
A Warlord's Wisdom: Literacy and Propaganda at the Time of the First Crusade

Author(s): Nicholas L. Paul

Source: *Speculum*, Vol. 85, No. 3 (JULY 2010), pp. 534-566

Published by: The University of Chicago Press on behalf of the Medieval Academy of America

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27866935>

Accessed: 08-11-2018 14:41 UTC

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>



JSTOR

Medieval Academy of America, The University of Chicago Press are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Speculum*

A Warlord's Wisdom: Literacy and Propaganda at the Time of the First Crusade

By Nicholas L. Paul

At some time in the second half of the twelfth century, a scribe working in the vicinity of Tours in northwest Francia copied a series of verses in praise of the leaders of the First Crusade (1095–99).¹ Each hero was assigned his own line, fashioned to end with a rhyme in the masculine superlative. The qualities ascribed to the crusaders read like a laundry list of knightly virtues, including “magnanimus,” “obstinatus,” “accerrimus,” and “expeditus.” But while Eustace, count of Boulogne, is said to have been “the best man” (“vir optimus”) and the count of Hainaut, Baldwin of Mons, is identified as both “prudent and well spoken” (“prudens et facundus”), for Bohemond, commander of the crusading forces from Norman southern Italy, is reserved the high praise of “sapientissimus”: “the wisest.”²

Far from offhand flattery, the anonymous poet's designation precisely encapsulates the way that Bohemond was most frequently characterized in twelfth-century historical narratives. William of Apulia, for instance, who completed a poetic encomium of Bohemond's father Robert Guiscard before 1099, described Bohemond as “a knight of real brilliance” (“magnae mentis eques”).³ How was this brilliance manifested? To the English chronicler William of Malmesbury, Bohemond “possessed great influence from his military skill.”⁴ For most other medieval writers, however, Bohemond's influence was primarily associated with his extraordinary powers of persuasion and his ability to manipulate others, characteristics that were revealed in the frequent assertions that he was a trickster, descriptions of

An early version of this paper was read at the International Medieval Congress held at Kalamazoo, Michigan, in 2007 in a session sponsored by the Crusades Studies Forum of Saint Louis University. I am grateful to Richard Gyug, Giles Constable, Maryanne Kowaleski, William Purkis, Vincent Ryan, and the anonymous reviewers at *Speculum* for their detailed comments and helpful suggestions. Special thanks are due to Jay Rubenstein for his invaluable advice and for sharing a draft chapter of his forthcoming work on the chronicles of the First Crusade. Work on this article was completed with the assistance of a Fordham University Faculty Fellowship and an Andrew W. Mellon Foundation Fellowship for Assistant Professors, which funded a membership at the Institute for Advanced Study in 2009–10.

¹ Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 5513, fols. 66v–67r. For a transcription of the verses and commentary on the manuscript see Nicholas L. Paul, “Crusade, Memory and Regional Politics in Twelfth-Century Amboise,” *Journal of Medieval History* 31 (2005), 127–41, at p. 141.

² Bohemond is also called “modestus” in these verses, but this is more likely a reference to knightly forbearance than to any sense of “modesty.” For a recent discussion of knightly virtues see David Crouch, *The Birth of Nobility: Constructing Aristocracy in England and France, 900–1300* (Harlow, Eng., 2005), pp. 56–80; on forbearance see pp. 63–67.

³ William of Apulia, *La geste de Robert Guiscard*, ed. and trans. Marguerite Matthieu (Palermo, 1961), p. 232.

⁴ William of Malmesbury, *Historia novella: The Contemporary History*, ed. Edmund King and trans. Kenneth Potter (Oxford, 1998), p. 414.

his dramatic public orations, and in the tales of his spectacular escapes, ruses, and coups.

The medieval assertions have proven very persuasive for modern commentators. R. C. Smail, in his 1956 history of crusading warfare, for example, echoed William of Malmesbury, writing that Bohemond was possessed of an "innate military genius" and that "he alone of the leaders of the First Crusade emerges as a skilful general."⁵ But in response to medieval portraits of Bohemond as a trickster and manipulator, many scholars of the early crusades have gone beyond what is explicitly recounted in the sources, attributing to him tactics that, if he indeed adopted them, would render him nearly unique among all of the lay lords of Western Christendom at this time. Specifically, they have associated Bohemond with the production or manipulation and dissemination of written texts, including forged documents and heavily prejudiced historical narratives, which are seen to have supported his political and military objectives. Over the past decade, arguments that he was involved in processes of textual composition, redaction, and distribution have become increasingly elaborate and specific. In a recent article, for example, we find Bohemond acting as "patron" to the writer of a historical "propaganda" narrative only to supervise two subsequent revisions of the same text.⁶

Most of what has been written so far regarding Bohemond's use of texts as propaganda has focused on one or more of the texts themselves and has sought either to prove or to disprove Bohemond's influence on the basis of how effectively these works lionize him, defend his political positions, or vilify his enemies.⁷ Missing from these arguments is any consideration of the wider implications of the notion that a lay warrior from southern Italy might have recourse to the written word, and most notably historical narrative, as a political tool and a military weapon in the first decade of the twelfth century. This notion is potentially very significant: although Bohemond's lifetime (c. 1058–1111) corresponds with what is sometimes seen as a critical period in the development of written communication and the rise of textual propaganda, most recent discussions of the rise of such propaganda associate it with powerful ecclesiastical and princely courts, not the households of itinerant warlords like Bohemond.⁸

As I will demonstrate, the idea that Bohemond made widespread use of written propaganda is grounded in late-nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century assumptions about literacy and the utility of written texts. What is offered here is a fresh

⁵ R. C. Smail, *Crusading Warfare: 1097–1193* (Cambridge, Eng., 1956), p. 202.

⁶ Jean Flori, "De l'Anonyme normand à Tudebode et aux *Gesta Francorum*: L'impact de la propagande de Bohémond sur la critique textuelle des sources de la première croisade," *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 102 (2007), 717–46; for Bohemond as patron see p. 743.

⁷ Compare, for example, Flori (ibid.) with the counterargument of Marc Carrier, "Pour en finir avec les *Gesta Francorum*: Une réflexion historiographique sur l'état des rapports entre Grecs et Latins au début du XII^e siècle et sur l'apport nouveau d'Albert d'Aix," *Crusades* 7 (2008), 13–34. The latter is based on Carrier's doctoral thesis, "L'image des Byzantins et les systèmes de représentation selon les chroniqueurs occidentaux des croisades 1096–1261" (Université Paris I, Panthéon-Sorbonne, 2006), pp. 240–54.

⁸ For the most recent discussion of the rise of propaganda see Martin Aurell, "Rapport introductif," in *Convaincre et persuader: Communication et propagande aux XII^e et XIII^e siècles*, ed. Martin Aurell (Poitiers, 2007), pp. 11–49.

perspective on the theory of Bohemond as propagandist, which seeks to identify Bohemond's strategies of diplomacy and persuasion and to trace the evidence of his reliance on the written word. I will argue that the use of literate officials to create sophisticated written instruments, a strategy adopted by Bohemond only late in his career and perhaps as a result of his experiences on crusade, did not extend to the propagation of deliberately constructed or redacted historical narratives. A campaign to enhance Bohemond's reputation in the collective memory of Latin Christians may indeed have been under way in the first decades of the twelfth century, but I suggest that it is not to Bohemond himself but to institutions and individuals sympathetic with the family into which he married, the Capetian royal dynasty of France, that we should look for its inspiration.

BOHEMOND'S CAREER AND REPUTATION

The arc of Bohemond's career is almost as well known among medievalists today as it was to medieval audiences in the twelfth century.⁹ The boy named Marcus but universally known as Bohemond was born the son of Robert Guiscard and his first wife, Alberada of Buonalbergo, at some point in the late 1050s.¹⁰ Robert was the son of a Norman lord, Tancred of Hauteville, and he had come to southern Italy along with eight of his brothers to seek his fortune. Through a series of military conquests in the 1060s and 1070s, Robert claimed the title *dux* of Apulia and Calabria, leaving the conquest of Sicily to one of his brothers, Bohemond's uncle Roger. In 1058, probably quite soon after Bohemond was born, Robert had his marriage with Alberada dissolved on grounds of consanguinity in order to make way for a more advantageous union with the Lombard princess Sikelgaita, daughter of Prince Guiamar IV of Salerno.¹¹

By 1080, Bohemond was playing an active role in his father's military campaigns, most famously the five-year struggle with the Byzantine emperor Alexios Komnenos in Illyria that ended in defeat after Robert succumbed to illness in 1086. Rendered illegitimate as an heir by his father's remarriage, Bohemond inherited nothing but perhaps the promise of lands in unconquered Byzantine terri-

⁹ The principal works on Bohemond's career are Jean Flori, *Bohémond d'Antioche: Chevalier d'aventure* (Paris, 2007); Ralph Bailey Yewdale, *Bohemond I, Prince of Antioch* (Princeton, N.J., 1924); and Boemondo: *Storia di un principe normanno*, ed. Franco Cardini, Nunzio Lozito, and Benedetto Vetere (Gelatina, Italy, 2003). For Bohemond's role in the First Crusade and the establishment of Antioch see Thomas Asbridge, *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch: 1096–1130* (Woodbridge, Eng., 2000). The best overviews of Norman Sicily during Bohemond's youth are those of Ferdinand Chalandon, *Histoire de la domination normande en Italie et en Sicile* (Paris, 1907; repr., New York, 1969), and G. A. Loud, *The Age of Robert Guiscard: Southern Italy and the Norman Conquest* (Harlow, Eng., 2000).

¹⁰ The acts transcribed by Léon-Robert Ménager identify him first as "marchisus congomine bohemont" (1076) and then "marcus qui abbamonte dicor" (1080): *Recueil des actes des ducs normands d'Italie, 1046–1127*, 1: *Les premiers ducs (1046–1087)*, ed. Léon-Robert Ménager, Documenti e Monografia 45 (Bari, 1980), pp. 89 and 103.

¹¹ Chalandon, *Histoire*, pp. 154–55; Joanna H. Drell, *Kinship and Conquest: Family Strategies in the Principalities of Salerno during the Norman period, 1077–1194* (Ithaca, N.Y., 2002), pp. 112–13.

tory.¹² He then spent a decade in fitful revolt against the powerful alliance of his stepmother Sikelgaita, her son (and Robert's heir) Roger Borsa, and his uncle Roger (now Count Roger I of Sicily), achieving only their recognition of his control of a number of disparate landholdings, including Taranto (in 1088) and Bari (in 1089). In 1096, at the siege of Amalfi, he took the cross for the First Crusade, memorably encouraging others to do so by cutting his own cloak into smaller cross-badges for his followers.¹³ Departing for the rendezvous point of Constantinople, he took with him the larger part of the Norman fighting contingent in southern Italy. In less than two years he had distinguished himself numerous times on the battlefield and had controversially seized for himself the wealthiest and strongest city conquered by the crusaders: the former Byzantine capital of Syria, Antioch-on-the-Orontes, where he remained for the duration of the crusade.

In the aftermath of this pyrotechnic performance, Bohemond returned to Europe in 1105, and in a series of public appearances, most famously the celebration of his marriage to Constance, the daughter of King Philip I of France at Easter 1106, he raised a new army with which he once again invaded Byzantine Illyria in October 1107. By the following September Bohemond had been defeated and was forced by Alexios to sign the humiliating Treaty of Devol. Acknowledging the emperor as the lord of the lands he had conquered in Syria and promising never again to challenge Byzantine authority,¹⁴ Bohemond retired to southern Italy where he virtually disappears from the historical record until his death in 1111, which was marked in the necrology of Montecassino as occurring on 7 March.¹⁵ Bohemond's body was buried in Canosa in an elaborate mausoleum of Byzantine inspiration, which survives to the present day.¹⁶

While much of Bohemond's fame clearly rested on what he had accomplished on the First Crusade, his expedition against Alexios in 1107–8 played an important role in shaping how his life would be understood and narrated by medieval authors. As is clear from the episodic and even genealogical structure of epic cycles, medieval audiences were enthralled by the idea that heroes might inherit both the character and the ambitions of their ancestors. Bohemond's continuation of his father's old struggle—waged on the same battlefield and against the same enemy—

¹² Anna Komnene, in the *Alexiad*, trans. E. R. A. Sewter, rev. Peter Frankopan (London, 2005), p. 134, has Robert say to Bohemond, "... make sure you don't neglect to follow up the war with the Roman [i.e., Byzantine] emperor."

¹³ *Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolyminatorum*, ed. and trans. Rosalind Hill (London, 1962), pp. 6–7.

¹⁴ See Asbridge, *Principality of Antioch*, pp. 94 and 98, who argues that the treaty was "disastrous" for Bohemond and that "any hopes that Bohemond might have had for dynastic control of Antioch would have been ended and he would have had nothing to bequeath to his heirs other than an unidentified dukedom."

¹⁵ *I necrologi cassinesi*, ed. Mauro Inguanez (Rome, 1941), fol. 17r (7 March). For commentary see Yewdale, *Bohemond I*, p. 133, and Flori, *Bohémond d'Antioche*, pp. 288–89. Flori considers the possibility that Bohemond died in 1109 and that the necrology may reflect the date of his burial. Bohemond's death was also noted by Albert of Aachen, *Historia Hierosolimitana*, ed. and trans. Susan Edgington (Oxford, 2007), pp. 824–25.

