearly Alexios was exerting a certain degree of hegemony over the magnates of the expedition in this period, but it was unlikely that his authority extended far beyond the elite to the wider body of crusaders. When, 19 June 1097, the city of Nicea had fallen to the combined crusader army and Byzantine fleet, the middle ranks, *mediocres exercitus personae*, of the Latin forces had expressed envy and enmity towards the Alexios and the princes.⁷⁷ Unlike the very poor and the princes, to

⁷² J. France, *Victory in the East*, p. 255.

⁷³ *Ibid.*

⁷⁴ GN 131–2.

⁷⁵ AA ii.22 (94–6).

⁷⁶ FC I.xi.1 (189).

⁷⁷ GN 153.

whom Alexios had made generous donations, the knights, footsoldiers and siege specialists who had exerted themselves the most and taken all the risks, had got nothing. They had been anticipating a share of the loot from the city, but the transition from Seljuk to Byzantine rule was skilfully managed by negotiation just at the point where it seemed as though the crusading army might break in.

The anonymous author of the *Gesta Francorum* was one of those knights who were furious with their leaders for playing a subordinate role to the Byzantine Emperor. He questioned why their own princes had felt it necessary to mislead the army with regard to Alexios.⁷⁸ Thus, even at his height of influence, the ability of the Emperor to direct affairs was limited and once clear of the immediate influence of Constantinople, the leadership of the crusade had to be created from rival geographical contingents and from those at the top of a social hierarchy whose boundaries were not clearly defined.

There was another brief period when one source claims the crusade was under the overall direction of one person. This was for two weeks in June 1098 when the Christian forces closed ranks to face the army of Kerbogha, atabeg of Mosul. Raymond of Aguilers reported that because Adhémar was sick, as was Count Raymond, and Stephen of Blois had fled, everyone promised to follow Bohemond's leadership for the coming battle and for fifteen days afterwards so that he could manage the custody of the city.⁷⁹

Bohemond was the commander for the battle of 28 June 1098,⁸⁰ but it is clear that Count Raymond, at least, was not one of those who subscribed to Bohemond's authority thereafter, for he resolutely refused to yield full control of Antioch to the Norman prince. Although he was general of the united Christian army for that one particular battle, Bohemond did not prove able to subsequently order the direction of the crusade, not least due to the rivalry of Count Raymond.

⁷⁸ GF 12.

⁷⁹ RA 116 (258).

⁸⁰ J. France, *Victory in the East*, pp. 295–6.

The Councils of the First Crusade

With no one person able to assert overall leadership, in practice the crusade was directed by councils and assemblies. Each of the regional contingents seems to have held its own councils, that, at least, is the impression given by the sources. In describing the journey of Bohemond's contingent through Byzantine territory the *Gesta Francorum* reported that Bohemond called a council of his people to restrain his forces from engaging in plunder.⁸¹ Similarly, Duke Godfrey held a council with the other *primores* of his army, in December 1096, before agreeing to the proposal of a legation of the Byzantine Emperor that he ride ahead to Constantinople.⁸² Shortly before the crusade reached Antioch, Count Raymond held a council of his own people before deciding to send five hundred knights ahead to see the rumour that the Turkish garrison had fled was true.⁸³ To encourage knights to defend those going on foot in search of forage at the siege of Antioch, Count Raymond again called together his magnates and the Bishop of Le Puy. They held a council at which it was agreed to establish a fraternity with a common pool of silver from which any knight who lost their horse could draw enough funds for a replacement.⁸⁴ When the Provençals were at 'Arqa and wanted the support of Duke Godfrey and Robert of Flanders, Count Raymond took counsel with his followers at 'Arqa, reported the author of the *Gesta Francorum*, and decided to summon them because of the rumour that an immense number of pagans were gathering to attack.⁸⁵

There was nothing exceptional about councils of this nature; they did not reflect any kind of shared command. Rather, it was customary for those at the apex of the feudal structure to take advice from their vassals. By contrast, when assemblies took place for the sake of decisions affecting the entire crusade, they were meetings of people with more or less equal authority.

A number of princes were clearly at the core of the decision-making of the crusade. Those named at various times as being among the

⁸¹ GF 8.

