University of Louisville

ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

1948

Relations of the Emperor Alexius with the first crusaders.

Marilyn Tyler Waggoner
University of Louisville

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.library.louisville.edu/etd>

Part of the [European History Commons](#), and the [Islamic World and Near East History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Waggoner, Marilyn Tyler, "Relations of the Emperor Alexius with the first crusaders." (1948). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 2185.
<https://doi.org/10.18297/etd/2185>

This Master's Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. This title appears here courtesy of the author, who has retained all other copyrights. For more information, please contact thinkir@louisville.edu.

UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE

Relations of the Emperor Alexius with the First Crusaders

A dissertation

submitted to the faculty

of the Graduate School of the University of Louisville

in Partial fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree

of Master of Arts.

Department of History

by

Marilyn Tyler Waggoner

1948

This PDF document is a scanned copy of a paper manuscript housed in the University of Louisville (UofL) Libraries. The quality of this reproduction is greatly dependent upon the condition of the original paper copy. Indistinct print and poor quality illustrations are a direct reflection of the quality of materials that are available for scanning. The UofL Libraries greatly appreciates any better copies that can be made available for replacement scans.

RELATIONS OF THE EMPEROR ALEXIUS WITH THE FIRST CRUSADERS

Approved by a Reading Committee of the following members

Robert I. Kutak

Laurence Lee Howe

Chairman

Date: Jan. 16, 1948

5 Jul 1948 RH

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter I	1
Introduction	
Primary Sources of First Crusade	
Chapter II	23
Preaching of the First Crusade	
Chapter III	38
Personnel of the First Crusade	
March to Constantinople	
Chapter IV	57
Emperor Alexius and the Crusaders	
Battle of Nicaea	
Chapter V	69
Battle of Dorylaeum	
Siege and Capture of Antioch	
Miracle of the Holy Lance	
Chapter VI	98
March to Jerusalem	
Capture of Jerusalem	
Conclusion	114
Bibliography	

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

PRIMARY SOURCES OF FIRST CRUSADE

Viewed from the broadest standpoint, the Crusades against the Moslems were an episode in that age-long drama of the struggle between the East and West, between Asia and Europe, of which the contest between the ancient Greeks and Persians was the opening act. They mark an important turning point in the long contest between the two great religions, Islam and Christianity, which, however, reached its greatest fury in the struggle between the Ottoman Turks and the Christians of Europe.

The piety of the Middle Ages had long found in pilgrimages to holy places a favorite method of kindling its religious zeal and atoning for past misdeeds. However, the idea of visiting sites of hallowed origin is an important ritual known to many religious groups. Especially has the religious sentiment of every people made the birthplaces or the tombs of their prophets, saints, and martyrs places of veneration and pilgrimage. Renares, Mecca, and Jerusalem attest the universality and strength of the sentiment among Hindus, Mohammedans, and Christians alike.

In the eleventh century, the zeal for pilgrimages had reached a high mark. The three most popular objectives for pilgrims were Compostella, Rome and Jerusalem, and of these, the last, as a matter of course, was the most important, because of its associations and its distance. A few important notables of Europe who pilgrimaged to Jerusalem were Fulk the Black of Anjou, and the two Roberts of the duchy of Normandy. Many hundreds of

thousands of the clergy also participated on various pilgrimages. Pilgrimages to venerated spots also enriched the coffers of the Church by the sale of relics. Each traveler felt the necessity of bringing home with him some sacred relic, and as these were sold by the churches it added to the wealth of the clergy.

At the beginning of the eleventh century, Jerusalem was controlled by the Fatimite Caliph of Cairo, the Caliph of Cairo at that time being El-Hakim. El-Hakim's father, El-Aziz, had been somewhat of a liberal surrounding himself with a number of Christians and Jews. However, it seems that very little of this tolerance affected El-Hakim, and when he took over the reigns of government, he placed many foolish and harassing restrictions (1) on both sects.

The Caliph of Cairo's power over Jerusalem, however, was to end in the immediate future. In 1038 Masud the Ghaznevid was defeated by the Seljukian Turks, who were led by Toghrul Beg, the grandson of Seljuk. Toghrul Beg began rapidly to make many conquests and in a short time made himself master of most of Persia. The Abbasids of Persia had long been very ineffective and now the power passed to Toghrul Beg, who in 1055 became Sultan. In 1063 Toghrul Beg was succeeded by his nephew Alp Arslan, under whose leadership the Seljuks conquered Armenia and defeated the Emperor Romanus Diogenes at the battle of Manzikert in August, 1071.

(1) William of Tyre History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea.
Translated and annotated by E. Babcock and
A.C. Krey. Vol. I, p. 65.

Now Asia Minor was completely isolated from both Western and Byzantine influence and civilization. It was not so much the political conquest that affected Asia Minor as it was the immigration which followed. The Turkish conquest opened up Asia Minor to the pastoral nomadic tribes of Central Asia, called by the Greeks Turkomans, and unruly and dangerous, so that roads became unsafe for merchants and the trade upon which city life depends declined. This in turn had its effect upon the pilgrimages from Europe.

The Turkish victory at Manzikert dealt the Eastern Roman Empire a blow from which it never completely recovered. As a result of the Seljuk capture of Emperor Romanus Diogenes the Byzantine Empire was rent by civil war and disaster for a period approximating ten years. By 1081 when Alexius Comnenus began his reign, the Turks had control of Asia Minor and were even close upon Constantinople. It is important to note that at the battle of Manzikert the old imperial military machine of the Byzantines had been destroyed almost completely and the remnants which had survived were swallowed up in the next ten years of civil war.⁽²⁾ Due to the Turkish capture of Anatolia (the territory from which the best Byzantine troops had been recruited) it was now necessary for the emperors to depend upon foreign mercenaries for the greater part of their armies.

Upon the death of Alp Arslan, Malek Shah became Sultan and

(2) Newhall, R.A. The Crusades p.54.

the conquest of Asia Minor and the Holy Land was in the main part directed by him. Previous to the coming of the First Crusaders, the East had a temporary lull through Malek Shah's death in 1092. At his death, his empire extended from the borders of China to the southern frontiers of Palestine.

However, this empire in the years that followed was disputed over fiercely by Malek's children, a fact which greatly weakened the power of the Seljuks, and made the subsequent progress of the First Crusade much more easy than it would have been a few years before.

The religious situation in the West also had its affect. In 1054 the Pope and the Patriarch of Constantinople had mutually excommunicated each other, so that a schism existed between the eastern and western branches of the Church. Looking back, we can now see that this was a decisive break never to be effectively mended, but it did not so appear to men of the eleventh century. The Popes at Rome for a number of years cherished the hope that this schism would be healed and the eastern church returned to the fold.

The desire for healing this breach and the expectations by which it could be brought about seemed to present itself to Urban II when in 1095, at the synod of Piacenza, there appeared envoys from Alexius Comnenus. The embassy appealed for aid and help against the Turks.