¹⁶ Ann Wharton Epstein, "The Date and Significance of the Cathedral of Canosa in Apulia, South Italy," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 37 (1983), 79–90. For a new interpretation of the inscriptions on the doors of the mausoleum see Flori, *Bohémond d'Antioche*, pp. 293–300.

fit this model precisely. Indeed, according to some accounts, it would seem as if Robert and Bohemond were an extension of the same ego. Abbot Suger of Saint-Denis, for instance, described how in 1083 both father and son had faced emperors on distant battlefields: Robert confronting his old adversary, the western emperor Henry IV, while Bohemond faced his future nemesis, the eastern *basileus* Alexios. Both men not only vanquished their respective emperors, wrote Suger, but did so on the very same day.¹⁷ The author of the most famous descriptions of both father and son, Alexios's daughter Anna, said that Bohemond was "the exact replica and living image of his father."¹⁸

For Anna, bitterness about the way the Normans of Italy had ceaselessly harassed her father was mixed with grudging admiration. In her stories the central characteristic shared by father and son may be seen as the negative side of "wisdom," that characteristic economically summed up in Robert's Romance sobriquet Guiscard, which can be rendered positively as "resourcefulness" or warily as "cunning."¹⁹ Like Anna, another hostile observer, the canon Albert of Aachen, saw this quality as a tendency toward deceit ("falsa"), and Albert peppered his stories of the cunning ("astutus") Bohemond with references to his "great plots" ("magni consilii"), his "cunning ear" ("callide aure"), and his trickery ("fraude" and "insidias").²⁰

What was thought to have been the nature of Bohemond's *sapientia* or *astutia*, his wisdom or cunning? Both those chroniclers favorable to Bohemond and those critical of him were aware of numerous accounts of his ruses and deceptions. Aside from Anna Komnene's outrageous story of how Bohemond feigned death to escape the Byzantine fleet blockading Antioch in 1105, which is in any case based on an older topos associated with Norman heroes,²¹ narratives of the early twelfth century stressed Bohemond's ability to persuade and convince even his most determined foes to take his side or assist him in his ventures. He was said to have used dramatically staged set-piece orations at Amalfi in August 1096, when he recruited troops to join him on the First Crusade, and at Chartres at Easter 1107, when he raised a second army to join him in his attack on Byzantium. It was also through persuasive oratory that he was said to have encouraged a traitor by the name of Firuz to hand over the walls of the city of Antioch to the crusaders in 1097 and to have effected his own release from captivity in 1103.²² In their suggestion that Bohemond was able to forge alliances even with those who feared and suspected him most, these stories amplify the sense of Bohemond's influence with words.

Notably, none of the chroniclers of the twelfth century, be they Greek or Latin, associated Bohemond's powers of persuasion with the use of the written (as op-

¹⁷ Suger, *Vita Ludovici grossi*, ed. and trans. Henri Waquet (Paris, 1929), p. 46.

¹⁸ Anna Komnene, *Alexiad*, p. 42.

¹⁹ Frédéric Godefroy, *Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue française et toutes ses dialectes du IXe au XVe siècle*, 10 vols. (Paris, 1880–1902), 4:388.

²⁰ Albert of Aachen, *Historia Hierosolimitana*, pp. 380–81, 683–84, and 689.

²¹ Emily Albu, "Bohemond and the Rooster: Byzantines, Normans, and the Artful Ruse," in *Anna Komnene and Her Times*, ed. Thalia Gouma-Peterson (New York, 2000), pp. 157–68.

²² For the accounts of the Firuz incident see Rebecca Slitt, "Justifying Cross-Cultural Friendship: Bohemond, Firuz, and the Fall of Antioch," *Viator* 38 (2007), 339–49; for the narratives of Bohemond's release from captivity see Yvonne Friedman, "Miracle, Meaning, and Narrative in the Latin East," *Studies in Church History* 41 (2005), 123–34.

posed to the spoken) word. Nor did any of the writers who described Bohemond in such great detail refer to an engagement or preoccupation on his part with written communications.²³ This medieval image of Bohemond can be contrasted with contemporary characterizations of the Spanish adventurer Rodrigo Díaz de Vivar (El Cid), a highly comparable figure. The Cid, whose autograph signature survives, is explicitly depicted as having transmitted numerous messages to allies and enemies in writing.²⁴ The silence of medieval sources regarding Bohemond's uses of the written word is of great significance, for although it has not recently been much of a concern to those working in this area, it was in fact the matter of literacy that, over a century ago, first led crusade historians to associate him with a campaign of written propaganda.

BOHEMOND AS PROPAGANDIST

In 1901 the prolific editor of crusade-related texts Heinrich Hagenmeyer published a collection of letters and documents pertaining to the First Crusade. In his detailed notes and commentary Hagenmeyer made new allegations regarding Bohemond's role in the creation of two of the documents in his collection. The first argument related to a charter issued in Bohemond's name in favor of the Genoese in July 1098. The charter awarded the Genoese privileges in the city of Antioch, which had been captured by the crusaders only one month earlier after a lengthy and vicious struggle.²⁵ Hagenmeyer believed the subscription clause and witness list of the document to be highly irregular. He noted, for instance, the charter's discursive subscription: "Signum mei Boemundi, qui hanc chartam donationis fieri iussi, firmaui et testes firmare rogavi" (I have signed with the mark of me, Bohemond, who ordered this charter of donation to be made, and I have asked the witnesses to sign). To Hagenmeyer, the use of the possessive pronoun "mei" together with the first-person "declaration" ("Erklärung") in what should, to him, have been a third-person subscription indicated that the text of the subscription had been added by Bohemond himself.²⁶ He contrasted Bohemond, "der Autor der Urkunde," with the charter's witnesses, who may have required a scribe to add

²³ According to Albert of Aachen, who provided an extremely detailed account of the First Crusade, Bohemond received legations bearing letters (*legatio litterarum*) and sent delegations (*legati*) and messengers (*nuncii* and *internuncii*). He is never, acting alone, associated with the creation of any written correspondence. See Albert of Aachen, *Historia Hierosolimitana*, pp. 83, 85, 482–85, 494–95, 522–23, 526–27, and 544–47.

²⁴ For the autograph see Richard Fletcher, *Quest for El Cid* (New York, 1990), p. 184. For the letters see Richard Fletcher and Simon Barton, *The World of El Cid* (Manchester, Eng., 2000), p. 97; for their translation of the relevant chapters of the *Historia Roderici* see pp. 123–27.

²⁵ Heinrich Hagenmeyer, *Epistulae et chartae ad historiam primi belli sacri spectantes quae supersunt aevo aequales ac genuinae: Die Kreuzzugsbriefe aus den Jahren 1088–1100. Eine Quellensammlung zur Geschichte des ersten Kreuzzuges mit Erläuterungen* (Innsbruck, 1901), pp. 155–56 (for the charter) and 310 (for the commentary). See also *Codice diplomatico della Repubblica di Genova*, 3 vols. (Rome, 1936–38), 1:11–12. The text ultimately derives from a thirteenth-century collection known as the *Liber privilegiorum ecclesiae Ianuensis* (Genoa, Archivio capitolare di S. Lorenzo, Codex PA); see *Liber privilegiorum ecclesiae Ianuensis*, ed. Dino Puncuh (Genoa, 1962), pp. 40–41.

²⁶ Hagenmeyer, *Epistulae*, p. 310 (thanks are owed to Judith Pfeiffer for her thoughts on Hagenmeyer's sense of "authorship" here).

their names beside the place where they themselves had made the *signum crucis*. Bohemond was not an illiterate knight who witnessed documents only with the sign of the cross but a man who could subscribe his own charters and even personalize their form and language. In other words, he possessed an extraordinary degree of literacy.

After three decades of intense scholarly focus on questions of orality and literacy in the Middle Ages, current approaches to the relationship between the medieval laity and written modes of communication differ significantly from those of Hagenmeyer and his contemporaries.²⁷ But other considerations may have contributed to the desire to see Bohemond as distinct from his fellow crusaders. Associated with Bohemond, as with all members of the Hauteville clan, is the seductive telos of the sophisticated courts that would eventually emerge under southern Italy's later rulers, such as Roger II of Sicily and Frederick II Hohenstaufen.²⁸ In Hagenmeyer's work in particular, however, it seems that the belief in Bohemond's extraordinary literacy was related to another conviction: that while on crusade Bohemond had actively manipulated texts for political purposes.

For Hagenmeyer, the evidence to support this second argument came in the form of a letter addressed to Pope Urban II by the leaders of the crusade in September 1098.²⁹ Beginning with an account of the capture of Antioch, the letter at one point breaks from the first-person plural voice of all of the crusade commanders, "We wish and desire that it should be known to you . . .," into the singular to announce that "I, Bohemond, having made an agreement with a certain Turk, who betrayed the city to me, placed ladders against the walls just before dawn with many Christian knights, and thus on the fourth of June we captured the city that had formerly resisted the Christians."³⁰ Both the style and the viewpoint of the letter suggested to Hagenmeyer that it was "written primarily under the influence of Bohemond."³¹

About a decade after Hagenmeyer published his edition and commentary, it was consulted by an American graduate student at Princeton University named Ralph Bailey Yewdale. In his doctoral thesis, which was published posthumously in 1924, Yewdale seized upon what Hagenmeyer had written in his commentary on the Genoese charter, citing it as evidence that Bohemond had "probably learned to read and write in Latin."³² Amplified in Yewdale's portrait, Hagenmeyer's beliefs

²⁷ For a review of the scholarship see Marco Mostert, "New Approaches to Medieval Communication?" and "Bibliography of Works on Medieval Communication," in *New Approaches to Medieval Communication*, ed. Marco Mostert, Utrecht Studies in Medieval Literacy 1 (Turnhout, 1999), pp. 22–28 and 193–297. On the specific question of how signatures in documents have been interpreted as evidence of literacy see Franz H. Bäuml, "Varieties and Consequences of Medieval Literacy and Illiteracy," *Speculum* 55 (1980), 240–42.

²⁸ Although first published more than two decades later, Ernst Kantorowicz's *Kaiser Friedrich der Zweite* (Berlin, 1928) demonstrates the extent to which the education of rulers in the "Kingdom in the Sun" would be romanticized in the German-language scholarship.

²⁹ Hagenmeyer, *Epistulae*, pp. 161–65.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 162: "Ego Boemundus, conuentione facta cum quodam Turco, qui ipsam mihi tradidit ciuitatem, scalas parum ante diem cum multis Christo militantibus muro applicui, et ita ciuitatem antea Christo resistentem Illo Nonas Iunii accepimus."

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 96: "Dass Boemund zuerst genannt wird, weist auf dessen bedeutenden Einfluss hin. . . . So ist der Brief auch vornehmlich unter Boemunds Einfluss geschrieben worden. . . ."

³² Yewdale, *Bohemond I* (above, n. 9), p. 7. Yewdale cites Hagenmeyer's discussion of the Genoese

about Bohemond's influence on the sources of the First Crusade now came to the attention of a wider audience. James Westfall Thompson, who had apparently discovered Hagenmeyer's arguments after reading the Yewdale biography, reconsidered the charter for the Genoese in great detail in his 1939 study of the literacy of the medieval laity.³³ The fact that Thompson ultimately dismissed the idea that Bohemond was a *miles literatus* did nothing to tarnish the image of Bohemond as a textual manipulator, which was meanwhile taking root in the minds of a new generation of crusade historians. Steven Runciman's 1951 history of the First Crusade, which remains the most influential modern work of crusade history in the English language, referred to the letters of the crusade princes as having been manipulated by Bohemond's "secretariat."³⁴ Thus the association between Bohemond and the creation or alteration of written texts remained firmly entrenched for the balance of the twentieth century.

The publication of Yewdale's thesis corresponded with a rise in interest among European and American historians in the genesis and nature of the early crusades and much closer scrutiny of the sources of the First Crusade.³⁵ A source of particular excitement for these scholars was a brief, anonymous account of the expedition known to them as the *Anonymi Gesta Francorum*. Long numbered among the chronicles of the crusade but dismissed as derivative of another work, the *Gesta Francorum* had recently been rehabilitated and was redistributed in a new edition by Hagenmeyer, who identified it as the earliest eyewitness source upon which many subsequent narratives of the expedition had been based.³⁶ Moreover, and of obvious significance to the present inquiry, the *Gesta Francorum* was thought to have been written by a southern Italian layman in Bohemond's entourage.³⁷ Once again, this theory owed much to the work of Hagenmeyer, who proposed that it might have been the *Gesta Francorum* author who wrote, at Bohemond's request, the letter to Urban II in September 1098.³⁸

In 1928 another American, August Krey, noticed that a passage greatly favorable to Bohemond seemed to have been inserted into the *Gesta Francorum* narrative. Krey theorized that the *Gesta Francorum*, in its surviving form, had been rewritten

charter in n. 27. Had he ever revised his work for publication, Yewdale might well have chosen to substantiate or perhaps even omit his opinions about Bohemond's literacy, but he never had a chance as he died shortly after taking up his first academic post at the University of Wisconsin in 1922. See Dana C. Munro, "Preface," *ibid*.

³³ James Westfall Thompson, *The Literacy of the Laity in the Middle Ages*, University of California, Berkeley, Publications in Education 9 (Berkeley, Calif., 1939), p. 67.

³⁴ Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades*, 3 vols. (Cambridge, Eng., 1951–54), 1:256.

³⁵ A study of the American contribution to this program has been made by Hans Eberhard Mayer, "America and the Crusades," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 125 (1981), 38–45.

³⁶ The text, which was first identified and edited by Jacques Bongars in his *Gesta Dei per Francos* (Hannau, 1611), had been dismissed in 1642 by John Besly as a mere recension of what he believed to be the authentic eyewitness account of the Poitevin priest Peter Tudebode. Although the *Gesta's* significance as an independent account was once again recognized by French and German scholars working independently in 1842, it was not until the critical edition of Heinrich Hagenmeyer in 1890 that a consensus began to develop in Europe and America about the *Gesta's* importance. For the history of these editions see Beatrice A. Lees, *Anonymi Gesta Francorum* (Oxford, 1924), pp. x–xi.

³⁷ See Thompson, *Literacy*, pp. 67 and 78 n. 68.