⁸² AA ii.9 (74).

⁸³ GF 26.

⁸⁴ RA 49 (245). See also J. Richard, 'La confrérie de la première croisade', *Études de civilisation médiévale: mélanges offerts à E. R. Labande*, ed. B. Jeannau (Poitiers, 1974), pp. 617–22.

⁸⁵ GF 84.

leaders are relatively well known and can be listed briefly: Hugh of Vermandois, known as Hugh the Great, brother of King Philip I of France; Robert Curthose, the eldest son of Duke William I of Normandy, the conqueror of England;⁸⁶ Robert, II of Flanders count from 1093, having been regent of Flanders between 1085 and 1091 when his father, Robert I of Flanders had been on pilgrimage; Godfrey IV, duke of Lower Lotharingia, lord of various territories in that region; Bohemond I, lord of Taranto, son of Robert Guiscard the duke of Calabria and Apulia; Stephen of Blois; Count Raymond IV of Toulouse and Bishop Adhémar of Le Puy. To these Latin princes, although he was never mentioned specifically as being present at a council, it is probably sensible to assume that Tatikios, the Byzantine general and commander of two thousand was present for so long as he participated in the expedition.

These nine princes were almost certainly those meant when the sources described how decisions that concerned the whole enterprise were taken. The examples from the *Gesta Francorum* are, however, characteristically vague. After the Anatolian town of Plastencia had given itself to the Christian army, Peter of Aups was given made governor by *omnes seniores*.⁸⁷ At the siege of Antioch *nostrī seniores* sent some knights to reconnoitre a castle near Antioch called Harem.⁸⁸ It was *omnes maiores* who gathered at the siege, 17 November 1097, to decide to build a castle later called *Malregard* on a hill near Bohemond's camp⁸⁹ and again, in March 1098, to decide upon building another castle at a former Muslim mosque.⁹⁰ Bohemond sought agreement from *omnes seniores* that whoever led the way into Antioch should keep the city⁹¹ and *omnes maiores* eventually came together in council to agree this.⁹² Finally, *omnes maiores* held a council before sending a message to Kerbogha, 25 June 1098.⁹³ Stephen of Blois and Tatikios, having abandoned the crusade earlier in the month, would not have been present at this last council and, given his predilection for 'slumber and idleness' at Latakia in the

⁸⁶ For Robert II of Normandy see C. W. David, *Robert Curthose, Duke of Normandy* (Cambridge, 1920).

⁸⁷ GF 25–6.

⁸⁸ GF 29.

⁸⁹ GF 30.

⁹⁰ GF 39.

⁹¹ GF 44.

⁹² GF 45.

⁹³ GF 65–6.

winter of 1097/8, Robert of Normandy was probably not present at the meetings that commissioned the construction of castles.⁹⁴

The material examined in Chapter Eight, however, serves as a warning not to assume that those present at such councils were limited to those these nine princes. Not only did the author of the *Gesta Francorum* tend to use *maiores* and *seniores* for the magnates in a broader sense than the princes, but the sources attest to a number of councils where there evidently was participation by members of this broader layer of nobles. After the victory over Kerbogha, the *Gesta Francorum* reported that ‘all our *seniores*, namely Duke Godfrey, Count Raymond of St-Giles, Bohemond, the Count of Normandy, the Count of Flanders and *et alii omnes*, sent the most noble knight Hugh the Great to the Emperor of Constantinople.’⁹⁵ The interesting phrase here is, ‘and all the others’. Who was the anonymous author pointing to by this? As Stephen of Blois and Tatikios had abandoned the crusade by this time, the only missing person from the list of nine princes was Adhémar of Le Puy, who was almost certainly present, but clearly there were others also.

For some councils the additional figures included other senior clerics. An important council was held in Antioch on 5 November 1098 to try and resolve the future of the expedition and the ownership of the city. This was something of an exceptional meeting, being probably the most formal gathering of the entire expedition. It took place in the Church of St Peter. *Omnes maiores*, says the author of the *Gesta Francorum*, returned to Antioch for this assembly, which dragged on over several days, as Bohemond referred again and again to the agreement the others had made to make him lord of Antioch if he could gain the city, while Count Raymond insisted that they remember the oath they had taken to the Byzantine Emperor, an oath, which he pointed out, that Bohemond had advised that they all take.⁹⁶

Eventually, ‘the bishops’, Duke Godfrey, Robert of Flanders and Robert of Normandy and other *seniores* went apart from the rest, to the part where St Peter’s chair stood, to give judgement.⁹⁷ Here, it is evident that bishops were an important part of the council. There

⁹⁴ RC 649.