In the light of Alexius's later actions (after the Crusade was in progress) this appeal for aid seems rather strange. As to the Turkish menace to the Byzantine Empire, we notice that it was probably less a menace in 1095 than it had been formerly, so that really no desperate situation calling for extraordinary efforts existed.

Since the disappearance of the old imperial military guard in the empire, it was Alexius's habit to recruit soldiers and allies in the West, and often he had called upon the aid of the Pope and Western leaders to help him in obtaining soldiers from the barbarians on the Danube. Robert I, the Frisian, the father of Robert II, count of Flanders, on the return journey of a pilgrimage to Jerusalem in 1083 visited Alexius and promised to send troops to help Alexius against the Turks. This promise
(3)
Robert I fulfilled in 1090. There is the possibility, therefore, that the embassy which appeared at the synod of Piacenza was appealing to the Papacy for aid of the type which had previously been granted. However, it offered the occasion for Pope Urban II to urge upon the Western world the project of a Crusade.

An important cause of the First Crusade which is coupled with the religious problem in the West is that of the restoration of Papal authority. In the tenth century the Church was to a large degree very feudal in character. Many priests and bishops were more interested in political affairs than in affairs of the

(3) William of Tyre Vol.I,p.138,note 24.

Church. Church laws were very lax regarding marriage and simony was wide-spread. The only notable organization which banded together for reform was that of the monastery of Cluny, which by its strict and stern discipline created great influence. This Cluniac revival of the tenth and eleventh centuries, kindling as it did a holy fervor in multitudes of souls, also gave a great impulse to the pilgrimaging zeal, and caused the number of pilgrims to the Holy Land greatly to increase.

Under the pontificate of Leo IX, a campaign was launched to stamp out simony and clerical marriage. It was during this period that we first hear of Leo's chief assistant Hildebrand. It was due to Hildebrand in this capacity that the famous electoral decree of 1059 was created which placed the control of papal elections in the cardinal clergy of Rome. A plan which was designed to leave the emperor completely out.

The election of Nicholas II had been peaceful because of the fact that Henry III had died leaving only an infant son, Henry IV, to rule in his stead. The same conditions still existed in 1061 when a new pope was elected. Finally, in 1073, Hildebrand, as Gregory VII, became pope, a fact which was recognized by Henry IV mainly because of the trouble which he was then having in Saxony.

Gregory VII fought more fiercely than any of the past popes to root out clerical marriages and simony. He was soon violent-

ly opposed by a number of the bishops, and as a result of this, Gregory began to suspend a few of them for disobedience to the papacy. However, in 1073, he proclaimed what he considered the greatest evil of all which was "lay investiture." By this decree, even though temporal princes and lords might have some influence in church elections, no candidate could be legally placed in a church position except by other church powers.

Henry IV now felt that he had gone as far along on this exerted power as he wished and he did very little about putting this new decree into practice. Gregory wrote him and threatened that he would be excommunicated unless he began to enforce this papal law. Henry IV answered by declaring Gregory a false pope who had attained his position unfairly.

Gregory at once pronounced Henry excommunicated and stated that all of Henry's subjects were freed from his rule and that they had the right to choose a new king. The nobles of Germany met together in 1076, where upon they told Henry that if in one year he did not receive absolution a new king would be chosen.

By now many of the clergy of Germany had become terrified and had hastened to Rome for forgiveness, the nobles had turned against Henry and there was little for him to do but to submit to the power of the papacy. Thus in 1077, Henry IV appeared over the Alps at Canossa and received absolution from the Pope. In this act the Church seemed greatly to have triumphed, and was

raised to a higher and loftier grandeur, leading the way for the action which Urban II took in proclaiming and preaching the Crusade in 1095.

However, in 1095 the lay investiture struggle was still far from being settled. For ten years Henry IV had maintained an Anti-Pope in Italy, and in 1095 Urban II did not even enjoy safe possession of Rome itself. Henry IV had been excommunicated again, and the King of France, who ruled over only a small territory and had many powerful lords and princes surrounding him, was under a similar ban.

During this period of loose-knit government and private warfare the Church lifted up a protesting voice. In the early part of the eleventh century there was a movement in France which aimed at the complete abolition of war among Christians. It proclaimed what was called the "Peace of God."⁽⁴⁾ In the name of the God of peace it commanded all men to refrain from war and robbery and violence of every kind as contrary to the spirit and the teachings of Christianity. But it was found utterly impossible to make men desist from waging private wars, even though they were threatened with the everlasting tortures of hell.

Then the clergy in Southern France, seeing they could not suppress the evil entirely, concluded it was wiser to try to regulate it. This led to the promulgation of what was called the "Truce of God." This movement to redeem at least a part of the

(4) Ludlow, J.M. The Age of the Crusades, p.71.

days from fighting and violence embraced in time all the countries of Western Europe. The details of the various edicts issued by Church councils and by the popes varied widely, but all embraced the principle of the edict of 1041. This Truce of God was not, as we may easily believe, very well observed.

The majority of the Western countries were beginning to increase in population. A custom which was followed in some regions, particularly Normandy and England, was that all the possessions were left to the eldest son, leaving many times a great many sons with no land what-so-ever. A good illustration of this is to be found in the family of Tancred de Hauteville of Normandy whose sons were forced into looking elsewhere for land of their own. Thus when the call went out for a crusade to the Holy Land, many sons of noble and aristocratic families saw this as an opportunity to perhaps establish a principality or fief of their own in Jerusalem.

It is difficult for people today to realize the ignorance and gross superstition which prevailed during this period. The little intellectuality that was to be found exercised itself almost entirely with theological and religious subjects.

The vast majority of people lived in the country, in complete isolation from their fellows, or they were huddled together in rude hamlets under the walls of the castles, serving as serfs to feudal lords who in return protected them.

The home of the common man was a hut but little better than the shelter provided for cattle, and often his cattle and farming animals lived in the same hut as he did. In many cases the peasant was denied the privilege of even roaming the fields, and of fishing or hunting to increase his food supply. There were no books or pictures for the peasant consequently practically all that was left to him was his faith, which was sometimes taught to him by a priest who could neither read nor write. With these conditions so rampant throughout Western Europe one can more easily understand the superstition of the age.

The living conditions of the higher noble class were much better and in their castles were a few more of the luxuries of the age. Their main interests were those of hunting, hawking, bear-baiting, and fighting. The love of war and fighting for its own sake was the dominant interest of this class. Throughout the tenth and eleventh centuries private warfare was carried on in Western Europe. In the pages of Ordericus Vitalis, one reads of the constant raids, counter-raids, burning and pillaging among various families and individuals. This love of arms combined with religious fervor were two dominant passions which, mingling in some way, lent each other a mutual energy. These two great principles, united and acting together, gave birth to the holy war; and carried, among the crusaders, valor, resignation, and heroism of character to the highest degree of

(5) Ordericus Vitalis The Ecclesiastical History of England and Normandy. Translated by Thomas Forrester. Vol.II,p.210.

eminence.

To a people such as has been described the appeal for the crusades, in which the imagined cause of heaven marched in step with their own tastes and habits, was irresistible.