³⁸ Hagenmeyer, *Epistulae*, pp. 96–97.

to support the recruitment drive for Bohemond's 1107 campaign against the Byzantine emperor Alexios.³⁹ The *Gesta Francorum* tradition was thus not entirely the work of its original anonymous author but, in fact, a specially prepared piece of propaganda. Rosalind Hill, who prepared a new edition of the *Gesta Francorum* in 1962, was herself not entirely convinced of Krey's arguments.⁴⁰ But the so-called Krey thesis nonetheless proved influential, and by 1966 John Gordon Rowe would write, "Modern research had demonstrated that during his sojourn in France Bohemond distributed copies of the *Anonymi Gesta Francorum*. This act of generosity had many purposes. It reminded the French of the crusading valour of the previous generation. It recorded for all Bohemond's great contribution to the crusade. Above all, the *Gesta* had by this time been doctored so as to establish the invincibility of Bohemond's claims to the principality of Antioch, and, more generally, to magnify the heroism of the crusaders and make even more desperate the wickedness of the Emperor Alexios."⁴¹ While a small but growing number of critics have registered their skepticism about Krey's thesis,⁴² it still occupies the mainstream of scholarship, appearing in some of the most respected works of crusade history published since the year 2000.⁴³

New possibilities for inquiry into the *Gesta Francorum* were introduced in 2005, when Jay Rubenstein argued that in its extant form the anonymous narrative was only one version of a now-lost account of the crusade upon which other accounts, such as the one by the Poitevin priest Peter Tudebode, were based.⁴⁴ Drawing on this new argument, Jean Flori performed a close comparative analysis of variant versions of the early *Gesta Francorum* tradition and discovered that details about the dishonorable conduct of members of the Capetian court were apparently suppressed at an early point in the diffusion of the narrative tradition.⁴⁵ Following in the footsteps of Krey, Flori insisted that these changes had been effected by Bohemond himself, asserting that the "first form" of the text, written under Bohemond's patronage, was subject to two wholesale revisions carried out at his command in 1104 and 1105–6, which augmented his role as a heroic protagonist and presented his political adversaries, Raymond of Saint-Gilles and Alexios Komnenos, in the worst possible light.⁴⁶

³⁹ August C. Krey, "A Neglected Passage in the *Gesta* and Its Bearing on the Literature of the First Crusade," in *The Crusades and Other Historical Essays Presented to D. C. Munro by His Former Students*, ed. Louis J. Paetow (New York, 1928), pp. 57–78.

⁴⁰ *Gesta Francorum*, ed. Hill, p. 10 n. 3.

⁴¹ John Gordon Rowe, "Paschal II, Bohemund of Antioch, and the Byzantine Empire," *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 49 (1966), 85.

⁴² Emily Albu, *The Normans in Their Histories* (Woodbridge, Eng., 2001), p. 177; Jonathan Phillips, *The Second Crusade: Extending the Frontiers of Christendom* (New Haven, Conn., 2007), p. 287 n. 34.

⁴³ Christopher Tyerman, *God's War: A New History of the Crusades* (Cambridge, Mass., 2006), p. 246; Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The Crusades: A History*, 2nd ed. (London, 2005), p. 118; Peter Lock, *The Routledge Companion to the Crusades* (London, 2006), pp. 144–45.

⁴⁴ Jay Rubenstein, "What Is the *Gesta Francorum* and Who Was Peter Tudebode?" *Revue Mabillon* 16 (2005), 179–204.

⁴⁵ Flori, "De l'Anonyme normand à Tudebode" (above, n. 6), pp. 724–39 (for the variants) and 741 (for the suppression of the flight of Guy II of Rochefort, seneschal of France); Flori, *Bohémond d'Antioche* (above, n. 9), p. 268.

⁴⁶ Flori, "De l'Anonyme normand à Tudebode," pp. 743–44; Flori, *Bohémond d'Antioche*, p. 245. No-

Krey and Flori were not the only ones whose imaginative fires were ignited by Hagenmeyer's spark of suspicion. Once Bohemond had been described as the potential shaper or publisher of one tradition, it became easier for historians to accept that his reach might have extended even further. Following the basic premise established by Krey, it became and continues to be widely accepted in the scholarship on the early Latin crusade chronicles that many of them were associated with Bohemond's recruitment campaign.⁴⁷ The idea is seductive for three reasons: first, because the period of Bohemond's recruitment campaign is thought to have generally coincided with the creation of the three well-known crusade chronicles of Guibert, abbot of Nogent-sous-Coucy, Baudri of Bourgueil, archbishop of Dol, and Robert, monk of Saint-Remi of Reims; second, because these narratives were based primarily on the *Gesta Francorum*; and, finally, because all of these texts demonstrate a loathing for the Byzantines and Alexios in particular. Why would so many writers have chosen to write at the same moment (supposedly c. 1106–8)?⁴⁸ Why would they have chosen this same source text? The solution proposed by some is that they were all written to support Bohemond, using materials and information supplied by him. For Luigi Russo, for instance, the fact that Guibert of Nogent's chronicle of the First Crusade can be dated to before 1109, that it contains anti-Byzantine sentiments, and that it was based on the *Gesta Francorum* all suggest that it was part of the "anti-Byzantine propaganda" of Bohemond's "plot (*colpo*)."⁴⁹ Others apparently believe that Bohemond had sponsored a sort of essay-writing competition to find the best (or most popular) version of his reworked rudimentary *Gesta Francorum*. For Carol Sweetenham, entrants in this contest would include the theological sophisticate Guibert of Nogent, the monastic apologist Baudri of Bourgueil, the Poitevin priest Peter Tudebode, and even the enigmatic Limousin knight Gregory Bechada (who wrote in the vernacular and in verse).⁵⁰ Perhaps the most improbable addition to the list was made by Harold

tably, however, Flori, in the former work, pp. 744–45, rejects the notion that Bohemond was directly responsible for the creation of any other narratives.

⁴⁷ See, for instance, Marshall W. Baldwin, ed., *A History of the Crusades*, 1: *The First Hundred Years*, 2nd ed. (Madison, Wis., 1969), pp. 228 and n. 14, 242 n. 47, 366, and 390–91.

⁴⁸ For the date of Guibert's work (finished in late 1108, with revisions about a decade later) see Jay Rubenstein, *Guibert of Nogent: Portrait of a Medieval Mind* (New York, 2002), pp. 95–96. Baudri's most recent editors believed that his history was written at around the time of his accession to the archiepiscopal see of Dol in 1107: see *Recueil des historiens des croisades: Historiens occidentaux*, ed. Académie des inscriptions et belles lettres, 5 vols. (Paris, 1844–95; repr., Farnborough, Eng., 1967), hereafter cited as RHC Occ., 4:vi and n. 5. The dating of Robert's chronicle to 1106–7 is based on his dedication of the work to an *abbas B*, thought to be Baudri of Bourgueil himself, who would no longer have been *abbas* after 1107, and the argument first advanced by Peter Knock, "Kreuzzug und Siedlung: Studien zum Aufruf der Magdeburger Kirche von 1108," *Jahrbuch für die Geschichte Mittel- und Ostdeutschlands* 23 (1974), 1–33, esp. pp. 16–21, that Robert's history was known to the author of the *Magdeburger Aufruf*. But neither the identity of the dedicatee nor the textual relationship between Robert's *Historia* and the Magdeburg text has been conclusively shown. For a recent discussion of the Magdeburg text see Giles Constable, "Early Crusading in Eastern Germany: The Magdeburg Charter of 1107/8," in *Crusaders and Crusading in the Twelfth Century* (Farnham, Eng., 2009), pp. 197–214.

⁴⁹ Luigi Russo, "Il viaggio di Boemundo d'Altavilla in Francia," *Archivio storico italiano* 603 (2005), 3–42, at pp. 26–37.

⁵⁰ See Carol Sweetenham's introduction to her translation of *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade*: "*Historia Iherosolimitana*," *Crusade Texts in Translation* 11 (Aldershot, Eng., 2005), pp. 4–7.

Fink, who went so far as to suggest that the earliest redaction of the chronicle of Fulcher of Chartres, which was written entirely in Palestine, might still have been written in support of Bohemond.⁵¹

The winner of such an unlikely competition would have been the writer known as Robert the Monk.⁵² According to Sweetenham, Robert's chronicle was written "with the clear purpose of shaping the story of the First Crusade as a basis for future action."⁵³ The number of extant manuscripts (110) containing Robert's text dwarfs those representing the others.⁵⁴ For scholars who, like Sweetenham, might look for further evidence of Bohemond's influence, Robert's text is also important because in many manuscripts it is found copied together with another text of obvious value to Bohemond.⁵⁵ This work takes the form of a letter purporting to be from Alexios Komnenos to Robert I of Flanders, father of the famous crusader Robert II, begging for his assistance in defeating the Turks. Although the comital house of Flanders did, in fact, have extensive diplomatic relations with Constantinople,⁵⁶ the letter is not a genuine piece of correspondence.⁵⁷ It dwells at length on the wealth and allure of the Byzantine capital and even goes so far as to suggest that the emperor would rather that his city fell into Latin hands than those of the Turks.⁵⁸ This sense of Greek capitulation, combined with vivid reminders of all that Constantinople had to offer, could be seen to justify a Latin attempt to seize the city, Bohemond's possible aim in 1107. A subtle and sophisticated confection, the letter was evidently popular with medieval readers on account of its continued integration into the many manuscripts of the chronicle of Robert the Monk and was convincing enough to fool generations of crusade historians and Byzantinists alike.⁵⁹

⁵¹ See Harold S. Fink's introduction to Fulcher of Chartres, *History of the Expedition to Jerusalem*, trans. Francis Rita Ryan (Knoxville, Tenn., 1969), pp. 19–20.

⁵² A project led by Marcus Bull at the University of Bristol is currently under way to prepare a new edition of Robert's text. An edition based on some of the manuscripts was printed in RHC Occ. 3:727–882.

⁵³ Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk's History*, p. 7.

⁵⁴ I thank Professor Bull for providing me with the number of manuscripts identified so far. For a prior attempt to catalogue the manuscripts see Friedrich Kraft, *Heinrich Steinhöwels Verdeutschung der Historia Hierosolymitana des Robertus Monachus; eine literarhistorische Untersuchung*, Quellen und Forschungen zur Sprach- und Culturgeschichte der germanischen Völker 96 (Strasbourg, 1905), pp. 154–64.

⁵⁵ Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk's History*, pp. 7 and 218.

⁵⁶ K. N. Ciggaar, "Flemish Counts and Emperors: Friends and Foreigners in Byzantium," in *The Latin Empire: Some Contributions*, ed. K. N. Ciggaar and V. D. van Aalst (Hernen, Netherlands, 1990), pp. 33–63.

⁵⁷ For the letter as forgery see Peter Schreiner, "Der Brief des Alexios I. Komnenos an den Grafen Robert von Flandern und das Problem gefälschter byzantinischer Kaiserschreiben in den westlichen Quellen," in *Documenti medievali greci e latini: Studi comparativi*, ed. Giuseppe De Gregorio and Otto Kresten, Incontri di Studio 1 (Spoleto, 1998), pp. 111–40, and Christian Gastgeber, "Das Schreiben Alexios' I. Komnenos an Robert I. von Flandern: Sprachliche Untersuchung," *ibid.*, pp. 41–186.

⁵⁸ Hagenmeyer, *Epistulae*, p. 134.

⁵⁹ Einar Joranson, "The Problem of the Spurious Letter of Emperor Alexius to the Count of Flanders," *American Historical Review* 55 (1949–50), 811–32; François Louis Ganshof, "Robert le Frison et Alexis Comnène," *Byzantion* 31 (1961), 57–74. The letter is still often described as an *excitatorium*, an imprecise term for texts meant to stir up enthusiasm for the crusade, for which see Paul Riant, "Inventaire

In sum, therefore, a substantial number of written narratives have been attributed to Bohemond's agency and political imperatives, including the extant version of the *Gesta Francorum* itself, the works based upon it (those of Guibert of Nogent, Baudri of Bourgueil, and Robert the Monk), works independent of it (Fulcher of Chartres and Gregory Bechada), the letter of the crusade leaders to Urban II in September 1098, and the wholly artificial but carefully concocted letter of Alexios Komnenos to Robert of Flanders. That some of these works lionized Bohemond or favored his side against Alexios Komnenos, as some passages in the *Gesta Francorum* quite clearly do, or that others, like the forged letter of Alexios to Robert of Flanders, may have helped to deepen Western distrust of the Byzantines more generally is beyond question. But the existence of numerous texts that appear to share certain political and cultural perspectives does not, in itself, link them all to one man's genius.

CRUSADERS AND THE WRITTEN WORD

In order to evaluate the likelihood that Bohemond was involved in the preparation and dissemination of textual propaganda, we must first consider the prevailing attitudes toward the utility of written texts among those knights and noblemen who took part in the First Crusade. Bohemond's lifetime saw dramatic changes in the relationship between the lay nobility and the written word. Pope Gregory VII's letters to Emperor Henry IV's vassals, the records produced by the Domesday inquests, the *Chanson de Roland* in Bodleian Library, MS Digby 23, the troubadour songs of Duke William IX of Aquitaine, or the autobiographical chronicle of Count Fulk IV le Réchin of Anjou, for example, could all be cited as evidence of these changes. However spectacular these textual monuments may seem, however, they have often been misinterpreted.⁶⁰ Among them, only the letters of Gregory VII were intended to provoke an immediate response by laymen, and they were

critique des lettres historiques des croisades," *Archives de l'Orient latin* 1 (1881), 15. The term was used frequently by Palmer A. Throop, *Criticism of the Crusade: A Study of Public Opinion and Crusade Propaganda* (Amsterdam, 1940), for whom it encompassed "letters, sermons, chronicles, and especially poetry" (p. 5). H. E. J. Cowdrey, "Pope Urban's Preaching of the First Crusade," *History* 55 (1970), 177–88, repr. in *The Crusades: Essential Readings*, ed. Thomas F. Madden (Oxford, 2002), pp. 15–29, at p. 25, names *excitatoria* as one of five categories of evidence shedding light on the nature and objectives of the First Crusade, but he cites only the encyclical of Pseudo-Sergius IV as an example. More recent studies of crusade preaching, for instance, Christoph T. Maier, *Preaching the Crusades: Mendicant Friars and the Cross in the Thirteenth Century*, Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought, 4th ser., 28 (Cambridge, Eng., 1994), have generally avoided the term.