⁹⁵ GF 72: *Omnes nostri seniores, videlicet dux Godefridus, comes Sancti Egidii Raimundus, Boamundus, et comes Nortmanniae, comesque Flandrensis, et alii omnes miserunt nobilissimum militem Hugonem Magnum imperatori Constantinopolim.*

⁹⁶ GF 75–6.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*

were, perhaps, nine bishops on the crusade at this point. Eight who had travelled from Western Europe⁹⁸ and one, Peter of Narbonne, who had recently been raised to Bishop of Albara after the capture of the city or about 25 September 1098.

John France has drawn attention to the phrase *aliique seniores* here as showing that there were many parties to the judgement,⁹⁹ and it is possible some of these other *seniores* were drawn from a wider layer of clergy than the Bishops present at this meeting. Robert the Monk wrote that it was 'bishops, abbots, dukes and counts' who went to St Peter's chair.¹⁰⁰ This provides an insight into the social position of those who Robert thought ought to have been involved in decision-making on the crusade, but his distance from the events means his report cannot be used as definitive proof that abbots also took part in the council.

Another council in which the clergy participated to a large extent took place much later on, when the crusade approached Jerusalem. When Tancred placed his banner over the Church of the Nativity at Bethlehem, 6 June 1099, he precipitated a debate about whether a secular prince should be lord over ecclesiastical properties, as if it were merely a temporal possession. In particular, did this mean that one of the princes would become king of Jerusalem? Because the princes at this point were in dispute, 'we' reported Raymond of Aguilers, rather vaguely, 'had an assembly convened'. At this meeting the 'bishops and clergy' objected to the prospect of any prince being elected with the title 'king' of Jerusalem.¹⁰¹

For the final attack on Jerusalem, William Hugh of Monteil, Isoard, count of Die and some of the clergy convened a council of the princes and *omni populus* to announce the plan of attack on Jerusalem and that it would be preceded by a bare foot procession.¹⁰² William Hugh was the brother of Bishop Adhémar of Le Puy and, as discussed in Chapter Four, along with the other former followers of the legate, had earlier broken from Count Raymond of Toulouse to pursue an independent policy. Both these councils took place in the context of a political vacuum at the head of the crusade due to a growing hostility to Count

⁹⁸ J. Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading* (London, 1986), p. 76.

⁹⁹ J. France, *Victory in the East*, pp. 20–1.

¹⁰⁰ RM 843.

¹⁰¹ RA 322 (295): *Habuimus eo tempore conventus, quia principes male inter se conveniebant.*

¹⁰² RA 326–9 (296–7).

Raymond, yet where no other leader, not even Duke Godfrey, was prominent enough to exert hegemony over the other princes.¹⁰³

The presence of ‘all the people’ at this latter council does not necessarily mean it was a mass assembly of the entire Christian army. *Populus* in this era was a term that often had a more limited meaning than the translation ‘the people’ suggests. It was frequently used in a legalistic context to indicate those involved in elections. Thus Raymond of Aguilers described the election of Robert of Rouen as bishop of Ramleh, 3 June 1099, as being a decision of the *maiores* and the *populus*.¹⁰⁴ Clearly a much broader body than the princes, in these kind of contexts *populus* has the sense of the more respectable members of the community rather than a crowd of the entire people.¹⁰⁵

A more clear case for mass participation in an assembly is that of a council held in Antioch on 2 February 1099, where the decision to leave for Jerusalem was taken by all, *magni et parvi*.¹⁰⁶ Because of the context it seems reasonable to accept the testimony of Albert of Aachen that the ‘great and small’ took part. At this point, Count Raymond of Toulouse was engaged in an arduous siege of Ma’arra and those left in Antioch were becoming so suspicious that Duke Godfrey, Robert of Flanders and Bohemond did not intend to continue on to Jerusalem that they were already leaving these lords. A guard had to be placed on the seaports to prevent the many departures.¹⁰⁷ The point of the council was to reassure the broader followings of these princes, which they did by resolving to assemble in March at Latakia in order to continue on to Jerusalem.