Another important feature to the Crusade is that of the governmental condition of Europe. Although France, in a small way was beginning to assume the appearance of a nation under the slow guidance of the Capetian rule, there were still many strong and powerful duchies, lords, and barons. Thus because of this lack of centralization in France and elsewhere the papacy could prompt and direct an action such as the First Crusade. Even though several kings resented the position which Urban II took in preaching the Crusade, they were not strong enough to block it. Patriotism or nationalism, as such, had not yet come into being.

Under such a system as feudalism, men could be readily organized, due to the close interdependence of lord and vassal. If the lord was deeply moved by the crusading movement and decided to participate, his retainers were also ready to march along beside him.

To the various causes and antecedents of the Crusade already noticed must be added, as a near inciting cause, that spirit of adventure and unrest with which almost all the lands of Western Europe were at just this time being filled by the enterprises of

the Normans. The conquest of England by William the Conqueror and that of Southern Italy and Sicily by other Norman leaders were simply two of the most important of their undertakings. Throughout the eleventh century the Norman knights, true to the old Viking spirit of their ancestors, were constantly raiding in Spain, in Africa, and in other Moslem lands. Everywhere they engaged in battle with the "infidels." Everywhere they stirred up the embers of the old fierce hate between Christian and Moslem. Everywhere throughout Western Christendom they awakened, by their restless zeal, the crusading spirit, and thus did much to prepare the way for the Holy Wars.

Another cause and factor which favored the Crusade is to be found in the growth of towns and commercial adventures. The darkest part of the middle ages was vanishing and there was now emerging once more a money economy and the revival of trade. Some of the Italian cities engaged in the undertakings from commercial or political motives. Due in a large part to the Norman activities in Southern Italy and Sicily, the Mediterranean was opened up again and trade channels were beginning to be put into operation. These conditions were only just beginning to appear at the time of the First Crusade and thus assume a more important role in the later crusades. However, from the start of the movements it was alone the command of the sea by the Italian cities that rendered that transport service which was indispensable to

the maintenance of the colonies established in Palestine as a result of the First Crusade.

Another factor which favored the First Crusade was that just before this time the Hungarians had been converted to Christianity, and thus the overland route to the East, which for centuries had been bared by heathen hordes, was reopened. The pathway for the earlier Crusades was prepared.

The last factor to be discussed is that of conditions in the East on the eve of the First Crusade. The Christians were greatly furthered by the antagonism of the Arabs and the Turks. This antagonism almost fatally divided the strength of the Mohammedan world.

The source material available for the First Crusade falls into two types or categories; the first is that of the letters written while on the journey and by leading men of the period, the second, that of chronicles written by eyewitnesses, by men who wrote accounts of the Crusade as they witnessed or experienced them.

In regard to the letters, it was very fortunate that on the First Crusade many members of the Church participated. These priests or clerics, wrote a number of letters, which found their way back to Europe where they were copied many times and

passed from hamlet to hamlet. These letters were treated as public property, as almost every region had a participant in the Crusade and was eager for news. Letters were used a great deal on the march to Constantinople and up to the time when the army left Nicaea. After this it became almost impossible to send back messengers, and thus there were fewer letters. Only several of these letters exist today.

The most important letters which are available today are the following: one letter from Emperor Alexius to the Abbot of Monte Cassino, five letters from the leaders of the Crusade to the Pope, two letters from Stephen of Blois to his wife, Adele, and two letters from the Pope, one to the assembling crusaders and the second to tell the news of the capture of Jerusalem to the Franks.

As it was difficult to obtain and send many letters, other methods were developed which would record the events of the First Crusade. These methods took on the form of chronicles, which were eyewitnessed reports. There were a variety of motives as to why certain men kept these chronicles. Many of them wished to glorify the leader under whom they were serving, others were moved by a purely spiritual attitude as they felt they were adding another chapter to the Sacred History of the Church.

The most valuable and complete chronicle that we have is the Anonymi Gesta. This anonymous author accompanied Bohemond

from the siege of Amalfi to the capture of Antioch. From Antioch he went to Jerusalem with the army under Raymond's leadership, whether with Raymond himself or (which is probably more true) with Tancred or Robert of Normandy, who were associated with Raymond, is not clear. His book was written around the close of 1101. Although we have no idea as to who the author was, due to his constant praise of Bohemond and his knowledge of Southern Italy, we suspect that he was a resident of this region. He may have been a Norman. Due to his secular point of view in regard to certain events, many modern critics have the idea that he might have been a knight. He enjoyed very little intimacy with the leaders, so if he was a knight he must have been a lesser knight. His use of language is somewhat amateurish and his vocabulary rather limited. He quotes only from the Bible. What he may lack in some places is made up by his fairness and impartiality toward the Saracen and Turkish foes and the quarreling among the Christian chiefs. He was also very wise in placing incidents in their proper perspective and by not allowing small and petty details to cloud the immediate issue. The greatest value in the Gesta results from the fact that it was probably written as the Crusade progressed. There are six MS copies of the Gesta in existence today.

The second account which we have of the First Crusade is written by Raymond, Canon of Puy and of Aguilers and Pontius of

Balazun and is dedicated to the Lord Bishop of Viviers.

Pontius of Balazun was a knight in the Provencal army, however, he was killed at Archas and Raymond was left to finish the Chronicle alone. Raymond served in the capacity of Chaplain to Count Raymond of Toulouse, who was one of the wealthiest lords to participate on the Crusade. Due to Canon Raymond's position he enjoyed intimate relations with Count Raymond and Bishop Adhemar, thus he had access to more information than did the author of the Gesta. But many critics today consider Raymond's account crude, bigoted and biased. (6)

Dr. Thatcher in his work on the Latin sources of the First Crusade says this of Raymond:

"The priest, Raymond of Aguilers, was at the head of a band of swindlers who made gain by playing on the credulity, superstitions, and religious simplicity of the crusaders. It was he who, with the aid of a few accomplices, planned and executed the fraud of discovering the holy lance in Antioch. Having been charged with this he wrote his account of the crusade as his defense, by while trying to clear himself he has betrayed his guilt. In addition to valuable information about the crusade his book would furnish the basis for an instructive chapter in the history of medieval fraud." (7)

These accusations are in some places quite true. Raymond was writing to tell all Christendom of the bravery of Count Raymond's army and the validity of the Holy Lance. Because of his faith in the Holy Lance a large portion of his work deals with this miracle. However, in complete justice to Raymond of

(6) Krey, August C. (ed.) The First Crusade Introduction, p.9. This book is the accounts of eye-witnesses and participants in the First Crusade.

(7) Thatcher, O. "Latin Sources of the First Crusade", an article in the American Historical Association Journal, 1900, p.509.

Aguilers, he was not altogether blind to the faults of his leader or the members of the army with which he marched. This account was written probably no earlier than 1102, although it must have been based on notes that he took during the journey. Raymond depicts very well the social life of Count Raymond's army and his account is rich in sociological aspects. Six MS copies of this work exist.