⁶⁰ According to M. T. Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record: England, 1066–1307*, 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1993), p. 33, "Two centuries thus elapsed before Domesday Book became a record which was regularly consulted or valued for its contents." Similarly Fulk le Réchin's chronicle is not known to have been utilized by any medieval writer save its copyist: see Nicholas L. Paul, "The Chronicle of Fulk le Réchin: A Reassessment," *Haskins Society Journal* 18 (2007), 19–35, at pp. 29–31. For the Oxford manuscript of the *Song of Roland* see Andrew Taylor, *Textual Situations: Three Medieval Manuscripts and Their Readers* (Philadelphia, 2002), pp. 26–70. H. E. J. Cowdrey recently characterized the letters of Gregory as "for the most part, records of what had already been decided, rather than instruments through which decisions were made": *The Register of Pope Gregory VII, 1073–1085: An English Translation*, ed. H. E. J. Cowdrey (Oxford, 2002), p. xvi.

produced by a group of leading intellectuals through the medium of the most sophisticated chancery in medieval Europe. In contemplating how a more modest member of the military aristocracy might have envisaged the utility of writing we must focus instead on different developments that were arguably even more significant.

In the late eleventh century, men and women of ducal, comital, and perhaps even some local seigneurial families, whose relationships with local religious communities had for centuries been documented in texts drawn up by those institutions, began to play a larger role in the processes of documentary production. These nobles began to adopt their own personalized seals with which to leave impressions of their unique identity on the documents that concerned them.⁶¹ They also incorporated literate officials with titles such as *capellanus* and *notarius* into their households.⁶² The increasing frequency with which such officials appear as scribes in the service of lay lords is a clear indication of the degree to which those lords now had access to the written word.⁶³ But some of the best evidence that the laity could and did have recourse to writing was generated by the same series of extraordinary events that brought Bohemond to the forefront of the European imagination: the First Crusade.

The great distances that separated participants on the crusade from their families and friends at home and the physical, spiritual, and psychological challenges that they faced while on the march were all catalysts for the creation of written as well as nonwritten correspondence.⁶⁴ That the crusaders might, generally speaking, have had access to written modes of communication has not traditionally been seen as anything of significance to crusade historians. After all, among the crusaders were senior ecclesiastical and monastic administrators—bishops, archbishops,

⁶¹ For the early use of seals by the lay nobility see Jean-Luc Chassel, "L'usage du sceau au XIIe siècle," in *Le XIIe siècle: Mutations et renouveau en France dans la première moitié du XIIe siècle*, ed. Françoise Gasparri (Paris, 1994), pp. 61–101, esp. pp. 64–67; for discussion see Brigitte Bedos-Rezak, "The Social Implications of the Art of Chivalry: The Sigillographic Evidence (France, 1050–1250)," in *The Medieval Court in Europe*, ed. Edward Haymes (Munich, 1986), pp. 142–75, reprinted in *Form and Order in Medieval France: Studies in Social and Quantitative Sigillography*, Collected Studies Series 424 (Aldershot, Eng., 1993).

⁶² For chaplains and notaries in Normandy see Marie Farroux, *Recueil des actes des ducs de Normandie de 911 à 1066* (Caen, 1961), pp. 41–43; for Flanders see Ferdinand Vercauteren, *Actes des comtes de Flandre, 1071–1128* (Brussels, 1938), pp. xlix–lxiii; for Anjou see Olivier Guillot, *Le comte d'Anjou et son entourage au XIe siècle*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1972), 1:421–49; for the region of Chartres see Kimberly A. LoPrete, *Adela of Blois: Countess and Lord (c.1067–1137)* (Dublin, 2007), pp. 156–58.

⁶³ Writing of England in the twelfth century, David Postles has recently observed, "There is now also sufficient evidence to illustrate that the laity of baronial status had their own loose organizations which, although they might not compose all of the charters of a baronial benefactor, might still compose some of them": "Country Clerici and the Composition of English Twelfth- and Thirteenth-Century Charters," in *Charters and the Use of the Written Word in Medieval Society*, ed. Karl Heidecker, Utrecht Studies in Medieval Literacy 5 (Turnhout, 2000), p. 29. See also Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record*, p. 56. For the patterns of survival of documents created outside of monastic and ecclesiastical contexts see Mary Garrison, "Send More Socks: On Mentality and the Preservation Context of Medieval Letters," in *New Approaches to Medieval Communication*, ed. Mostert (above, n. 27), pp. 69–99.

⁶⁴ See Sophia Menache, "The Communication Challenge of the Early Crusades: 1099–1187," in *Autour de la première croisade: Actes du Colloque de la Society for the Study of the Crusades and the Latin East (Clermond-Ferrand, 22–25 juin 1995)*, ed. Michel Balard (Paris, 1996), pp. 293–314.

and abbots. Chief among them was the papal legate Adhémar of Monteil, who had brought with him a number of the canons of his cathedral chapter of Le Puy.⁶⁵ Drawing presumably upon the large body of clerics present within the army, the leadership of the crusade, a council of the great princes acting together with the legate Adhémar, were able to compose written letters (*epistulae*) addressed to their leader in absentia, Pope Urban II. It also seems that written messages made up at least part of the announcements or bulletins (*legati*) to the people of Latin Christendom announcing their achievements and asking for support.⁶⁶

Distinct from these collective projects, however, were the letters composed by named individual authors to named individual recipients. Stephen, count of Blois and Chartres, who was one of the most powerful princes on the expedition, dispatched at least two missives (he referred to both as his "litterae") to his wife, Adela, but indicated that he had written others.⁶⁷ Anselm of Ribemont, a castellan from the Low Countries, likewise wrote two letters (he called them his "epistulae") to his friend Archbishop Manasses II of Reims before and after the siege of Antioch.⁶⁸

By comparing the letters of the crusaders, it is possible to detect a spectrum of attitudes toward literate communication or trust in writing within the crusade army. For Stephen of Blois, for example, the composition and transmission of letters may not have seemed such an extraordinary act. A charter for the monks of Marmoutier witnessing Stephen's departure on crusade in 1096 is one of the most discursive and personal of such documents written in the voice of a departing crusader.⁶⁹ It has recently been argued that the intended recipient of his dispatches, his wife Adela, possessed a relatively high degree of literacy herself and may in fact have been among the most educated lay potentates of her generation.⁷⁰ For Anselm of Ribemont, however, written correspondence was more revolutionary. His first letter to Manasses closes with the words, "and in order that you may believe this: you will know because you have sent me a tapestry by Raymond *de Castello*. Farewell."⁷¹ Anselm was unsure whether Manasses would trust that the letter was genuine, and so he included information that only he and Manasses would have known as a sign of its authenticity. He was relying upon the same strategies as more humble members of the army who communicated over long distances without the help of literate mediators. When in 1096 the crusader Walter of Montsoreau had similar doubts about whether a message he sent from Apulia would be trusted and understood by his wife Grecia when she received it, he sent with the

⁶⁵ Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The First Crusaders* (Cambridge, Eng., 1997), p. 79.

⁶⁶ Hagenmeyer, *Epistulae*, pp. 141–42 (Adhémar of Le Puy and Patriarch Simeon of Jerusalem), 153–55 (Bohemond, Raymond of Saint-Gilles, Godfrey of Bouillon, and Hugh of Vermandois), 161–65 (Bohemond, Raymond of Saint-Gilles, Godfrey of Bouillon, Robert of Normandy, Robert of Flanders, and Eustace of Boulogne), and 167–74 (Daimbert of Pisa, Godfrey of Bouillon, and Raymond of Saint-Gilles).

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 138.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 144–46 and 156–60.

⁶⁹ Paul, "The Chronicle of Fulk le Réchin," pp. 22–23, where my reference is to the cartulary copy. For the original see LoPrete, *Adela of Blois*, pp. 445–46.

⁷⁰ LoPrete, *Adela of Blois*, pp. 29–34.

⁷¹ Hagenmeyer, *Epistulae*, pp. 145–46: "Et, ut hoc credas[,] scito, quia tapetium misisti mihi per Raimundum de Castello. ualete."

monk who carried his instructions "certain signs" ("certis signis"), perhaps meaning clothing, jewelry, or other personal possessions, to validate his message.⁷²

Stephen of Blois and Anselm of Ribemont came from different regions and were of different status, but they did have two important things in common that might help us to understand their ability to create texts. First, both of their lordships lay in the belt of northern Francophone principalities that stretched from Normandy in the west to Flanders in the east, where the quantity and sophistication of textual production were already on the rise. A surplus of highly trained clerics from the cathedral and monastic schools of Normandy, Touraine, and the region of Chartres was close to hand, as were the prestigious royal and episcopal chanceries that employed so many of them. Stephen and Anselm also had in common that they were accompanied by literate household officials: namely, chaplains.

Chaplains were among the officers commonly found in the households of the great princes of northern Francia. Their responsibilities naturally included prayer and the administration of sacraments,⁷³ but the frequency with which they appear in charters suggests an active role in administration and the redaction of written documents.⁷⁴ As attested in Orderic Vitalis's well-known description of Gerold of Avranches, the chaplain of Earl Hugh I of Chester, chaplains could also play an important role in the education of the laity and in the shaping of their knightly identities.⁷⁵ By the first quarter of the twelfth century, the company of chaplains and other household officials may have been an important signifier of nobility.⁷⁶

Nine of those who took part in the First Crusade are identified explicitly as chaplains in the service of other individuals, but considering how many other participants only identify themselves as *clericus*, there were doubtless many more. The second letter of Stephen to Adela names the scribe of the document as his chaplain Alexander, who accompanied Stephen on both of his journeys to the East (1096 and 1101).⁷⁷ Some crusaders may also have been accompanied by more than one chaplain.⁷⁸ Anselm of Ribemont noted in his first letter to Manasses that one of his chaplains, "the venerable abbot Roger,"⁷⁹ had already died, but it is possible that by this time he had acquired another one. The career of Fulcher of Chartres, who left the army of Robert of Normandy and Stephen of Blois to become the chaplain of Baldwin of Boulogne, demonstrates that clerics may have

⁷² "Le cartulaire de l'abbaye de Noyers," ed. Casimir Chevalier, *Mémoires de la Société archéologique de Touraine* 22 (1872), 275: "Per eundem vero monachum mandavit uxori suae Grecia certis signis, ut tam ipsa quam infantes eius hoc idem donum annuerent et confirmarent." Walter's instructions were to grant the monks of Noyers freedom from tolls in his lordship.

⁷³ David S. Bachrach, *Religion and the Conduct of War, c. 300–1215* (Woodbridge, Eng., 2003), p. 45.

⁷⁴ Charles Homer Haskins, *Norman Institutions* (Cambridge, Mass., 1918), pp. 51–54.

⁷⁵ Orderic Vitalis, *The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis*, ed. Marjorie Chibnall, 6 vols. (Oxford, 1969–80), 1:216. For commentary see C. Stephen Jaeger, *The Origins of Courtliness: Civilizing Trends and the Formation of Courtly Ideals, 939–1210* (Philadelphia, 1985), pp. 231–35.

⁷⁶ David Crouch, *The Image of Aristocracy in Britain, 1000–1300* (London, 1992), pp. 292–93.

⁷⁷ Hagenmeyer, *Epistulae*, p. 152; "'Annales' de l'abbatiat d'Arnaud," in *Chronique de Saint-Pierre-le-Vif de Sens, dite de Clarius*, ed. Robert-Henri Bautier and M. Gilles (Paris, 1979), pp. 184–87.

⁷⁸ Riley-Smith, *The First Crusaders*, pp. 85–87.

⁷⁹ Hagenmeyer, *Epistulae*, p. 145.

been free to associate themselves with new commanders as the fortunes of their lords changed.

Although the household clerics who accompanied the crusade have been compared unfavorably with the more learned churchmen who did not take the cross, the chaplains were in fact able to use their modest abilities as writers in important and innovative ways.⁸⁰ Chaplains from princely households, for instance, were responsible for the construction of narrative histories of the expedition. Fulcher of Chartres composed a lengthy account of the crusade and the early kingdom of Jerusalem.⁸¹ Raymond of Aguilers, the loyal chaplain of the count of Toulouse, Raymond IV of Saint-Gilles, composed his own partisan account of the crusade shortly after its conclusion in collaboration with a knight named Pons of Balazun.⁸² While in earlier times, officials associated with royal or imperial chapels (and therefore "chaplains") are known to have engaged in historical writing, with the possible exception of William of Poitiers no such endeavors had ever been undertaken by the household clergy of princely dynasts before the First Crusade.⁸³ The precedent set by Fulcher and Raymond was to be followed, however, by a long line of chronicler-chaplains through the time of the Spanish conquest of the Aztec empire.⁸⁴

In light of the key role that household chaplains could play in the mediation between their lords and the written word while on crusade, therefore, it is of critical importance to this investigation that as far as we can tell, Bohemond, alone among the crusade commanders, is not known to have been accompanied by any chaplains or other administrative officers.⁸⁵ The names of those who followed Bohemond when he began his journey across the Balkans toward Constantinople in 1097 are well known both from Italian sources and crusade chroniclers; among them were bishops and powerful lay lords from southern Italy and beyond the Alps, the kind of men who may well have possessed their own households.⁸⁶ The participants who later composed accounts of the expedition, some of whom

⁸⁰ Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading* (London, 1986), pp. 80–81; Riley-Smith, *The First Crusaders*, pp. 86–87.

⁸¹ Fulcher of Chartres, *Historia Hierosolymitana (1095–1127)*, ed. Heinrich Hagenmeyer (Heidelberg, 1913), pp. 1–19.

⁸² John H. Hill and Laurita L. Hill, eds., *Le "Liber" de Raymond d'Aguilers*, trans. P. Wolff, *Documents Relatifs à l'Histoire des Croisades 9* (Paris, 1969), pp. 9–12. It is also possible that the Poitevin priest of Civray, Peter Tudebode, served as a chaplain.

⁸³ For William see Marjorie Chibnall's introduction to *The "Gesta Guillelmi" of William of Poitiers*, ed. R. H. C. Davis and Marjorie Chibnall (Oxford, 1998), pp. xv–xix.