The nature of more important decision-making councils on the First Crusade then, does not seem to have ever become fixed. Depending on which princes were present, the strength of the disagreements between them, and the extent to which the decision was a religious matter, councils of differing size and composition were convened. Similarly, even

¹⁰³ For a summary of the situation at this time see J. France, *Victory in the East. A military history of the First Crusade* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 233–4.

¹⁰⁴ For references to Robert of Rouen see J. Riley-Smith, *The First Crusaders 1095–1131* (Cambridge, 1997), p. 221. For the early history of the bishopric of Ramla see H. E. Mayer, ‘The Origins of the Lordship of Ramla and Lydda in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem’, *Speculum* 60.3 (1985), pp. 537–552.

¹⁰⁵ For the nuances of *populus* in the work of, for example, William of Tyre, see C. Kostick, ‘William of Tyre, Livy, and the Vocabulary of Class,’ *Journal of History of Ideas*, 65.3 (2004), pp. 353–368, here pp. 360–1.

¹⁰⁶ AA v. 28 (342).

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*

the smaller councils, held to direct day-to-day military affairs, turn out on closer inspection, to have something of the same fluidity.

Following the return of scouts sent to investigate the news of Kerbogha's impending arrival, the leaders of the army met to hear the report, 3 June. Those listed by Albert of Aachen as being among *omnis primatus* for that assembly were Duke Godfrey, Robert of Flanders, Robert of Normandy, Count Raymond of Toulouse, Bohemond, Eustace and Tancred.¹⁰⁸ Even if Albert was not accurately informed about this particular council, his inclusion of Eustace III, count of Boulogne, elder brother of Godfrey,¹⁰⁹ and Tancred, as well as unnamed others echoes the earlier example from the *Gesta Francorum* above, of the council that sent Hugh the Great on his embassy to Alexios. In both cases there were other magnates from outside the princely elite in attendance.

That Eustace was considered one of the leaders of the crusade, even though it was his younger brother Godfrey who was the more dominant figure among the Lotharingian contingent, is evident from a letter written by the princes of the First Crusade to Pope Urban II, 11 September 1098.¹¹⁰ Those whose names are appended to it are six from the group of nine princes (Stephen of Blois and Tatikios had left the crusade and Adhémar was dead at the time of its composition) plus Eustace. It is quite likely that Tancred was also regularly one of the 'others' at the councils of the leaders as he is specifically mentioned as being in two assemblies reported in the *Gesta Francorum*. When 'our men' (*nostrī*) held a council to deal with raids from the Turks in Antioch, reported the *Gesta Francorum*, Tancred came forward from among the others (*ante alios*) to volunteer to garrison a castle with just his own men, providing he received payment. The council offered him four hundred marks of silver.¹¹¹ The impression here is of a meeting of the senior princes, at which other prominent magnates, including Tancred, were present but were not playing the same decision-making role. He could come forward and speak but, perhaps, not quite with equal weight as the senior princes who made him the offer of silver.

¹⁰⁸ AA iv.14 (268).

¹⁰⁹ For Eustace III, count of Boulogne see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem, A Dynastic History 1099–1125* (Oxford, 2000), p. 193.

¹¹⁰ Letter of Bohemond and the Other Princes to Pope Urban II: Hagenmeyer, *Epistulae et Chartae*, pp. 161–5.

¹¹¹ GF 43.

Later, after the fall of Antioch but before the battle with Kerbogha, when the *maiores* held a council at which they decided to swear an oath not to flee from the city, Tancred added the qualification that he would stay so long as he had forty knights.¹¹² Here, he seems to be on an equal footing with the other *maiores*, but this may reflect the broad nature of the council rather than a status accorded to Tancred that was equal to the senior princes.