The third chronicle on the First Crusade was written by Fulcher of Chartres. Fulcher of Chartres was born at Chartres in 1059, he was trained for the Church and at the time of the Council of Clermont he was a priest either at Chartres or at Orleans. Fulcher of Chartres accompanied Robert of Normandy and Stephen of Blois. He remained with this army until October, 1097, when he became the chaplain of Baldwin, Godfrey's brother. From 1097 to 1118, at the time of Baldwin's death, Fulcher of Chartres remained in his service. Because of Fulcher's association with Baldwin, he was not present at the siege of Antioch nor that of Jerusalem. At the time of the battles of Antioch and Jerusalem, Fulcher was at Edessa, Baldwin's principality in the north. Upon Godfrey's death, Baldwin of Edessa was called to be king of Jerusalem. Fulcher accompanied him to Jerusalem where he remained until his own death in 1127 or 1128.

Fulcher's account was written due to the urgings of his

friends and must have first appeared in 1105. By his writing it seems that Fulcher enjoyed a more extensive education than the authors of the first two chronicles discussed. His work was quite long and the last part of it was concerned with an account of the Latin Kingdom in Jerusalem. Fulcher displays a strong interest in the common people serving in the crusade and he seems to fit perfectly the role of a simple French cufe. He had very little interest in the main leaders of the Crusade or the powerful members of the Church. It remains second only to the Gesta as a wealth of information on the First Crusade. Fifteen MS copies exist.

Another source which is very important to the history of the First Crusade is the Alexiad, written by Anna Comnena. Anna Comnena was only fourteen years old when the First Crusaders passed through Constantinople, but it can be supposed that such a large number of strangers would leave a vivid impression on her mind. Anna and her husband, Nicephorus Briennius, were both well educated. They became involved in an intrigue to capture the throne, an attempt which proved unsuccessful. Anna was placed in a convent by her brother's order and there she decided to finish the history which her husband had begun. Forty years had now lapsed since the First Crusaders had passed through Constantinople and in the intervening time many more crusaders had made their way to the Holy Land. Since the days of the First

Crusade Bohemond had taken Antioch and attempted to conquer the Byzantine Empire. Relations between Count Raymond and Alexius had changed and other events similar to these had occurred. Thus it was hard for Anna to place events, facts, and people's character in their proper place. As a consequence, Anna's chronology is faulty, her facts not always true and her style vain and affected. She is constantly confused over the identity of the Latin chiefs and their names and native regions perplex her. Nevertheless Anna's account is very valuable in that it does correctly depict the Byzantine attitude in regard to the pilgrims and leaders and explains Alexius's true attitude. One MS copy exists today, corrected by Anna herself, and is at Florence.

Also included in the group of eye-witness chronicles of the First Crusade is the work by Peter Tudebode, a priest of Civray. His work at one time was regarded as the original of the Gesta but today this is not believed. Instead Peter's work is an almost word-by-word copy of the Gesta with a few parts from Raymond of Aguilers and a few observations of his own. His account differs most from the Gesta in that he applies its words of praise for Bohemond to his own leader, Count Raymond of Toulouse. It was written after both the Gesta and Raymond of Aguilier's account, the date being around 1111. Four MS copies exist.

This then concludes the sources which are strictly of the first rank and the next two writings are those of men who were not eyewitnesses but who went to the East soon after the Crusade was over.

Ekkehard of Aura, who is considered one of the best historians of Medieval times, was a monk at Corvey when the First Crusade began. He journeyed to Jerusalem in 1101 and there saw a copy of the Gesta, which he used for a source. This work he wrote for the Abbot of Corvey in 1112. The value of Ekkehard's contribution to the First Crusade rests in his brief items about the Peasants Crusade. Six MS copies exist.

Another work of importance is that of Raoul de Caen. He was a Norman knight who at the time of the First Crusade was not old enough to volunteer. He first went to the Holy Land in 1107, when Bohemond was assembling troops to return and fight the Byzantine Empire. On Bohemond's death he journeyed to Antioch and entered the service of Tancred. He seems to have been very well educated and to have enjoyed Tancred's friendship. By this relationship he came to know Tancred's views on the First Crusade and on subsequent developments. Because of this, Raoul's work is a panegyric of the Norman princes of Antioch and is very hostile to the Emperor Alexius and to Count Raymond of Toulouse. His work is valuable because it reflects the Norman attitude and treats the history of the First Crusade

and of Tancred up to 1105. In Raoul's early years he had studied under Arnulf who, in 1112, became Patriarch of Jerusalem. His style is polished and many learned quotations are included. The account was written sometime between Tancred's death in 1112 and that of Arnulf's in 1118. One MS copy remains and is at the Royal Library of Brussels.

The last remaining chronicle of importance is that of Albert of Aix's. Very little is known of Albert, but he is said to have been a canon of the church of Aix-la-Chapelle about the middle of the twelfth century. In his own words he tells us that he never visited the Holy Land. He wrote a history of the First Crusade and the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem down to the year 1120 and twelve copies of this exist. He states that he obtained his material from oral and written testimony of those who participated in the Crusade. Much of his work is undoubtedly legend; but more of it seems true while some of it stands the test of comparison with the other chronicles. However, his work has a great deal of information in it not treated by other writers and is thus incapable of comparison. Albert's chronicle, therefore, has rather a mixed value. It has been said that Albert obtained some of his material from a Lorraine chronicle that is now lost, a fact which has never been proved or disproved. His work traces Godfrey's march to Constantinople and here proves a valuable source.

Three other writers are included in the source material, even though they did not participate in the First Crusade in any way. However, these authors all wrote an entire history of the Crusade. All three were churchmen of high standing and each in turn endeavored to rewrite the Gesta. The First is Robert the Monk. His work was written at the request of Bernald, Abbot of Marmoutier, sometime before 1107. It was very popular with the West in the twelfth century. Eighty MS copies of it now exist. The second was Balderic, Abbot of Bourgueil, and Archbishop of Dol after 1107. He added very little of importance to the Gesta account. Seven of these copies exist. The third was Guibert, who was Abbot of Nogent from 1104 to 1121 and this is the best account of the three. He wrote his account between 1108 and 1112 and it was dedicated to Lisiard, Bishop of Soissons. He had an extensive knowledge of Northern France and thus added some valuable facts about the crusading chiefs from this region. Four MS copies exist.

(8) Krey Introduction, p.13.

CHAPTER II

PREACHING OF FIRST CRUSADE

On March first to the seventh, 1095, a council was held at Piacenza on the order of Pope Urban II. There were present two hundred bishops, more than four thousand of the clergy, and thirty thousand laymen. This council met to decide on the German and anti-pope problem. To this was added the scandal in France, where King Philip had taken for his wife, Bertrada de Montford, the wife of Fulk Rechin of Anjou.

The most important feature of this Council of Piacenza, however, was that an embassy from the Emperor Alexius of the Byzantine Empire appeared and asked for aid from the West. In the message Alexius declared that if aid would be sent, he would do everything in his power to bring the Eastern and Western churches together.