⁸⁴ In the sixteenth century, the conquests of Hernán Cortés were dutifully reported by his chaplain, Francisco López de Gómara; see *Cortés: The Life of the Conqueror by His Secretary*, ed. and trans. Lesley Byrd Simpson (Berkeley, Calif., 1964).

⁸⁵ Asbridge, *Principality of Antioch* (above, n. 9), p. 183. It should be noted that a "chaplain" is mentioned by Robert the Monk in his colorful and wholly fantastic account of Bohemond's secret negotiations with the traitor Firuz during the siege of Antioch. The character is simply a vehicle for Robert's theological commentary. See Marcus Bull, *Knightly Piety and the Lay Response to the First Crusade: The Limousin and Gascony, c.970–c.1130* (Oxford, 1993), p. 197.

⁸⁶ For the most comprehensive list of the sources of Bohemond's departure see now John H. Pryor, "Introduction: Modelling Bohemond's March to Thessalonike," in *Logistics of Warfare in the Age of the Crusades*, ed. John H. Pryor (Aldershot, Eng., 2007), p. 2 n. 6. See also Evelyn Jamison, "Some Notes on the *Anonymi Gesta Francorum* with Special Reference to the Norman Contingent from South Italy and Sicily in the First Crusade," in *Studies in French Language and Mediaeval Literature Presented*

were chaplains themselves, subjected Bohemond to close scrutiny and awarded him extensive reportage, but the only officer they name in Bohemond's service is his cousin Robert, son of Gerard, who is identified as *constabularius* and *signifer*.⁸⁷

The fact that Frankish writers identified a man at the head of the Apulian cohort with the old Carolingian office of "constable" obscures the fact that knightly households and cultures of power in southern Italy were not identical to those found in the transalpine lands. In order to properly understand Bohemond's access to and attitudes toward writing, therefore, it is necessary to go beyond the principal observation that he was accompanied by no chaplains and look in more detail at the kinds of textual cultures that existed in the Mezzogiorno, the world of his youth. Within this meridional context, how might the turbulent years of Bohemond's early career have influenced his opportunities for engagement with the processes of textual production?

LITERACY AND LORDSHIP IN SOUTHERN ITALY

The southern Italy of Bohemond's youth was a region of numerous overlapping cultural, linguistic, and confessional identities. By the time he was twenty, Bohemond had mixed with Latins (both Lombard and Norman), the Greek-speaking former Byzantine subjects of Apulia and Calabria, and the Muslims of Sicily. In order to command the combination of Norman vassals and local auxiliaries in his father's armies, Bohemond would likely have spoken at least elementary Greek and possibly also Arabic together with the Norman and Italian Romances.⁸⁸ Like the later generations of Norman descent who would be born into this world, Bohemond's identity was probably fairly fluid, and it has been argued that the Byzantine Greek culture of Apulia and the Adriatic was the source of many elements of his self-representation.⁸⁹

As in England, the disruption of established lordship and the repositioning of lands and allegiances that went hand in glove with conquest made the production of written texts greatly desirable for the Norman conquerors of southern Italy. While powerful monastic institutions such as Montecassino or La Cava dei Tirreni had some of the most prolific scriptoria in the region, the written word was not limited to monks and clerics: in towns formally under Lombard and Byzantine control, documents were also produced by judges and notarial officials, many of whom were laymen.⁹⁰ Notably, however, the conquests also corresponded with an influx of clergy from Normandy and other regions of northern Francia. Geoffrey Mala-

to Professor Mildred K. Pope by Pupils, Colleagues, and Friends, Publications of the University of Manchester 268 (Manchester, Eng., 1939), pp. 183–208, esp. pp. 196–97.

⁸⁷ Jamison, "Some Notes," pp. 198–99.

⁸⁸ Jonathan Shepard, "When Greek Meets Greek: Alexius Comnenus and Bohemond in 1097–8," *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 12 (1988), 185–276, at pp. 251–58.

⁸⁹ Ibid.; Epstein, "Cathedral of Canosa" (above, n. 16).

⁹⁰ Horst Enzensberger, "Chanceries, Charters and Administration in Norman Italy," in *The Society of Norman Italy*, ed. G. A. Loud and A. Metcalfe, *The Medieval Mediterranean* 28 (Leiden, 2002), pp. 117–19; Valerie Ramseyer, *The Transformation of a Religious Landscape: Medieval Southern Italy, 850–1150* (Ithaca, N.Y., 2006), p. 29.

terra, for instance, the monk commissioned by Roger of Sicily to write a chronicle of the conquests that might be read out at court, is thought to have come from what he called "the regions on the other side of the mountains."⁹¹ It is possible that the decision on the part of the Hautevilles to retain northern clerics with them in the Mezzogiorno reflected a desire to appropriate for themselves some of the new talent and training that were emanating outwards from the northern European schools.

Although a notary who called himself "Johannes filius Franconi" was already producing documents in Guiscard's name as early as 1065,⁹² the origins of a functioning chancery are usually seen to date from the period of Guiscard's union with the ruling dynasty of Salerno through his marriage to the Lombard princess Sikelgaita.⁹³ By that time, notaries of the ducal *acta* had the Lombard names Urso (called *protonotarius* from September 1079)⁹⁴ and Grimoaldus.⁹⁵ After Guiscard's death, Sikelgaita grew to rely on a subdeacon of the cathedral of Salerno, Peter Borda, who was (appropriately enough for a Salernitan) also the household doctor.⁹⁶ By April 1086 at the latest, Peter Borda had added to his sacerdotal and medical responsibilities the new title of "notary of our palace."⁹⁷ Among all of these curial officials, no individual identified as a chaplain can be observed in the following of Guiscard, his wife, or his children, although his brother Roger did on one occasion rely on the literate skills of a chaplain with the transalpine Frankish or perhaps Norman name of Rainald.⁹⁸

In his youth Bohemond fit somewhat awkwardly into this world of texts, scribes, and institutions. After making his documentary debut as a witness to a charter of his father in 1076,⁹⁹ his name appears only once more before Guiscard's death ten years later.¹⁰⁰ This silence is surprising, given the important military role that Bohemond played from at least 1081, and it indicates the degree to which his father's second wife, Sikelgaita, had succeeded in dissociating him from Robert's official

⁹¹ Kenneth Baxter Wolf, *Making History: The Normans and Their Historians in Eleventh-Century Italy* (Philadelphia, 1995), p. 144.

⁹² *Recueil des actes des ducs normands* (above, n. 10), pp. 64, 72, and 78 (at Troia from 1065 to 1067).

⁹³ Horst Enzensberger, "Documenti i cancellaria," in *Roberto il Guiscardo: Tra Europa, Oriente, e Mezzogiorno*, ed. Cosimo Damiano Fonseca (Galatina, Italy, 1990), pp. 62–66.

⁹⁴ *Recueil des actes des ducs normands*, pp. 97, 103, 107–8, 110, 115, 117, 122, and 124.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 170, 176, 178, 180, 182, 184, 185, 201, 213, and 218.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 135.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 174: "Textum vero huius nostre oblationis scribere precepimus tibi Petro, medico et palatii nostri notario."

⁹⁸ Rainald, who was probably not usually relied upon to fulfill such functions, acted in his lord's stead to confirm a gift of Roger Borsa to the cathedral of Palermo dated 7 November 1086: *Recueil des actes des ducs normands*, p. 186. G. A. Loud, "The Chancery and Charters of the Kings of Sicily (1130–1212)," *English Historical Review* 124 (2009), 779–810, at pp. 792–93, has noted two further instances of chaplains acting as scribes for the ruling family of Sicily before the establishment of the chancery in the 1130s, but he argues that "it does not appear that at this stage the court chapel regularly functioned as a *de facto* Latin writing office."

⁹⁹ *Recueil des actes des ducs normands*, p. 89.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 103.

business and in positioning her own son, Roger Borsa, as heir apparent in Bohemond's place.

After Robert's death in 1086, Bohemond appears with much greater frequency in the witness lists of important acts.¹⁰¹ By this time, Bohemond had accumulated significant power and influence as a commander during the Illyrian campaigns. His reemergence in the documentation testifies to the looming military threat that he now posed; Sikelgaita and her son Roger Borsa were eager to demonstrate Bohemond's assent to their policies and decisions. Bohemond now clearly interacted with officials from within the Hauteville administrative system, and he had certainly met the doctor/notary Peter Borda and the notary Grimoald. But he was not in a position to command such officials, nor would he have needed them. Without *dominium* of his own there was little for him to administer and nothing for him to grant or give away for the sake of his everlasting soul.

One document that can be dated to this critical period seems to reflect the difficulties that Bohemond faced engaging in the normal modes of documentary production associated with administration in Apulia. In late 1087 Bohemond rose in open revolt against Roger Borsa, seizing for himself the town of Taranto. In October, in the midst of this chaos, the *praepositus* John of the monastery of Saint Peter in Taranto sought out Bohemond, apparently now recognized as functional lord of the territory, to obtain confirmation of a grant to his house. The resulting document was written in Greek, perhaps by the monk John himself.¹⁰² In place of what would be a traditional subscription, however, is a note explaining that the document bore a wax seal because Bohemond did not have the facility available at that place to provide the necessary lead seal.¹⁰³ It is unclear whether Bohemond did not have with him a *tipario* (the clamp that was used to produce the impression) or the lead itself, or if, indeed, these words were meant to disguise the embarrassing fact that he had no seal at all.¹⁰⁴ Given the dearth of documentation regarding Bohemond's movements and his actions in this period, there is a danger of reading too much into this single piece of evidence. What must be acknowledged, however, is that on the only occasion that Bohemond is known to have been asked to enact an official written document in his own name, he was unable to do so to the satisfaction of the petitioner.

Bohemond's fortunes began to change in 1088, when, after a year of hostilities, he succeeded in winning recognition of his lordship of Taranto, as well as Otranto and Oria.¹⁰⁵ In 1089 Bohemond received from Roger Borsa the lordship of the old provincial capital of Bari on the Adriatic coast. He thus found himself in command of a Greek-speaking former Byzantine territory, and he seems to have immediately adopted, probably out of necessity as much as by preference, the style of a Byzan-

¹⁰¹ Ibid., pp. 172 (March 1086), 176 (May 1086), 180 (May 1086), 197–80 (May–December 1086), and 219 (June 1087).

¹⁰² *Syllabus Graecarum membranarum*, ed. Francesco Trinchera (Naples, 1865), p. 66.

¹⁰³ Ibid. (my thanks to John Paulas for his advice on the subscription).

¹⁰⁴ Prior to the Norman conquest, lead seals were widely used by officials of all ranks in Byzantine Apulia; see Nikolas Oikonomedes, "The Usual Lead Seal," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 37 (1983), 147–57.

¹⁰⁵ For these conflicts in the wider context of the revolts against Roger Borsa see Loud, *The Age of Robert Guiscard* (above, n. 9), pp. 256–59.

tine governor. By 1090 he was using his own lead seal, which closely followed the style used by an earlier catapan (or governor) of Bari, complete with a Greek inscription on the reverse.¹⁰⁶ The earliest surviving act that bears this seal further reveals his debt to the existing systems of administration: he retained his own catapan, Helberandus, and the act was written by "Simeon, *protonotarius* from the aforesaid city of Bari."¹⁰⁷

In the six years between his annexation of the city and his departure for the First Crusade, Bohemond spent much of his time assisting his uncle, Count Roger I, in the conquest of Sicily and the consolidation of Norman holdings on the mainland. Consequently, before his death in 1111 Bohemond spent little time in Bari, leaving the city to be administered by the catapans William *Flammenge* (1094–1105)¹⁰⁸ and Geoffrey of Gallipoli (1107 and 1108).¹⁰⁹ Paul Oldfield has recently characterized Bohemond's administration as "pragmatic and sensitive" and notes that while Bohemond's officers did demonstrate a loyal deference to their lord, they also deferred to older Byzantine and Lombard customs and institutions.¹¹⁰

Both Bohemond and his catapans seem to have followed Robert Guiscard's example and relied upon local officials for documentary production. The scribe of the catapan William's acts, Nikephorus *protonotarius*, is referred to as both "our notary" and "notary of the court of Bari," although this may have been meant to disguise his true identity if, as seems likely, he was identical to the notary of the same name working in the court of the archbishop Elias.¹¹¹ Bohemond himself appears only twice in the documentation of this period, but both the first document, a 1093 charter of confirmation for the archbishop, and the second, the 1096 act that ensured the catapan William complete authority while Bohemond was on crusade, were written by his notary Alferius.¹¹² Since Alferius does not appear in any other acts from Bari, we may safely conclude that on the two occasions when he was in the city Bohemond had brought a notary with him from elsewhere.

With *dominium* had come responsibility. Between his acquisition of Bari in 1089 and his departure on crusade in 1096, Bohemond appears to have been forced to overcome his youthful lack of administrative experience. On the eve of his departure, Bohemond was working with an administrative system in Bari that was at least as sophisticated, if not slightly more so, than those of his fellow crusade commanders. He was certainly aware that his power, previously demonstrated

¹⁰⁶ A photograph of the seal was published in *Le pergamene di S. Nicola di Bari, periodo normanno (1075–1194)*, ed. Francesco Nitti di Vito, Codice Diplomatico Barese 5 (Bari, 1902), pl. II.i. The seal has also been reproduced with commentary by Arthur Engel, *Recherches sur la numismatique et le sigillographie des Normands de Sicile et d'Italie* (Paris, 1882), p. 92, and most recently in Epstein, "Cathedral of Canosa" (above, n. 16), pp. 79–80.

¹⁰⁷ *Le pergamene di S. Nicola di Bari*, pp. 29–30. Regarding Bari under Bohemond's rule see Paul Oldfield, "Urban Government in Southern Italy, c.1085–c.1127," *English Historical Review* 122 (2007), 579–608, esp. pp. 590–92.

¹⁰⁸ *Le pergamene di S. Nicola di Bari*, pp. 35–36, 37–38, 38–40, 41–42, and 76–79.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 88, 93–94, 94–95, and 98.