Tancred's career on the crusade provides the most interesting example of the presence of a layer of lords who might best be described as 'semi-princes'. These were magnates with an independent following who might aspire to become fully equally with the princes, or, if their affairs went badly, could sink back into a more dependent position. To some extent this reflected the careers of magnates all over Western Europe. Success in political and military affairs could make dukes out of knights, kings out of dukes. Three years of campaigning on the First Crusade provided opportunities for the aspiring prince to establish himself as an independent lord and it has to be taken into consideration that such figures may have participated in the councils that directed the crusade.

Tancred was the son of Bohemond's sister Emma. As they shared wine together and discussed the coming crusade, Bohemond urged his nephew to participate as his second-in-command, 'as though a duke under a king'.¹¹³ After many promises, Tancred agreed and came on the First Crusade with the South Italian Normans, where he did indeed command the army in Bohemond's absence.¹¹⁴ In anticipation of his future successes, many people transferred their allegiance to Tancred, including, so long as they were paid, *iuvenes*. Tancred borrowed from his richer supporters to pay those who were poorer.¹¹⁵

A dramatic illustration of Tancred's ambition took place when he was finally brought before Alexios, at the end of June 1097, having tried up until then to avoid performing homage to the Byzantine emperor. Submitting angrily to the required act, Tancred was offered the chance to ask for a treasure by the conciliatory emperor. The Norman prince had the temerity to ask for the tent that Alexios used when campaigning. This was an enormous affair, requiring twenty camels to move it,

¹¹² GF 59.

¹¹³ RC 607: *quasi dux sub rege*.

¹¹⁴ GF 11.

¹¹⁵ RC 610.

and which had a turreted atrium when assembled. It could hold 'a multitude'.¹¹⁶ The message was clear and prescient: Tancred sought royal dwellings, suitable for the magnificent lord that he intended to become.

When, around 10 September 1097, Tancred left the main army with a detachment of troops to make for Tarsus, he was nevertheless clearly a follower of Bohemond, as he negotiated for the surrender of Cilician cities in the name of his lord.¹¹⁷ On leaving Cilicia to rejoin the main army, having left troops to garrison a number of towns and cities, he was reported as leading a hundred knights and two hundred archers.¹¹⁸

During the siege of Antioch, as noted above, Tancred undertook to defend a castle for pay and, with Bohemond's support, he also obtained land near Hamah and Harenc. Tancred's total revenues during the worst of the famine at Antioch, over the winter of 1097/8, meant that he not only kept his followers but was able to recruit to his table 'many excluded by others'.¹¹⁹ As noted above, Tancred agreed to stay committed to the crusade so long as he had forty knights and curiously this was the number attributed to him when he brought up the rearguard of the troops heading towards Jerusalem under Count Raymond.¹²⁰

For this period of the crusade, Tancred had become the follower of Count Raymond, for a payment of five thousand solidi and two fine horses, presumably transferring his allegiance while Bohemond consolidated his position as prince of Antioch. Although R. L. Nicholson believes that Tancred was encouraged by Bohemond to join with Count Raymond in order to monitor the affairs of the Provençal lord and get him away from Antioch, there is no direct evidence for this.¹²¹

In any case, Tancred soon chaffed at his relationship with Count Raymond and, contriving a quarrel, he 'wickedly' abandoned Raymond for Duke Godfrey,¹²² whom he followed with a great deal of autonomy. With trickery that his grandfather, Robert Guiscard, would have been proud of, Tancred sent his banner to a number of Arab towns, claiming

¹¹⁶ RC 619. See also AC 11.3 (340).

¹¹⁷ AA iii.6 (146).

¹¹⁸ RC 630.

¹¹⁹ RC 650: *multos ab aliis exclusos*.

¹²⁰ RA 186 (272).

¹²¹ R. L. Nicholson, *Tancred*, pp. 76–7.