There is a school of thought among historians headed by Riant, Tuthill, Chalandon and Luchaire which disputes the fact that an embassy from the Emperor even appeared at the Council of Piacenza. They held out as their most convincing piece of evidence that Bernold of St. Blasien alone mentioned the envoy's appearance at Piacenza. Today new information has been spread on this issue in that the monk Martin also mentions their
(1)
presence. By this discovery it is now taken for an accepted fact and truth that an embassy for aid from the Emperor was sent to Piacenza and that here the Western world at large was first introduced to the desperate needs of the East. Previous to this

(1) Munro, D.C. "Did the Emperor Alexius Ask for Aid at the Council of Piacenza?" An article in the American Historical Review, July 1922, p.731-3.

Michael VII had sent similar requests to Gregory VII for aid
 (1)a
 against the Turks. Gregory was very interested in the idea of
 a crusade but was too much occupied at home to embark seriously
 upon the undertaking. Thus appeals of aid from the East
 were nothing new to the papacy.

In the words of the chronicler, the Council of Piacenza
 came to no decision upon the war against the infidels. The
 results of the council were anathemas against the emperor of
 Germany and the anti-pope Guibert. King Philip, even though
 he sent envoys to make peace for him with the Pope, was still
 held under the ban of excommunication.

In the months that followed, Pope Urban and a number of
 the high ranking clergy surrounding him, journeyed across to
 France where they preached to various assemblies and, states
 Munro, talked over the deplorable conditions in both East and
 (2)
 West with the important lords and barons. During the summer,
 Urban called another council to meet at Clermont in Auvergne
 on November 18, 1095.

This Council of Clermont lasted for ten days, from the
 eighteenth to the twenty-eighth of the month. The first days
 of the council were concerned with conditions in Europe; it
 reviewed the Truce of God and threatened all who refused to
 accept peace and justice with the thunders of the Church.
 Urban begged them to:

(1)a Tout, T.F. The Empire and the Papacy, p.391.

(2) Munro, D.C. The Kingdom of the Crusaders, p.51.

"Keep the Church in all its orders entirely free from the secular power; to see that simoniacan heresy in no way takes root among you." (3)

On the next to the last day of the council, Pope Urban arose and exchanging the language of the universal Latin Church for the French speech, he delivered the plea for a crusade to the Holy Land.

Urban pictured the humiliation and misery of the provinces of Asia; the profanation of the places made sacred by the presence and footsteps of the Son of God; and then he detailed the conquests of the Turks, until now, with almost all of Asia Minor in their possession, they were threatening Europe from the shores of the Hellespont. After he had described the horrible state of Jerusalem, he said to the gathered crowd:

"On whom, therefore, is the task of avenging these wrongs and of recovering this territory incumbent, if not upon you? You, upon whom above other nations God has conferred remarkable glory in arms, great courage, bodily energy, and the strength to humble the hairy scalp of those who resist you. Oh, most valiant soldiers and descendants of invincible ancestors, be not degenerate, but recall the valor of your forefathers." (4)

He entreated those who were accustomed to wage private warfare with their neighbors to now transfer this fighting to the infidel. To those who might be detained by dependents, Urban declared:

"However, if you are hindered by love of children, parents, and wives, remember what the Lord says in the Gospel, 'he that loveth father, or mother more than me, is not worthy of me.' 'Every one that hath forsaken houses, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or lands for

(3) Fulcher of Chartres Historia Hierosolymitana in Krey, p.27.

(4) Chronicle of Robert the Monk in Krey, p.31.

my name's sake shall receive an hundred-fold and shall inherit everlasting life.' Enter upon the road to the Holy Sepulchre; wrest that land from the wicked race, and subject it to yourselves. That land which, as the Scripture says; 'floweth with milk and honey' was given by God into the possession of the children of Israel." (5)

In calling for volunteers to fight the infidel, Urban asked for all types of men, rich and poor alike, knights as well as foot-soldiers. Urban compared the Franks to the Biblical Maccabees and pleaded with them not to refuse this opportunity to rescue the Holy Land. Urban also stated to them:

"I speak to those present; I proclaim it to the absent; moreover, Christ commands it. And if those who set out thither should lose their lives on the way by land, or in crossing the sea, or in fighting the pagans, their sins shall be remitted. This I grant to all who go, through the power vested in me by God." (6)

The Pope also declared that those who had been robbers should now become soldiers, those who had been mercenaries at low wages now could gain eternal rewards. He pleaded with them that if they must fight to not fight among their own countrymen but to purge the Holy Land of the base infidel.

Urban was very wise in the methods which he used in preaching the crusade at Clermont. By reverting to the French language of his youth he drew the crowd closer to him. He realized the correct emphasis to place upon the valor and courage of the Franks and the necessity of describing in detail the actions and atrocities of the Turks in the Holy Land to stir the crowd's emotions.

(5) Chronicle of Robert the Monk in Krey, p.31.

(6) Fulcher of Chartres Historia Hierosolymitana in Krey, p.29.

A large assembly had gathered for the council, thirteen archbishops, two hundred and twenty-five bishops, a large number of abbots and priests besides thousands of the laity. At the end of this eloquent and stirring speech the enthusiasm of this vast assembly burst through every restraint. The vast multitude arose and answered him with the cry: "DIEU LE VOLT" "DIEU DE VOLT" "It is the will of God!" "It is the will of (7) God."

Hundreds in the assembly came forward and pledged themselves to be participants in the Crusade. The old and feeble were discouraged from entering in the Crusade as they would be more likely to hinder than assist. Women were forbidden to participate unless accompanied by their husbands, brothers or legal guardians. Priests and clerks could not volunteer without the permission of the bishop, and all the laity were required to first receive the blessing of a priest. The enthusiasm reached its peak when the envoys of Count Raymond of Toulouse, declared that their lord, one of the richest and most powerful lords of Southern France, had pledged himself to go on the Crusade. It was also announced at this time that Adhemar, the Bishop of Puy, would go with the Lord of Toulouse, and would serve in the capacity as spiritual leader and adviser of the Crusade.

After the handing out of crosses to those who pledged to go on the Crusade, Urban gave instructions to all that were

(7) Chronicle of Robert the Monk in Krey, p.32.

gathered to return to their regions and there to preach the Crusade. All priests throughout Europe were authorized to give the sacred symbol, with the full papal benediction to the people in their parishes. The Church, to prove her good faith, promised protection to the wives, children, and property of all who undertook the "Way of God." With this, the council was
(8)
dismissed.

Later in December, 1095, Urban sent instructions to the assembling crusaders in which he stated that the Crusade headed by Adhemar, Bishop of Puy, would set out for the Holy Land on
(9)
August 15, 1096. This date was probably set then so it would leave time to make preparations and also so the march would not be in extreme hot weather.

No history of the First Crusade would be complete without including the legend which makes a simple monk, Peter the Hermit, the instigator of the Crusade.

In the pages of the Gesta and those of Fulcher of Chartres there is no mention of Peter the Hermit as the originator of the First Crusade. In the material that is available today the story in its entirety is related only by Albert of Aix. This legend presenting Peter as the creator of the Crusade was passed by Albert of Aix to Guibert de Nogent, William of Tyre and other writers down to today.