¹¹⁰ Oldfield, "Urban Government," p. 591.

¹¹¹ *Le pergamene del Duomo di Bari*, ed. Giambattista Nitto de Rossi, Codice Diplomatico Barese 1 (Bari, 1897), p. 65.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, p. 66; *Le pergamene di S. Nicola di Bari*, pp. 41–42.

on the battlefield, could also be symbolically projected through the application of his *tipario* to the *bullae* that hung from written documents and, in his absence, through the ritual presentation of these documents by his catapans.¹¹³ We have no evidence, however, that Bohemond ever called upon the literate men of his court to create anything more ambitious than a sealed charter. By way of contrast, before 1099 both his half brother, Roger Borsa, and his uncle Roger I commissioned Latin narrative histories.¹¹⁴ Although Bohemond apparently thought it expedient to keep the notary Alferius in his entourage when he traveled to Bari, no one matching the description of a Lombard notary caught the attention of any chronicler of the crusade. Nor does any text created during the course of the crusade bear any sign of Apulian diplomatic.¹¹⁵ With this in mind, what are we to make of the assertions, in vogue since the publication of Hagenmeyer's collection, that at least two documents composed in the course of the First Crusade were written under Bohemond's influence?

TEXTUAL ENCOUNTERS ON CRUSADE

To be properly understood, both Bohemond's charter in favor of the Genoese of 13 July 1098 and the letter of the crusade leaders to Urban II of 11 September 1098 must be read in the context of the political and leadership crises that beset the crusaders after their victory in battle before Antioch on 28 June of the same year.¹¹⁶ In the immediate aftermath of the battle the expedition fell into a period of internal division, bickering, and indecision that lasted for nearly five months. The first great cause of discord was the dispute between Bohemond and the Provençal prince Raymond of Saint-Gilles over Bohemond's claim to the city of Antioch, which erupted with Bohemond's seizure of the citadel in the days after the battle. In early July, with the dispute over Antioch still unresolved, the crusade was beset by further infighting following the death of the papal legate, Bishop Adhémar of Le Puy. The loss of Pope Urban II's representative robbed the crusade of its sole recognized overall commander and plunged the princes into a leadership struggle.

The charter for the Genoese was generated at an early point in the contest between Bohemond and Raymond over Antioch, with Bohemond in possession of the citadel and Raymond's followers occupying the Bridge Gate gatehouse. At a very basic level, the charter is an acknowledgment of Bohemond's position of supremacy in terms of the amount of land his troops occupied inside Antioch. With the majority of the city in his hands, he was in a position to begin assigning property, such as a headquarters to the Genoese for their commercial operations. But the document makes no reference to Bohemond's wider claim to the entirety of Antioch. As Thomas Asbridge observes, the charter refrains from identifying Bohemond as the ruler of Antioch outright, for instance, with the title *princeps Antiochenis*, by naming him only as "Roberti Guiscardi ducis Apuliae filius" in

¹¹³ *Le pergamene di S. Nicola di Bari*, p. 39.

¹¹⁴ Wolf, *Making History* (above, n. 91), pp. 123–24 and 145–47.

¹¹⁵ The charters of Bohemond in Bari follow the convention of other Norman chanceries of the same period by making invocations to the Holy and Indivisible Trinity.

¹¹⁶ For what follows see Flori, *Bohémond d'Antioche*, pp. 173–84.

its address.¹¹⁷ Like the charter recording Bohemond's confirmation of gifts to the monastery of Saint Peter in Taranto drawn up by the *praepositus* John in 1087, the charter for the Genoese recognizes Bohemond's authority *de facto* but not *de jure*. If any party benefited from the existence of this written monument, it was the Genoese, who continued to refer to the presence of the act in their cartulary in narrative accounts composed a generation later as evidence of their glorious participation in the crusade.¹¹⁸

The Genoese, as the primary beneficiaries of the transaction, are therefore the most likely to have been the primary force behind the generation of their July charter. As Thompson showed in 1939, the wording of the charter for the Genoese does not imply that Bohemond wrote the words of the subscription himself. In fact, the clauses of command that emphasize the central place of Bohemond to the transaction are completely formulaic and can be found in charters issued by lay princes elsewhere in the Mediterranean, including Bohemond's rival Raymond.¹¹⁹

It is likewise difficult to maintain that the letter of the crusade leaders to Pope Urban II of 11 September 1098 was written at Bohemond's behest or to his particular political advantage. The document itself may be one of the most puzzling texts of the entire First Crusade. Interpolated by Fulcher of Chartres into the second redaction of his chronicle of the crusade in the 1120s, but also surviving in other, apparently independent versions,¹²⁰ it is difficult to establish to what extent the "letter" represents a single textual tradition, whether or not that tradition was based on one or many messages from Antioch to the pope, and whether those messages were originally written or communicated orally.¹²¹

The letter has several distinctive, not to say problematic, features. Unlike the *epistulae* and *litterae* of Stephen of Blois and Anselm of Ribemont or the other *legati* of the crusade leaders, it contains no internal reference to its mode of transmission. In its argument, the princes take the extraordinary step of inviting Urban II to come and lead the crusade himself, because "indeed although we have subdued the Turks and the pagans, it has not been possible for us to defeat the heretics, Greeks, Armenians, Syrians, and Jacobites."¹²² Of greatest significance to Hagenmeyer,

¹¹⁷ Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade: A New History* (Oxford, 2004), p. 252.

¹¹⁸ *Annali genovesi di Caffaro e de' suoi continuatori (secoli XII–XIII)*, 1, ed. L. T. Belgrano, *Fonti per la Storia d'Italia* 11 (Rome, 1890), p. 109.

¹¹⁹ Claude de Vic and Joseph Vaissete, *Histoire générale de Languedoc*, 15 vols. (Toulouse, 1872–92), 5:697–98 (confirmation of the foundation of the abbey of Saint-Pons in 1085). The formula is also nearly identical to an 1102 charter of the Catalan count Ermengol V of Urgel for the monastery of Solsona; see *Diplomatari de l'arxiu diocesa de Solsona (1101–1200)*, ed. Antoni Bach Riu, 2 vols. (Barcelona, 2002), 1:56.

¹²⁰ For the letter's place in Fulcher's second redaction see Fulcher of Chartres, *Historia Hierosolymitana* (above, n. 81), pp. 258–64 and n. 1 at p. 259. For the additional copies see *ibid.*, p. 264, and Hagenmeyer, *Epistolae*, p. 161. According to Hagenmeyer's transcription, a version of the letter in Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 2827, contains a postscript in which the first-person speaker reappears, complaining that the pope has allowed some of those who had taken the cross to remain behind and urging him to sever ties with the emperor "who promised us much, but did little."

¹²¹ For this letter see most recently Christopher MacEvitt, *The Crusades and the Christian World of the East: Rough Tolerance* (Philadelphia, 2008), pp. 1–2 and 100–104.

¹²² Hagenmeyer, *Epistolae*, p. 164: "nos enim Turcos et paganos expugnauimus, haereticos autem, Graecos, et Armenos, Syros Iacobitosque expugnare nequiuimus."

however, was the appearance of Bohemond's first-person voice in the middle of the otherwise collectively voiced message from the leaders, informing the pope how he had convinced an inhabitant of the city to "hand over the city to me."¹²³

If we accept that the document represents, even in a broad sense, the contents of a message that was transmitted from the princes to Urban in September 1098, we can clearly see how Bohemond's interests were among those represented. That the city was handed over "to me" ("mihi") rather than "to us" is consistent with the arguments that were made in favor of Bohemond's claims to control over Antioch. Likewise, the idea that future fighting would mainly be directed at Greeks, Armenians, Syrians, Jacobites, and heretics suggests a focus on the conquest of northern Syria rather than on progression toward Jerusalem; the former strategy would indeed be the one ultimately adopted by Bohemond.

Like the charter for the Genoese, however, the letter of 11 September would not have been a particularly effective tool for the advancement of Bohemond's own claims. Among the princes, the only voice to assert Bohemond's story of the betrayal of Antioch into his hands is that of Bohemond himself. If the letter had been altered or wholly fabricated by Bohemond, would he not have depicted the other commanders as acknowledging the legitimacy of his claims? In September, moreover, Bohemond was not the only prince in favor of hesitation and a consolidation of the holdings in Syria. When popular elements in the crusade army threatened to burn their encampments and so force the continuation of the march southwards toward Jerusalem in November, they did so in defiance not only of Bohemond but of all of the princes. The distinction between "the Turks and the pagans" and "the heretics, Greeks, Armenians, Syrians, and Jacobites" may simply represent a clumsy attempt to distinguish between the war against the Seljuk Turks of Anatolia and northern Syria (which had for the moment been won) and the coming fight for the cities of the south, which were under either local ("Syros Iacobitosque"?) or Fatimid Shi'ite ("haereticos"?) control. Had Urban II taken up the extraordinary offer to lead the crusade, it is hard to see how this could have been an advantage only to Bohemond, and the offer might more accurately reflect the growing *popular* frustration with the failure of the princes to make effective progress toward Jerusalem.

THE RECRUITMENT CAMPAIGN (1105–7)

Concerned, correctly, that a backlash from Constantinople against his decision to hold the former Byzantine city of Antioch would be quick to arrive, Bohemond abandoned the crusade and spent the remainder of 1099 in Syria battling to defend his position against the fleets Alexios Komnenos sent against him. In August 1101 he was captured by the Turkish emir Ghumushtigin Ibn-Danishmend. Following his release in 1103,¹²⁴ and with the Byzantine navy still dominating the waters of his principality, Bohemond returned to the West, telling his nephew Tancred,

¹²³ The letter elsewhere (p. 164) addresses Bohemond in the third person.

¹²⁴ Asbridge, *Principality of Antioch* (above, n. 9), p. 53.

whom he had left in command of Antioch, that he would seek to raise a new army to help remedy the situation.¹²⁵

The subsequent recruitment campaign for Bohemond's 1107 crusade against Alexios, which began with Bohemond's arrival in Bari in December 1105 and lasted until his army crossed the Adriatic and invaded Illyria on 9 October 1107, was an energetic and creative affair.¹²⁶ Bohemond sought powerful allies to assist him in recruitment, and he began with the Roman church and the French crown. Meeting with Pope Paschal II in November 1105, Bohemond left Rome with the banner of Saint Peter and in the company of a veteran crusade preacher, Bishop Bruno of Segni.¹²⁷ While it is debated whether Bohemond ever made entirely plain to Paschal his intention to attack Alexios, it is clear that at least initially his effort was recognized as a "crusade" equivalent to the one that conquered Jerusalem.¹²⁸ The timing and nature of Bohemond's negotiations with Philip I of France that ultimately won him the hand of Philip's daughter Constance are not known. It should be noted, however, that Constance had already been promised to the count of Champagne, Hugh of Troyes.¹²⁹ The decision to terminate the arrangement and to award Constance to Bohemond is striking evidence of the power of Bohemond's fame and his skill at negotiation. Philip was taking a great risk.

Accompanied at least part of the way by the papal legate Bruno of Segni, Bohemond began his recruitment tour of northwest Francia.¹³⁰ A variety of contemporary writers bear witness to the electric effect of Bohemond's presence. So well publicized was his arrival that charter writers at the monastery of Ronceray in Angers actually dated a transaction to the time when "Bohemond came into these lands advocating the way of the Lord."¹³¹ A starstruck monk of Marmoutier in the Touraine similarly noted the year that Bohemond "departing from Jerusalem, visited this place and asked for the support of our prayers for himself and for all of the Christians whom he had left behind in those parts in the service of God. He accepted the hospitality of our society and said that he would come back to visit us, and moreover he promised, if God were to favor him with success, that he would provide for us and for our house."¹³² Throughout his campaign, Bohemond played upon the fame that preceded him and the profound curiosity surrounding what

¹²⁵ Ralph of Caen, *Gesta Tancredi in expeditione Hierosolymitana*, RHC Occ. 3:713–14; trans. Bernard S. Bachrach and David S. Bachrach as *The "Gesta Tancredi" of Ralph of Caen: A History of the Normans on the First Crusade* (Aldershot, Eng., 2005), p. 170.

¹²⁶ For the date of Bohemond's return see *Romoaldi II archiepiscopi Salernitani annales*, ed. Wilhelm Arndt, MGH SS 19 (Hannover, 1866), p. 413. The most complete account of Bohemond in the West is Russo, "Il viaggio di Boemundo" (above, n. 49).

¹²⁷ Yewdale, *Bohemond I* (above, n. 9), pp. 107–8.

¹²⁸ John Gordon Rowe, "Bohemond of Antioch, Paschal II, and the Byzantine Empire," *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 49 (1966–67), 176–202.

¹²⁹ Orderic Vitalis, *Historia ecclesiastica*, 4:264–65.

¹³⁰ For the itinerary see Yewdale, *Bohemond I*, pp. 109–12, and Russo, "Il viaggio."

¹³¹ "Cartularium monasterii beatae Mariae Caritatis Andegavensis," ed. Paul Marchegay in *Archives d'Anjou: Recueil de documents et mémoires inédits sur cette province*, 3 vols. (Angers, 1854), 3:242, act no. 396: "Boamundus in terram istam viam Dei monere venit."