¹²² RA 218 (278): *male*.

to be leader of the crusade and demanding tribute.¹²³ He led frequent raids; was the first to Bethlehem, which he tried to claim;¹²⁴ and, on the fall of Jerusalem, first to the Temple of the Lord, where he took a fortune in silver to increase the numbers of his military force and to pay the foreign soldiers who had joined up with him.¹²⁵ Tancred also gave a banner to the Muslims who had taken refuge there, probably intending to sell them on the slave market, but was furious that instead they were slain in the massacres. When he left Jerusalem, Tancred had eighty knights as followers.¹²⁶

Throughout the crusade then, Tancred led a following of his own, which varied between some forty to eighty knights. He conducted himself with a great deal of independence, but nevertheless was subject to Bohemond as far as the capture of Antioch, and later, more nominally, Count Raymond and Duke Godfrey. It is significant that after Tancred was sent for in March 1101 by the Normans of Antioch to be ruler of the city, because Bohemond had been captured by the Danishmend ruler Malik Ghāzī, his biographer, Ralph of Caen reported that he felt burdened by the suspect nature of the dignity, because in the event of Bohemond's return, he would have been more of a host than a prince.¹²⁷ By 1105 though, there was no doubting that Tancred was a most illustrious prince in his own right, having obtained full authority over Antioch when Bohemond left the city to recruit an army to fight against the Byzantine empire. In that year also, Tancred was regent of Edessa while its lord, Baldwin of Bourcq was a prisoner.

Another example of a young relative of one of the senior princes striving to become a lord and leader in his own right is that of Baldwin of Boulogne, younger brother of Eustace and Duke Godfrey.¹²⁸ As with Tancred, Baldwin had his own following, but served under Godfrey and captured cities in Cilicia under his older brothers' name.¹²⁹ Notoriously, the two young aspirant princes came to blows during this campaign,

¹²³ RA 218 (278).

¹²⁴ RA 322 (295).

¹²⁵ RC 696.

¹²⁶ RC 703.

¹²⁷ RC 706.

¹²⁸ For Baldwin of Boulogne see H. E. Mayer, *Mélanges sur l'histoire du royaume latin de Jérusalem*, Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, n.s. 5 (Paris, 1984), see also A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem, A Dynastic History 1099–1125* (Oxford, 2000).

¹²⁹ AA iii.10 (152).

their conflict fuelled not only by rivalry between the Lotharingian and Norman contingents, but the implications for their status as princes. Baldwin got the upper hand, driving Tancred's troops from Tarsus, but this led to the low point of his career. Around 20 September 1097 some three hundred Norman soldiers arrived at Tarsus, looking for Tancred. Ignoring the pleas of his own men, Baldwin mistrusted the Normans and refused to let them into the city. During the night these troops were slaughtered by the local Turkish forces, leading to a mutiny in which the enraged lower ranks sought out Baldwin, intending to harm him for his guilt in the death of these fellow Christians. He survived the arrows aimed his way from his own men by taking to a tower until the tumult died down.¹³⁰

Thereafter, though, Baldwin saw a dramatic turn in his fortunes. A fleet arriving in the region to join the crusade turned up only a few days later. It had, as one of its leaders Winemer of Boulogne, a member of the household of Count Eustace, Baldwin's brother.¹³¹ These reinforcements augmented Baldwin's forces considerably, allowing him to garrison a number of towns. Even more fortunately, Baldwin thus attracted the attention of the Christian rulers of Edessa, who saw in him the possibility of emancipating themselves from pressure of the local Muslim princes. Marching to Edessa with between sixty and two hundred knights,¹³² he was disappointed to learn that the ruler there, Thoros, wished only to hire his services for coin. Refusing to be treated like a mere mercenary, Baldwin's supporters among the elders of the town obliged Thoros to adopt the Lotharingian as his son, c. 6 February 1098.¹³³ A coup by the townspeople on Sunday 7 March 1098 killed the elderly Thoros and installed Baldwin as lord of Edessa. Thereafter his status as a prince was never in doubt, and indeed, his feet were firmly set on the path that would take him to Jerusalem and a crown.

Baldwin's elevation was reflected in the writings of his chaplain, Fulcher of Chartres, who thereafter included him amongst the very few whom were designated *princeps* by the historian.¹³⁴ For Raymond of Aguilers too, there was no doubt that Baldwin was now one of the

¹³⁰ AA iii.12–3 (156–8).

¹³¹ AA iii.15 (160). Winemer is otherwise unknown.

¹³² 200 in AA iii.19 (168); 80 in FC, I.xiv.7; 60 in Matthew of Edessa, *Chronique*, RHC Arm. 1, 36.

¹³³ AA iii.21 (170). William of Tyre, *Chronicon* 4.3 (236).