As the legend goes, about the year 1092, Peter the Hermit,

(8) Fulcher of Chartres Historia Hierosolymitana in Krey, p.41.

(9) Urban's instructions to the assembling Crusaders in Krey, p.43.

a native of Amiens, went on a pilgrimage with a group of Christians to Palestine. While there Peter learned about the conditions of the Christians in Jerusalem and his sympathy and indignation were stirred by their plight. Wishing to talk over these matters with a member of the Church, he sought out Simeon, the Patriarch of Jerusalem.

The Patriarch told Peter of the misfortunes of the Christians and Peter asked if there was anything he could do to relieve these conditions. At this, the Patriarch could only lament his own powerlessness unless aid could come from the West. Peter then suggested that perhaps a letter could be given him addressed to the Pope and the powers of Europe for aid. This the Patriarch hastened to do. ⁽¹⁰⁾

Soon after this, Peter attended the Church of the Resurrection of the Lord. While there spending the night in prayers he fell asleep. During his sleep a vision came to him in which Christ appeared to him and said:

"Rise, Peter, make haste and do without fear the tasks which have been entrusted to you, for I shall be with you. It is time that the holy places were purged and my servants aided." (11)

Peter in answer to this divine admonition immediately left Jerusalem and set sail for Rome. He arrived in Italy and sought Pope Urban to whom he presented the letter from the Patriarch which told of the sufferings of the Christians in Jerusalem and asked for aid. Urban listened to him and prom-

(10) William of Tyre Vol.I,p.84.

(11) Ibid.

ised him that something would be done.

Such is the legend as is told by Albert of Aix. The legend that Peter the Permit started the Crusade arose naturally in that region where he was the first to preach it. Albert of Aix, who lived there, helped to introduce this legend into literature.

Another reason, perhaps may be cited for the beginning of this legend. Due to the actions and failure of the army which Peter afterwards assembled, later in the march of the First Crusade he became the laughingstock of the army and the butt of their jokes. As the crusaders journeyed through Asia Minor they composed many couplets and songs to cheer themselves up. A daring deed, amusing incidents, a ridiculous situation would all create material for a new verse or song. These songs contained a wide display of emotions. Along with praise, they contained wit, rough humor, and irony. The crusaders took great delight in treating Peter in a mock heroic way. For the short time in Europe when he had enjoyed immense popularity, he was now paid with a period of humiliation, the object of jeers and jokes. However, when these songs and verses passed eventually back to the West, their true feelings were not always understood (11) by those who had not participated on the First Crusade. To the people of the West, these songs appeared to be sober statements of facts. Thus this may account in part for the

(11) Thatcher, O. op.cit., p.511.

legend of Peter the Hermit. Today we know that it was not a simple hermit who prompted and brought about the First Crusade, but instead Pope Urban II.

In describing the consequences in Europe of the preaching of the First Crusade at Clermont, Gibbon writes:

"Due to the efforts of many self-made preachers of the crusade, villages, even towns became void of inhabitants, and sank into ruin. The standard of the cross appeared to them as a certain asylum against misery and oppression. According to the decrees of the Council of Clermont, the crusaders were freed from all imposts, and could not be pursued for debts during their voyage. The assurance of impunity, the hope of a better fate, the love of license, and a desire to shake off the most sacred ties, actuated a vast proportion of the multitude which flocked to the banners of the Crusade."

"Many nobles who had not at first taken the cross, and who saw their vassals set out, without having the power to prevent them, determined to follow them as military chiefs, in order to preserve some portion of their authority."

"Religious sentiments seemed to possess many, and the fever which accompanied it was a blind passion which spoke louder than all others. The power of the laws was reckoned as nothing among men who believed they were fighting in the cause of God. Subjects scarcely acknowledged the authority of princes or lords in anything which concerned the holy war; the master and the slave had no other title than that of Christian, no other duty to perform than that of defending his religion, sword in hand."

"As is often true, madness, the close companion of enthusiasm and credulity began to take form. One group joined together using as its leader a goose, another went forward killing all Jews saying that it was the Christians first duty to destroy all those who had crucified the Lord. Thus some made the Crusade an excuse of wonton rapine, murder and stealing." (13)

The popular enthusiasm reached new heights and the story of miracles spread through Europe. There were said to have

(13) Gibbon, Ed. The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, vol. VI, p. 30-4, Chap. 5.

been seen blood-red clouds floating in the sky, torches of fire flying overhead, and cities in the heavens. People came forward showing crosses which had been stamped on their bodies
(14)
by angels.

In the midst of this excitement and heated enthusiasm. Peter the Hermit's true role in the First Crusade comes to the front. Guibert of Nogent gives these following striking passages in regard to Peter the Hermit's activities:

"Now then, while the princes who felt the need of large funds and the support of numerous followers were making preparations carefully and slowly, the common people, who were poor in substance but abundant in numbers, attached themselves to a certain Peter the Hermit."

"He was from the city of Amiens, if I am not mistaken, and we learned that he had lived as a hermit in the garb of a monk somewhere in Northern Gaul. We beheld him leaving there, with what intent I do not know, and going about through cities and towns under the pretext of preaching. He was surrounded by such great throngs, received such enormous gifts, and was lauded with such fame for holiness that I do not remember anyone to have been held in like honor." (15)

Guibert goes on to say that Peter was very generous and handed out gifts of money to many people. Peter seems to have been a very effective preacher and according to the chronicles, gathered thousands of the common people to his standard. On the whole, his throng was composed of peasants but not all of these were poor as some of them set out in carts drawn by oxen. Peter chose as his aide, Walter the Penniless, a soldier who was a native of Normandy and a son-in-law of Peter de Maule.

(14) Chronicle of Ekkehard of Aura in Krey, p.46.

(15) Chronicle of Guibert of Nogent in Krey, p.47.

The preaching of Peter the Hermit brought some fifteen thousand French pilgrims to Cologne about Easter 1096. These people were anxious to start on the Crusade and did not wish to wait for the main bands which were to begin the march in August. Peter, however, wished to wait awhile longer and to preach among the Germans, but the French would not wait and so set out under the leadership of Peter's aide Walter the Penniless.

Walter and his army took the route by which they passed through Hungary. King Coloman upon hearing their purpose for passing through Hungary permitted them safe transit and established markets in which they could buy supplies. The main body of the army marched into Bulgaria, and to the city of Belgrade. Unknown to Walter, around sixteen of his company remained in Malevilla (Semlin on the Danube) to purchase arms. Some of the Hungarians, noting the absence of the main army, attacked these men, taking their goods, arms, clothing and (16) money.

The army now being encamped in Bulgaria, Walter begged the Bulgarian chiefs to set up a market where they could buy food. This the chiefs refused to do, so the peasants, angry, began to pillage and steal whatever they could. This led to a battle between the crusaders and the Bulgarians, in which a few of the crusaders were killed.

After this loss, the remaining remnants of the army wandered for several days in the forests of Bulgaria. Finally they

(16) Chronicle of Albert of Aix in Krey, p.49.

managed to reach Nish where the duke allowed them provisions. Then without anymore trouble they marched on to Constantinople where they waited for the arrival of Peter the Hermit and his (17) army.