¹³² *Recueil des actes des comtes de Ponthieu (1026–1279)*, ed. Clovis Brunel (Paris, 1930), pp. 29–30, no. 16: "... Buamundus descendens Ierosolymis visitavit hunc locum petivitque tam sibi quam omnibus conchristianis, quos in illis partibus in Dei servitio reliquerat, orationum nostrarum suffragia, et accepit

the crusaders had seen and done in the East. In the hands of Bohemond and his followers, narrative could be a powerful tool to capture an audience and rouse their emotions. Some of the most popular stories that Bohemond told related to his recent time in captivity. Among his first destinations in Francia was the shrine of St. Leonard, whose cult was associated with the liberation of prisoners, in the Limousin.¹³³ The Saxon bishop Waleran of Naumberg, whose pilgrimage to Leonard's shrine happened at or soon after Bohemond's, transcribed some of Bohemond's incredible stories and presented a copy of them to his friend Gertrude of Saxony when he returned home.¹³⁴

Decades after Bohemond's tour of the west, writers remembered vividly how he told stories about his adventures on crusade. Bohemond would describe "the fleeing Turks and the approaching Franks . . . , Antioch that was captured by night through guile and Jerusalem that was captured by day through force of arms."¹³⁵ Orderic Vitalis included in his *Historia ecclesiastica* Bohemond's own account of how, while he was held prisoner by Ghumushtigin, he had seduced the latter's daughter.¹³⁶ Bohemond also relied upon the connections of the men in his service. In his biography of Anselm of Bec, Eadmer remembered how Bohemond and his followers had visited the archbishop at Rouen. There, Bohemond's knight Ilger Bigod, who was both an old friend of Anselm's and an excellent speaker, entertained the archbishop and his court with stories of "the capture of cities, the location of places, and not a few other things that had befallen him in the aforesaid wars."¹³⁷ Ilger presented Anselm with a precious relic: two of the twelve hairs of the Virgin that he had acquired from the patriarch of Antioch. But Ilger had also presented hairs of the Virgin to churches in Normandy and the region of Chartres,¹³⁸ where, presumably, the storytelling had also occurred. Ilger's gifts and pious donations were probably another part of Bohemond's plan.

Bohemond was married to Constance of France at Easter 1106 in Chartres. The event, which was organized by the countess of Blois, not only "magnificently celebrated" his nuptial coup but also created a critical concentration of the magnates of the Île-de-France and many of the knights and more powerful lords from the countess's lands in the region of Chartres.¹³⁹ Bohemond did not miss his chance. According to Orderic Vitalis, Bohemond addressed the gathering from a pulpit

societatis nostre benefactum, atque suo nos revestivit, insuper promisit, si Deus successus suos secundaret, se nobis et loco nostro provisurum. . . ."

¹³³ For Bohemond's pilgrimage see Albert Poncelet, "Boémond et S. Léonard," *Analecta Bollandiana* 31 (1912), 24–44.

¹³⁴ "Vita et miracula S. Leonardi auctore Waleramno Episcopo Namburgensi," *Acta sanctorum*, 68 vols. (Paris, 1863–70), Nov., 3:173–82.

¹³⁵ Ralph of Caen, *Gesta Tancredi*, p. 603; trans. Bachrach and Bachrach, *The "Gesta Tancredi"*, p. 19.

¹³⁶ Orderic Vitalis, *Historia ecclesiastica*, 5:354–78.

¹³⁷ Eadmer, *Historia novorum in Anglie*, ed. Martin Rule, Rolls Series 81 (London, 1884), pp. 179–80: "Familiariter itaque cum eo agens, inter plurima quae ipsi de superatis bellis, de urbibus captis, de situ locorum, aliisque nonnullis quae in expeditione Ierosolimitana acceperat, delectabili allocutione disseruit."

¹³⁸ Orderic Vitalis, *Historia ecclesiastica*, 5:170–71.

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*, 3:182–83.

("orcistram") "and there related to the huge throng that had assembled all his deeds and adventures," entreating them with promises of the fortunes that they would win under his command.¹⁴⁰ Following his audience with the secular lords of the northwest, Bohemond made his case to the princes of the church at the Council of Poitiers on 26 June.

The preparations for Bohemond's expedition also featured the use of the written word and the recruitment of literate figures. During his travels, Bohemond recruited at least two chaplains, both of whom are known to us as the authors of influential texts. When, at some point during his sojourn in the north, Henry I of England prohibited Bohemond from crossing the Channel to continue his recruitment in England, Bohemond instead sent a written appeal for assistance to Archbishop Gerard of York.¹⁴¹ A chaplain of Bohemond's named Hugh composed and delivered the letter to Gerard, encouraging him to join the expedition.¹⁴² Gerard was evidently impressed with both the rhetorical skill and personal loyalty of Bohemond's scribe; he pledged his support for the expedition, commending to Bohemond the chaplain "who, because of the faith and love which he has for you and because of his uprightness, is greatly pleasing to us."¹⁴³ Gerard's reaction to Hugh and his letter makes it tempting to conclude that the same Hugh was the writer of another letter sent from Bohemond to Paschal II after his return to Italy in September 1106, which (unlike nearly all of the other letters I have cited so far) makes frequent and artful use of the Psalms and other parts of Scripture in its invectives against the Byzantines.¹⁴⁴

We know far more about Bohemond's second chaplain, Ralph of Caen. Ralph was an interesting choice. Before the First Crusade, Ralph had studied at Caen under the Flemish priest Arnulf of Chocques. Arnulf had been the tutor for Cecilia, daughter of William the Conqueror, and would later serve as chaplain to her brother, the prominent crusade leader Robert Curthose, duke of Normandy.¹⁴⁵ Ralph

¹⁴⁰ Ibid., 6:70–71. Chibnall (1:26) believed that Orderic himself may have been present at the wedding.

¹⁴¹ Ibid., 4:211.

¹⁴² F. Liebermann, *Quadripartitus, ein englisches Rechtsbuch von 1114, nachgewiesen und, soweit bisher ungedruckt* (Halle, 1892), p. 161. For the presence of the letter to Bohemond in the lawbook see Patrick Wormald, *Legal Culture in the Early Medieval West: Law as Text, Image, and Experience* (London, 1999), p. 108.

¹⁴³ Liebermann, *Quadripartitus*, p. 161: "Commendo vobis Hugonem capellanum vestrum, qui fide et amore, quem erga vos habet, et sua probitate nobis plurimum placet."

¹⁴⁴ For the text see Walther Holtzmann, "Zur Geschichte des Investiturstreites," *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde* 50 (1935), 280–82. It is possible that Hugh the chaplain is identical to the Norman scribe Hugo de Galteri Villa (Vatierville, dépt. Seine-Maritime), who was described by Bohemond as "cancellarius meus" in a charter for Saint Lawrence of Aversa written before crossing to Illyria in 1107. For this charter see *Regii Neapolitani archivi monumenta*, ed. Antonio Spinelli, 6 vols. (Naples, 1845–61), 5:314, no. 527. Hugh of Vatierville had been in southern Italy since before the First Crusade, but after 1107 he is known only from acts for Bohemond or his widow Constance, suggesting that he was serving in a household capacity. For this Hugh see Léon-Robert Ménager, "Inventaire des familles normands et franques émigrées en Italie méridionale et en Sicile (XIe–XIIe siècles)," in *Hommes et institutions de l'Italie normande* (London, 1981), p. 351. Following Loud, "Chancery and Charters" (above, n. 98), p. 793, we should understand *cancellarius* as meaning only "charter writer."

¹⁴⁵ For Arnulf's place in Robert's entourage see William M. Aird, *Robert Curthose Duke of Normandy, c. 1050–1134* (Woodbridge, Eng., 2008), p. 165; Haskins, *Norman Institutions* (above, n. 74), p. 74; Bachrach and Bachrach, *The "Gesta Tancredi,"* pp. 1–2.

was therefore in a position to receive precisely the kind of training that would prepare him for service with a lay lord like Bohemond. In common with the literate household chaplains that Bohemond had met while in the East, Ralph possessed the skills of an encomiast. After Bohemond's campaign collapsed, Ralph proceeded to Antioch, where he composed an account of the crusading exploits of Bohemond's nephew Tancred, the *Gesta Tancredi*.¹⁴⁶

PROPAGANDA AND MEMORY

I have shown that during his sojourn in Francia, Bohemond created and disseminated information, mainly in the form of elaborately performed narrative, to encourage audiences to support his 1107 expedition. He also recruited specially trained clerics from the homelands of those he had met on crusade in order to be able to compose sophisticated and influential written texts. For Hagenmeyer, Yewdale, Krey, and many who have followed them, the pairing of those two strategies would logically lead to control over the written, as well as the performed, narrative and support the opinion that Bohemond had sponsored programs of historical writing and forgery in order to further bolster the legitimacy of his war with Alexios. These are the conclusions of modern observers, living in the age of the "new propaganda" of mass influence.¹⁴⁷ But the variety of communicative and persuasive strategies conflated as "propaganda" (performance, gesture, letter, chronicle, and forgery) are not interchangeable. It is not required (nor would it be desirable) that we establish artificial distinctions between "literate" and "oral" cultures to see that different strategies of persuasion might be adopted when addressing different audiences and in the hopes of achieving quite different objectives.¹⁴⁸

Bohemond's primary aim in 1105–6 was to recruit as many followers as possible for his attack on the Byzantine Empire. Drawing from his own experience of appealing to his fellow southern Italians to take the cross at Amalfi in 1096, he knew that dramatic public gesture and performance could be very effective. On the basis of his experiences within the council of leaders on the First Crusade, moreover, he also knew that the recruitment of literate clerics like Hugh and Ralph would allow him to communicate with powerful ecclesiastical figures (for whom written communications were commonplace) and ask for their support. While it is not inconceivable that these chaplains could have been called upon to create other kinds of texts, perhaps short written exempla of the emperor's perfidy that could be incorporated into sermons urging knights to take the cross,¹⁴⁹ it is unlikely that

¹⁴⁶ On the text see Luigi Russo, "Tancredi e i Bizantini: Sui *Gesta Tancredi in expeditione Hierosolymitana* di Rodolfo di Caen," *Medioevo greco* 2 (2002), 193–230, esp. pp. 193–99.

¹⁴⁷ Stanley B. Cunningham, *The Idea of Propaganda* (Westport, Conn., 2002), pp. 11–33.

¹⁴⁸ On the problems associated with these distinctions see Joyce Coleman, "On Beyond Ong: Taking the Paradox Out of 'Oral Literacy' (and 'Literate Orality')," in *Medieval Insular Literature between the Oral and the Written*, 2: *Continuity of Transmission*, ed. Hildegard L. C. Tristram, ScriptOralia 97 (Tübingen, 1997), pp. 155–76.

¹⁴⁹ Such a motive would seem to be a logical explanation for the proliferation of the story of Alexios intentionally "robbing and drowning pilgrims," for which see Jonathan Harris, *Byzantium and the Crusades* (London, 2003), pp. 88–89.

even this limited form of written propaganda was necessary. Thanks to Jonathan Riley-Smith's identification of all those who are known to have followed Bohemond to Illyria, we can see that a great majority of them were drawn from the area between Chartres and Poitiers, the very route followed by Bohemond himself.¹⁵⁰ The knights who decided to follow Bohemond had either seen and heard him speak or had spoken with friends or relatives who had done so.

It is likely that the textual traditions relating to the First Crusade that emerged in northwest Francia in the first decades of the twelfth century were the product, not of Bohemond's immediate political aims in 1105–6, but of a larger concern to safeguard his honor and his legacy. Like so many members of the military aristocracy of his period, Bohemond desired that his memory should be preserved, both for the good of his soul and for his reputation.¹⁵¹ I have already noted how he enjoined the monks of Marmoutier to commemorate him while he was away in "the service of God." This desire may also explain the design of the bronze doors of his mausoleum on which, in addition to a series of laudatory epitaphs, are images of his release from Ghumushtigin's prison through the intervention of St. Leonard and his triumphant return to Antioch—images that cleverly manage to encompass heroism, lordship, and piety all at once.¹⁵² An anecdote recorded by Ralph of Caen also suggests that Bohemond was eager that the memory of the expedition and his place in it should be preserved. Ralph recalled how Bohemond and Tancred would publicly lament that the master writers of their own day were too preoccupied with fictions to record the "victories of the army of Christ."¹⁵³ If there is any truth to Ralph's story, part of an elaborate apologia for writing *gesta principum*, then those who were already inclined to write histories may have been encouraged to do so by Bohemond or perhaps by the more learned members of his entourage. To Bohemond, these memorials of parchment, like the memorials of bronze erected in his honor in Canosa, were not the weapons he needed to prosecute a military campaign but were instead the means to secure his legacy in the collective memory of Latin Christians.¹⁵⁴

Almost completely obscured by the historical fascination with Bohemond's supposed tampering with the narrative traditions of the First Crusade is the fact that within a few years of his tour of Francia a deliberate effort was under way to radically rewrite the final episodes in Bohemond's remarkable saga. Gerhard Rösch

¹⁵⁰ For identifiable crusaders of 1107–8 see Riley-Smith, *The First Crusaders* (above, n. 65), map 4 and pp. 239–42. The crusade of Sigurd I of Norway, although coincident with Bohemond's expedition in time, appears to have been in preparation since 1104 and has not been shown to have been influenced by Bohemond's recruiting or Paschal II's early attempts to support him. For Sigurd's crusade see Paul Riant, *Expéditions et pèlerinages des Scandinaves en Terre Sainte au temps des croisades* (Paris, 1865), pp. 173–79.

¹⁵¹ For the importance of reputation see Daniel Lord Smail and Thelma Fenster's introduction to *Fama: The Politics of Talk and Reputation in Medieval Europe*, ed. Daniel Lord Smail and Thelma Fenster (Ithaca, N.Y., 2003), pp. 1–12.

¹⁵² This follows the interpretation of the images in Flori, *Bohémond d'Antioche*, pp. 297–300.

¹⁵³ Ralph of Caen, *Gesta Tancredi*, p. 603; trans. Bachrach and Bachrach, *The "Gesta Tancredi,"* p. 19.