¹³⁴ FC I.xxxiv.2 (335).

leaders of the crusade, although his occupancy of Edessa meant that he could not help direct affairs. Raymond reported that *omnes principes* with the exception of Baldwin, met in Antioch for the assembly of 5 November 1098 described above.¹³⁵

In the drawn out expedition that was the First Crusade the bonds of vassalage and obligation were weakened, allowing considerable fluidity as knights changed allegiance according to which prince had the means to support them. To maintain a place at the council of princes and a measure of leadership over events, it was desirable to have a reputation for good generalship, for piety and for bravery. But what a lord required, above all, was control of revenues from captured cities. It was control of tribute, redistributed to followers, which ensured a lord of a following. When Arnulf of Chocques was elected Patriarch of Jerusalem, he drew attention to this particular aspect of lordship as being the one that set the princes apart from all others. 'You have promoted me from my humble position. You have made me famous, who was unknown. As if one of you, you bring about my sharing in tribute.'¹³⁶

Baldwin's success in becoming lord of Edessa allowed him to attract considerable numbers of followers, including the *iuvēnes* grouped with Drogo of Nesle discussed in Chapter Six. As supplies dwindled at the siege of Antioch, Baldwin settled all the revenues of Turbessel on Duke Godfrey. The value of the corn, barley, wine and oil amounted to 50,000 bezants a year, reported Albert of Aachen.¹³⁷ Their relationship had changed from one in which Baldwin served his older brother, to one of equals.

If Baldwin and Tancred provide the examples of those 'semi-princes' whose careers and status rose during the course of the crusade, there were several others who strove in the same direction with less success. At the start of the crusade, the Lotharingian nobles Henry of Esch and Hartmann, count of Dillingen and Kyburg had considerable resources, enough to finance the building of a siege engine at Nicea at their own expense.¹³⁸ They were so destitute by the siege of Antioch, however, that they became dependent on a stipend of bread, meat and fish from

¹³⁵ RA 159 (267).

¹³⁶ RC 699: '*Vos me de humili promovistis, vos de ignoto celebrem reddidistis, vos quasi unum ex vobis, et participem tributorum creastis*'.

¹³⁷ AA iv.9 (262).

¹³⁸ AA ii.30 (112).

Duke Godfrey. Hartmann was obliged to enter battle against Kerbogha on a donkey, holding only a Turkish round shield and sword, having sold all his arms and weapons a long time earlier.¹³⁹

Emerging from the Provençal contingent as a figure of prominence towards the end of the crusade, Gaston IV, viscount of Béarn, was somewhat more successful a contender for a place among the princes. He rode with his own knights alongside Robert of Flanders in the vanguard of the Christian army as it marched towards Jerusalem.¹⁴⁰ In distinct rivalry to the activities of Count Raymond of Toulouse, who funded his own siege equipment, Gaston was the choice of the other princes to be appointed to oversee operations in the crucial task of constructing their towers and mangonels for the siege of Jerusalem.¹⁴¹ Gaston had a following of thirty knights who seem to have formed an alliance with those of Tancred. Both troops engaged in raiding the outskirts of Jerusalem as the crusading forces arrived at the city.¹⁴² At the fall of Jerusalem Gaston and Tancred together placed their banners on the Temple of the Lord in their vain effort to signal that the non-Christians who had sought refuge on the roof of the Temple were their prisoners.¹⁴³ ‘Tancred and Gaston’ were also listed together in the *Gesta Francorum*’s description of the marshalling of the various contingents of troops for the battle of Ascalon, 12 August 1099.¹⁴⁴

Another Provençal noble who was an important figure and for a time a leader in his own right was Raymond Pilet, lord of Alès. Raymond Pilet came on the crusade in the army of Count Raymond of Toulouse. At one point, after Kerbogha had been defeated and while the senior princes were dispersing to the nearby regions to avoid the heat and plague of the summer of 1098, Raymond Pilet led an army of his own. He ‘retained’ (*retinere*) many knights and footsoldiers and set off south east, so reported the anonymous author of the *Gesta Francorum*, using his preferred verb for the establishment of the relationship between lord and vassal.¹⁴⁵ After some initial successes Raymond Pilet’s forces were defeated in an attempt to storm Ma’arra, 27 July 1098.¹⁴⁶ Thereafter

¹³⁹ AA iv.54 (332–4).