Two weeks after Walter and his army had set out for Constantinople, Peter and his throng began their march. Peter's army was composed of not only Franks, but also Swabians, Bavarians and Lotharingians and was of enormous size. Peter followed the same route as Walter.

The army passed through Germany, Bavaria, and the modern Austria in relative peace, some on foot, some floating down the Danube and other rivers in boats. At Oedenberg they reached the Hungarian frontier, and there awaited Coloman's permission to cross his country. Upon receiving this, they journeyed in peace and good order to Semlin. When they reached Semlin, they saw hanging from the walls of the city the arms and goods of Walter's soldiers, and immediately Peter gave the word to attack. The citizens of the town fled and the crusaders occupied the town. In the next few towns on the march the citizens had fled upon hearing that the army was close, so that there were ample provisions. At Nish the duke allowed the army a market but as some of the army were disorderly he told his subjects to attack them. Many of the crusaders were killed and all their supplies and money was taken. Around seven thousand managed to

(17) Ibid.

survive and these banded together and on August 1, 1096, they
 (18)
 reached Constantinople.

Now that both armies had joined together in Constantinople, Alexius said to them:

"Do not cross the Strait until the chief host of the Christians has come, for you are not so strong that you can do battle with the Turks." (19)

However, the crusaders, whose conduct was rude and disorderly, began to burn and plunder the city. It is even told that they stripped the lead from the churches in Constantinople and sold it to the Greeks. Alexius, angry at these actions, now ordered them to cross the Strait. With the aid of the Emperor's ships, they passed over the Strait of St. George and entered Cappadocia. From the region of Cappadocia they marched to Nicomedia, and made camp near the port of Civitote.

While the armies were resting at Civitote the Emperor's ships keep them constantly supplied with foodstuffs of various kind. Also Alexius sent messages to Peter in which he advised the crusaders to not venture into the mountainous region of Nicaea.

For several months, the army obeyed the advice of the Emperor. Finally against the pleas of Peter, a group of the crusaders began to wander into the territory belonging to Kiliz Arslan Daud, stealing and plundering the land. The other main
 (19)a
 group, which was Alemanni in nationality, seeing the plunder

(18) Ibid., p. 51.

(19) Chronicle of Anonymi Gesta in Krey, p. 71.

(19)a People of the stem-duchies of Germany.

which the other crusaders had captured, decided to venture out on their own.

The Alemanni entered the territory of the Sultanate of Rum, also and advanced four days beyond Nicaea. They found a fortress, Xerogord, which its inhabitants had deserted and seized it. In a short time, Kiliz Arslan Daud, learning of the capture of Xerogord arrived to besiege it. Outside of the fortress there was located a cistern. The Turks found a number of the crusaders here as they were trying to obtain water and killed them. After this had been done, Kiliz Arslan besieged the fort. As there was no water supply, the people inside were in dire straits. This siege lasted around eight days. (20)

Finally the leader of the Alemanni made an agreement with the Turks to surrender his companions to them and he, pretending to go out and fight against the Turks, fled over to their side. The people inside the fort were either killed or were carried off in chains to Chorosan, Antioch or Aleppo as slaves.

Kiliz Arslan, now learning of the larger body of troops located near Civitote began his march there. Peter the Hermit was no longer with the troops; he had become discouraged with their complete disregard of his pleas to restrain themselves and had returned to Constantinople. The Turks now rushed down upon the camp and Walter, unable to muster any control over them, saw them plunged by their own recklessness into destruction. Thousands of the pilgrims were immediately killed, including

(20) Ibid.

(21)

Walter the Penniless.

A number of the crusaders managed to escape and fled to a deserted fortress near Civitote. The Turks rushed to the fort and began to set it afire. They also aimed their arrows high, so that they would fall inside the fort thereby killing the remnants of the armies. By this last battle, the peasant armies of Peter and Walter were completely wiped out.

It is an interesting point that none of the chroniclers place the blame for the failure and destruction of these armies upon Peter or Walter. They are agreed in the decision that the peasants were rude, disorderly and would not listen to the good advice of their leaders. This is not only the decision of William of Tyre, but also Fulcher of Chartres and Albert of Aix.

The complete destruction of these armies made a huge mound of bones which, states Anna Comnena:

was as lofty as a mountain, and occupying a space very conspicuous for its width and depth. So high did that mound of bones tower, that some barbarians of the same race as the killed later used the bones of the slain instead of stones in constructing a wall, thus making that fortress a sort of sepulchre for them." (22)

As late as the fifteenth century, visitors to the Holy Land were shown this wall, which served as a tribute to the armies of Peter the Hermit and Walter the Penniless.

(21) Ibid., p.72.

(22) Anna Comnena Alexiad in Krey, p.77.

CHAPTER III

PERSONNEL OF THE FIRST CRUSADE

MARCH TO CONSTANTINOPLE

In the months after the Council of Clermont, the various lords who had agreed to participate on the Crusade prepared the equipment which it was thought would be sufficient for so long a journey. Each tried to estimate the amount of traveling money necessary, in accordance with the length of the way.

The choice of different routes by the leaders indicated careful planning and correspondence among them. It was fortunate that in 1095 both the land and sea routes were open; the former had been made possible by the conversion of the Hungarians to Christianity early in the century; the latter, by the expulsion of the Moslems from Sicily in 1091. The crusaders separated into five bands making as their meeting place the city of Nicaea.⁽¹⁾

Hugh the Great of Vermandois, the brother of Philip I of France, commanded the contingent from the Ile de France. Due to probable financial aid from Philip, Hugh gathered around him a fine army of knights. He had, however, few of the qualities of a great commander and played only an insignificant part in the Crusade.

Among the most powerful leaders who took part was Count Raymond of Toulouse. His army was composed of the men of the Langue d'Oc. Raymond had been merely Count of St. Giles but through the death of his older brother William, while on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, he had become in 1093, Duke of Narbonne,

(1) Fulcher of Chartres Historia Hierosolymitana in Krey, p.57.

Count of Toulouse and Marquis of Provence. In his band there were men from all these fiefs. Raymond was older than the other crusading chiefs, now being past fifty years of age. In his company there was also Adhemar, Bishop of Puy, the Papal legate. Raymond was very experienced in warfare as he had fought in the Spanish wars. Thus being wealthy and experienced he was able to attract many to his army, which is described by the chroniclers as numbering 100,000 men. Raymond was accompanied on the Crusade by his third wife, Elvira, natural daughter of Alfonso VI, king of Leon and Castile, and their son, who was quite young and whose name has not been preserved.⁽²⁾

Another army marched under Godfrey of Lorraine with his two brothers, Baldwin and Eustace. Godfrey's forces were drawn chiefly from the regions of modern Belgium, Luxemburg, adjacent Northern France, and the lower Rhine country which was then included in the duchy of lower Lorraine. Their father, Eustace II of Boulogne, had accompanied William on his expedition to England and even before then had played a prominent part in English politics. Through their mother Ida, they were perhaps descended from Charles the Great; and Godfrey claimed the duchy of Lorraine, which was confirmed to him while still a youth by the Emperor Henry IV.⁽³⁾ His early manhood was spent in war and politics; he fought for Henry against Rudolph

(2) Ordericus Vitalis Vol.III,p.68.