¹⁵⁴ For the broader contests over the memory of the First Crusade see James Powell, "Myth, Legend, Propaganda, History: The First Crusade 1140–ca. 1300," in *Autour de la première croisade* (above, n. 64), pp. 27–141; Paul, "Crusade, Memory and Regional Politics" (above, n. 1), pp. 128–29.

has observed that there were essentially three main historiographical traditions describing Bohemond's war against the Byzantine Empire: one emanating from Constantinople, one from the Latin East, and a Western one associated with the monastery of Saint-Benoît-sur-Loire known as Fleury.¹⁵⁵ The scriptorium of Fleury was responsible for the creation of both of the most significant extant narratives of Bohemond's war against Alexios in 1107–8. These included a lengthy poem by Rodulfus Tortarius, which reimagined Bohemond as an epic hero, whose vast army, drawn from every part of the West, defeated the unworthy successors of Achilles,¹⁵⁶ and a second anonymous prose narrative of the events.¹⁵⁷ As Rösch pointed out, these texts provide a pretext for Bohemond's decision to attack Alexios, suggesting that the latter was obstructing Western pilgrims on their way to the Holy Sepulchre. The Fleury texts also substantially skew the final result of the war in 1108, making it seem as if Bohemond had not actually been defeated but had extracted oaths of security and fidelity from Alexios. As a result of this "propaganda," Rösch concluded, "from the most serious political defeat of his career [Bohemond] emerged as the victor in the eyes of his contemporaries."¹⁵⁸ Furthermore, it has been suggested that textual borrowings in these and other chronicles authored at Fleury show that the monks were in possession of other texts favorable to Bohemond and critical of Alexios Komnenos and the Byzantines. These included a narrative either identical to or derived from the same source as the *Gesta Francorum* and, perhaps most tellingly, the forged letter of Alexios to Robert of Flanders.¹⁵⁹

What all of this indicates is that the monks of Fleury were attempting to counteract potentially damaging stories about Bohemond *after* his 1107 campaign was over. But why? Although there were rumors that in his last years in Italy he was considering yet another expedition, there is no evidence that any preparations were under way. This historiographical program must therefore have been undertaken for another reason. Fleury was a community with strong links to the French crown. Historians from the abbey had played a crucial role in the legitimation of Capetian authority,¹⁶⁰ and the body of Philip I of France was in fact entombed there at the very moment that Bohemond was facing Alexios on the battlefield in Illyria in 1108.¹⁶¹ It thus seems very likely that, rather than undertaking their writing program for Bohemond's sake, the monks of Fleury were manufacturing some

¹⁵⁵ Gerhard Rösch, "Der 'Kreuzzug' Bohemunds gegen Dyrrhachion 1107/8 in der lateinischen Tradition des 12. Jahrhunderts," *Römische historische Mitteilungen* 26 (1984), 181–90, esp. pp. 184–85.

¹⁵⁶ Rodulfus Tortarius, *Carmina*, ed. Marbury B. Ogle and Dorothy M. Schullian (Rome, 1933), pp. 298–316.

¹⁵⁷ *Narratio Floriacensis de captis Antiochia et Hierosolyma et obsesso Dyrrachio*, RHC Occ. 5:356–62.

¹⁵⁸ Rösch, "Der 'Kreuzzug,'" p. 190.

¹⁵⁹ On the relationship between the *Narratio Floriacensis* and the *Gesta Francorum* tradition see the preface to RHC Occ. 5:xcii–xciii; for the relationship between the chronicle of the monk Hugh of Fleury and the letter of Alexios see p. xcvi.

¹⁶⁰ Robert-Henri Bautier, "La place de l'abbaye de Fleury-sur-Loire dans la historiographie française du IXe au XIIe siècle," in *Études ligériennes d'histoire d'archéologie médiévale*, ed. R. Louis (Auxerre, 1975), pp. 23–33; Frederick S. Paxton, "Abbas and Rex: Power and Authority in the Literature of Fleury, 987–1044," in Robert F. Berkhofer III, Alan Cooper, and Adam J. Kosto, eds., *The Experience of Power in Medieval Europe, 950–1350* (Aldershot, Eng., 2005), pp. 197–212.

¹⁶¹ Augustin Fliche, *Le regne de Philippe 1er, roi de France (1060–1108)* (Paris, 1912), p. 77 and n. 2.

traditions and gathering (and potentially disseminating) others in order to rehabilitate his memory for the sake of an institution of far greater importance to them: the Capetian dynasty.

Depictions of Bohemond in the early twelfth century hint at why the Capetians and their sympathizers might have become concerned about his reputation after his defeat and death. The chronicle of Guibert of Nogent, which was written either while Bohemond's ill-fated expedition against Alexios was under way or shortly after its disastrous conclusion, demonstrates a preoccupation with Bohemond's lineage and his reputation, two of the central characteristics of nobility. Guibert wrote that Bohemond's father Robert "was born into a family of no great distinction" ("tenui satis loco natus") but that the son's great deeds, namely, his marriage to Constance and his bold attack on Alexios, "caused the lowliness of his ancestry to be forgotten" ("veterum oblitterata vilitate parentum").¹⁶² One early-twelfth-century redaction of Guibert's chronicle describes, in the words of Maccabees 10.58, the "great glory" of Bohemond's marriage to Constance and then how, "having returned to Apulia, he subjugated a great part of the kingdom of the emperor of Constantinople to himself."¹⁶³ Abbot Suger of Saint-Denis, apologist-in-chief for the Capetians, would assert in his biography of Constance's brother Louis VI of France that her husband was a worthy match, as he was "rich in both gifts and promises."¹⁶⁴ The last glimpse of Bohemond and Constance in Suger's narrative has the couple returning "prosperously and gloriously" ("prospere et gloriose") to Apulia.¹⁶⁵

Writing three decades after the events, Suger knew that Bohemond's promises were empty ones and that the story had not ended in either fortune or glory.¹⁶⁶ The prince's death in ignominy in 1111 had left Constance and their two small children in a precarious position. They were expelled from Bari in 1113, and in 1120, two years after returning to the city, Constance was imprisoned by a usurper.¹⁶⁷ It is not a coincidence that those events go unmentioned by chroniclers in the orbit of the Capetian court.¹⁶⁸ It was of utmost importance to the Capetian dynasty that it not seem as if the decision to grant Bohemond a royal princess had been a rash one. In this crucial period, the reign of Philip's son Louis VI, the Capetians were attempting to distinguish themselves from the territorial princes and castellans

¹⁶² Guibert of Nogent, *Dei Gesta per Francos et cinq autres textes*, ed. R. B. C. Huygens, CCCM 127A (Turnhout, 1996), p. 137.

¹⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 337: "Deinde in Apuliam regressus magnam regni Constantinopolitani imperatoris partem sibi subegit. . . ."

¹⁶⁴ Suger, *Vita Ludovici grossi* (above, n. 17), p. 48.

¹⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 48.

¹⁶⁶ For the date of Suger's *Vita Ludovici grossi* (c. 1137–43) see Suger, *Œuvres*, 1, ed. and trans. Françoise Gasparri, Les Classiques de l'Histoire de France au Moyen Âge 37 (Paris, 1996), p. liv.

¹⁶⁷ Romuald of Salerno, *Chronicon*, ed. C. A. Garufi, in *Rerum Italicarum scriptores*, 25 vols. (Milan, 1914–36), 7:206 and 210; Oldfield, "Urban Government" (above, n. 107), pp. 600–601.

¹⁶⁸ Even the Norman monk Orderic Vitalis, who could otherwise chart the minutiae of political events in faraway Sicily, would say only that "[Bohemond] took the king's daughter Constance with him when he left for the eastern lands; but in that expedition things did not fall out altogether as the crusaders desired": Orderic Vitalis, *Historia ecclesiastica*, 4:264–65. Elsewhere (3:182), when Orderic again alluded to the failure of the expedition, he blamed it on the vanity and greed of those in the army.

over whom they claimed suzerainty.¹⁶⁹ Hastily arranged marriages with lowborn feuding adventurers did not contribute to this royal image. In fact, they implied that the Capetians were no better than the Hautevilles. Bohemond's worthiness for a Capetian princess, as both Guibert and Suger agreed, stemmed directly from his deeds and his reputation. If both ultimately proved to have been a sham, then the union was a monumental error for a royal dynasty built in no small part on clever dynastic marriages.¹⁷⁰

It was in an effort to circumvent the awkward and potentially dishonorable aspects of Bohemond's legacy that the monastic and clerical supporters of the Capetian dynasty in western Francia carefully reframed the narratives of Bohemond's career and the First Crusade. In doing so, they were in part continuing in text the work that Bohemond himself had begun in his public performances. Some of the writers, among them the authors of the early crusade chronicles, may themselves have been at least partly inspired by Bohemond's presence in the West and the subsequent discourse relating to the legitimacy of his attack on Alexios. But by the time that these earliest works had been completed and were circulating in manuscript form they would have been of little use as propaganda to Bohemond himself. These chronicles, combined with forged letters from the wicked emperor Alexios, and poetry and prose works recasting his defeat at Devol as a great victory, served as a powerful statement of the worthiness of the crusade hero and of his cause that sought to obliterate the memory of the Byzantine victory over the crusading forces in Illyria, the inglorious death of Bohemond, and the shameful treatment of a French princess in Apulia.

CONCLUSIONS

What was the nature of Bohemond's *sapientia*? Confronted with so many references to his great wisdom, cunning trickery, and sound counsel, we may be tempted to assign to Bohemond all of the qualities and skills that we associate with intelligence and manipulation. For Heinrich Hagenmeyer and Ralph Bailey Yewdale, who lived in the pioneering age of mass manipulation (Yewdale himself fought in the First World War) and at a time when text was still the best medium through which political propaganda could be disseminated, the concept of persuasion was inseparable from control over the written word. In their critical readings of the sources of the First Crusade, the heirs to this scholarly legacy have continued to see Bohemond as a significant, often hidden, force whose political prerogatives had shaped numerous traditions.

¹⁶⁹ Annals written at Sens c. 1109 describe Louis VI battling to force Henry I of England (as duke of Normandy), William IX of Aquitaine, and Hugh II of Burgundy "and many other counts (*consules*) who are under the king of the Franks" to do him homage ("facere hominium"): "*Annales* de l'abbatiat d'Arnaud" (above, n. 77), pp. 148–49; for the date see p. xli.

¹⁷⁰ Constance herself seems to have been aware of the need to maintain Bohemond's memory as a crusading hero. In two charters for Saint Lawrence of Aversa of 1115, Constance identifies herself as "*Ego Constanca Francorum Regis filippi filia et quondam domini Boamundi antiocheni principis magne et immortalis memorie uxor*": *Regii Neapolitani archivi monumenta* (above, n. 144), 6:1–3, nos. 559 and 560.

What medieval sources tell us about Bohemond's strategies of persuasion and his use of writing complicates this sequence of assumptions and hypotheses. Only from the time of his accession to a position of authority over important urban centers such as Bari in 1089 can Bohemond be seen to have made use of clerical officials. It was Bohemond's experience as a member of the council of princely leaders of the First Crusade that provided him with an opportunity to observe the utility of writing for diplomatic purposes and to identify the kinds of personnel that were needed to effectively deploy diplomatic instruments. Hence, during his recruitment tour in northwest Francia in 1105–6, he located individuals who were especially trained for this purpose and put them to use composing rhetorically sophisticated missives to powerful ecclesiastical officials.

The composition of these letters represents only one of many strategies employed by Bohemond to achieve his primary goal of raising an army. Those who witnessed Bohemond's tour agreed that the mainstay of his recruitment campaign consisted not of writing but of performance and spectacle. The shadows that Bohemond and his hateful invectives against Alexios cast over the narrative texts written in the first decade of the twelfth century were the shadows of his public performances. Thus, although Bohemond's tour is sure to have influenced how Western Latin society remembered the First Crusade, the proliferation of narratives glorifying Bohemond and demonizing the Byzantine Empire was most likely a result of an entrenched program of dynastic and institutional legitimation of the kind well attested in western Europe in the twelfth century, rather than the propaganda campaign of a single individual on a year-long recruitment campaign.¹⁷¹ As the work of Marcus Bull and Jean Flori has shown, the Capetians and their circle were the ultimate beneficiaries of the reshaped narrative of the First Crusade, which privileged the position of crusaders from the royal circle and excused or excised their failings.¹⁷² The narrative amendment of Bohemond's career at Fleury, Saint-Denis, and elsewhere was thus only part, albeit an early and significant part, of a larger and longer process.

The case of Bohemond and the narrative traditions surrounding the First Crusade raises questions about the ways that the term "propaganda" has been applied to medieval historical narratives. In his study of historiography in medieval western Europe, for instance, Bernard Guenée argued that "a massive amount of historical propaganda appeared for the first time in the second half of the eleventh century, linked to two events that at that time left their mark on the West: the Gregorian reform and the investiture struggle on the one hand and the First Crusade on the other."¹⁷³ The truth of what Guenée observed, that this period saw a proliferation

¹⁷¹ On the use of historical writing for the purposes of dynastic and institutional legitimation see Gabrielle M. Spiegel, *The Past as Text: The Theory and Practice of Medieval Historiography* (Baltimore, 1997), esp. pp. 83–98, and Amy G. Remensnyder, *Remembering Kings Past: Monastic Foundation Legends in Medieval Southern France* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1995). For the proliferation of programs of historical writing for noble dynasties see most recently Leah Shopkow, "Dynastic History," in *Historiography in the Middle Ages*, ed. Deborah Mauskopf Deliyannis (Leiden, 2003), pp. 217–48.

¹⁷² Marcus Bull, "The Capetian Monarchy and the Early Crusade Movement: Hugh of Vermandois and Louis VII," *Nottingham Medieval Studies* 40 (1997), 25–46, esp. pp. 39–43; Flori, "De l'Anonyme normand à Tudebode" (above, n. 6), pp. 743–45.

¹⁷³ Bernard Guenée, *Histoire et culture historique dans l'Occident médiéval* (Paris, 1980), p. 334:

of historical writing created for the purposes of persuasion, does not mean that we should assume that these historical narratives would be useful in effecting political outcomes in the manner we have come to expect from modern propaganda. While historical narrative was a powerful medium through which communities such as the abbeys of Fleury and Saint-Denis might express a collective identity and attempt to shape wider social memory, a charismatic personal presence, a well-crafted story, and a carefully staged performance were the tools with which a wise warlord harnessed popular support.

“Une massive propagande historique apparut pour la première fois dans la seconde moitié du XI^e siècle, liée aux deux événements qui marquèrent alors l’Occident: la réforme grégorienne et la querelle des investitures d’une part, la croisade de l’autre.”

Nicholas L. Paul is Assistant Professor of History at Fordham University, Bronx, NY 10458 (e-mail: npaul@fordham.edu).