¹⁴⁰ AA v.42 (396).

¹⁴¹ RA 331–2 (297).

¹⁴² AA v.45 (402).

¹⁴³ GF 92.

¹⁴⁴ GF 95.

¹⁴⁵ GF 73.

¹⁴⁶ GF 74.

Raymond Pilet resumed a place among the army of Count Raymond; although he was the commander given the responsibility of leading Provençal troops when they were detached from the main army. In the company of Raymond *vicecomes* of Turenne he took Tortosa;¹⁴⁷ again with Raymond of Turenne he left the siege of Jerusalem in search of battle and was victorious against two hundred Arabs.¹⁴⁸ When a contingent of knights was required for the hazardous journey to Jaffa to meet with recently arrived ships, a hundred knights of the Provençal army set out, with Raymond of Pilet a prominent leader.¹⁴⁹

Other important magnates whose prominence might have warranted their presence as being among the 'others' at the councils of princes were Anselm II of Ribemont, Baldwin of Bourq, Baldwin II of Mons, count of Hainaut, Geldemar Carpenel, Hugh II, count of Saint-Pol and Roger Barneville.¹⁵⁰ There were ecclesiastical magnates of some distinction too. In addition to the bishops referred to in the council at Antioch on 5 November, both Arnulf of Chocques and Robert of Rouen became important voices at the head of the clergy, the former eventually becoming the Patriarch of Jerusalem, the latter bishop of Lydda.

There is one person from outside the ranks of the nobility who must also be taken into consideration in a discussion of the leaders of the First Crusade: Peter the Hermit. Peter was considered a leader in the same light as the senior princes by Fulcher of Chartres, when he listed those who led armies on the expedition.¹⁵¹ After the catastrophic defeat of the People's Crusade, Peter must have lost a great deal of authority. He does not feature in any of the sources as directing troops and this, combined with his lowly background, makes it unlikely that he participated in many of the day-to-day councils of the leaders. In one capacity, though, Peter the Hermit continued to play a leading role, sometime after the death of Adhémar he had been put in charge of the *pauperes*, the clergy, and the people.¹⁵²

When the Christian forces had been united at the siege of 'Arqa in March 1098 by the arrival of Duke Godfrey and Robert of Flanders

¹⁴⁷ GF 83–4.

¹⁴⁸ GF 87–8.

¹⁴⁹ GF 88.

¹⁵⁰ For Anselm of Ribemont see J. Riley-Smith, *The First Crusaders*, p. 199.

¹⁵¹ FC I.vi.3–8 (154–161).

¹⁵² RA 214 (278).

a tithe was taken for the sake of the poor. A quarter of the collection went to Peter of Narbonne as the bishop of Albarra, another quarter went to the priests of the army, but half came to Peter the Hermit. He, in turn, split this fund equally between the remaining clergy and the laity.¹⁵³ Peter had always had a special responsibility for women,¹⁵⁴ and this seems to have continued all the way down to Jerusalem. When the military forces marched out to fight at the battle of Ascalon, Peter moved about in procession from church to church with the women, the clergy and the thin crowd of feeble people who remained in the city.¹⁵⁵ This prominent role among the non-combatants suggests that Peter would have been present at those broader assemblies discussed above, which dealt with the concerns of the clergy and the poor.

The leadership of the First Crusade was carried out by a core group of princes who were, depending on circumstances, joined in their decision-making assemblies by other prominent magnates and ecclesiastical figures. As the examples in Chapter Three and Four show, however, it would be a mistake to envisage such councils to have always been authoritative bodies. The instructions coming from the council were not always obeyed and there was more than one instance of popular mutiny against the princes. Narrative histories of the First Crusade have therefore tended to describe events a little too neatly as flowing from the initiative of nine or so very senior princes. Even among themselves the princes did not manage to stabilise a formal structure of authority for very long. The composition of their councils was constantly changing as prominent nobles died, or left the crusade and as other magnates emerged as important leaders.

¹⁵³ *Ibid.*

¹⁵⁴ See below, pp. 280–1.

¹⁵⁵ BD 107.