(3) Archer and Kingsford, The Crusades p.42.

and Gregory. Before the First Crusade, Godfrey figures as a somewhat turbulent noble of no particular piety. However, in the years that followed when Godfrey became the hero of the First Crusade, men loved to think of Godfrey of Bouillon as marked out from his infancy for his high career.

One of the most able leaders of the First Crusade was Bohemond, the first son of Robert Guiscard. Before the First Crusade Bohemond had made a name for himself by his exploits in Apulia, Calabria and by the side of his father in their battles with Alexius, the Byzantine Emperor. (4)

Robert Guiscard was one of the sons of Tancred de Hauteville of Normandy. He had left Normandy while still a young man and in 1046 had journeyed to his brother Drogo's stronghold in Apulia, Italy. In the years that followed Robert Guiscard conquered Calabria and on the death of his brother in 1057 he became the Count of Apulia.

Robert longed for the opportunity whereby the Normans would become once and for all legal rulers in Southern Italy. This opportunity presented itself in the church controversy between Nicholas II and Benedict X. From this time on, the Church and the Normans worked together.

There were many Byzantine strongholds in Apulia, and from the beginning of the Norman activity in Southern Italy there had been a great deal of trouble between the two. Robert con-

(4) Haskins, Charles H. The Normans in European History p.205.

tinued this policy and in 1061 successfully forced the Byzantines from the coast of Apulia.

Of all the great projects carried on by Robert Guiscard, the most ambitious by far was his attempted conquest of the Byzantine Empire. In the spring of 1081 this venture against the Byzantines began. Robert Guiscard and his son, Bohemond, first attacked the island of Corfu and capturing it, marched on against Durazzo. The Emperor Alexius soon arrived on the scene with a large army which, however, the Normans soon defeated.

In 1082, the town of Durazzo surrendered to Robert and the army advanced farther east into the province of Illyria. It now seemed that Robert would encounter little trouble on his march to Constantinople.

This glorious advance was suddenly cut short by the news from Italy that Henry IV was descending upon Apulia, which had once more flared up in revolt against Robert. Henry also seemed at the point of capturing Rome and Gregory VII had sent numerous appeals for aid to Robert. Robert decided that he must leave and on his departure placed Bohemond at the head of the army.

During Robert's absence, Bohemond was successful in defeating another army sent against him by Alexius. In the spring of 1083, Alexius sent an even larger army against the Normans and

this time Bohemond and his army were badly defeated. All provisions were destroyed and many of his soldiers deserted going over to Alexius or returning to Italy.

In 1084, Bohemond returned to Salerno and told Robert that the expedition had failed. Robert, never to be discouraged, began preparations for another attack upon the Empire.

On this last expedition, Bohemond and Robert managed to recapture Corfu but as it was getting winter the army encamped near the Glycis River in Epirus. During this winter of 1084-5, hunger and cold so weakened the troops encamped on the Glycis that violent dysentery broke out and destroyed the greater part of the army. Bohemond fell ill and was sent back to Apulia. On 17th of July, 1085, Robert Guiscard died and soon afterwards his remaining troops returned to Italy.

Bohemond was born of his father's first marriage which was to a rather insignificant Norman lady. Robert Guiscard married a second time to Sykelgaita, a Salerno princess, and by this marriage had Roger Borsa. Thus it was Roger Borse who obtained all Robert Guiscard's territory and wealth at his death. The only property which Bohemond obtained was that of the port of Otranto.⁽⁵⁾

Anna Comnena has this to say of him:

"Bohemond took after his father in all things, audacity, bodily strength, and untameable temper. These two, father and son, might rightly be termed 'the caterpillar and the locust' for whatever escaped Robert, Bohemond took and devoured."

(5) Chronicle of Anonymi Gesta in Krey, p. 62.

Bohemond first heard of the Crusade when he was participating in the siege of Amalfi on the sea of Salerno in the year 1095. It is reported that Bohemond heard that an army of Franks had come through Italy on their way to Jerusalem to fight the infidel. He ask what fighting arms these people carried, and what sign or cry they used. The reply was:

"They bear arms suitable for battle; on the right shoulder or between both shoulders, they wear the cross of Christ; they cry 'God wills it! God wills it!' They shout in truth with one voice." (6)

As soon as he heard this, he ordered his best cloak to be brought to him and he immediately begin cutting it up into crosses. Many of the knights engaged in the siege rushed to him to procure a cross. After this Bohemond returned, writes the author of the Gesta, to his own land, most probably Apulia, and there began his plans for the Crusade.

The band which accompanied Bohemond included Tancred, his nephew (later to be immortalized in Tasso's Jerusalem Delivered); Richard of Principati, and Rianulf, his brother; Robert of Anse; Herman of Cannae; Robert of Durda Valley; Robert, son of Tostanus; Hunfred, son of Raoul; Richard, son of Count Rainulf; the Count of Roscignolo with his brothers, Boellus of Chartres, Albert of Cagnano, and Hunfred of MT. Scaglioso. Ordericus Vitalis declares that they unanimously attached themselves to Bohemond and took a solemn oath to submit to his command devoutly and constantly in their holy enterprise.

(6) Ibid.

(7) Ordericus Vitalis Vol.III,p.83.

Tancred was the son of Bohemond's half sister, Emma. His father, according to William of Tyre, was William the Marquis,⁽⁸⁾ but is named Odo by others. Later legend was to endow Tancred with a Saracen father. In later years, Tancred became one of the heroes of the Crusade and to him is attributed the real spirit of chivalry and the true virtues of a perfect knight.

At the head of the fifth and last band was Robert, Duke of Normandy; his sister's husband, Stephen, count of Blois and Chartres; and his cousin, Robert of Flanders. They headed a large army of Normans, Angles and Bretons.

Upon William the Conqueror's conquest of England, he had left the duchy of Normandy in the hands of his eldest son, Robert. Difficulties between the two arose as early as 1074. Robert tried constantly to beg his father to hand the duchy over to him while William was still alive. Even though William had named Robert as his successor in the duchy of Normandy before the conquest of England, William entertained no idea of giving it up during his lifetime.

A number of times as a result of this, Robert was exiled from the duchy and wandered over Europe, spending a great deal of money and going deep into debt.

The best description of Robert's character is to be found in the pages of Ordericus Vitalis:

"The duke was personally brave and daring, and had many

(8) William of Tyre Vol.I,p.134.

merits; was a good speaker, but inconsiderate in conducting his affairs, profuse in spending, and liberal in his promises, while no dependence could be placed upon them; he was compassionate to those who implored his mercy, but too gentle and easy in executing justice on offenders; changeable in his resolutions, and too affable and condescending in his general behavior, he was held in contempt by the evil-minded and those who wanted discretion; his figure was short and corpulent, from which his father gave him the surname of Curthouse. Endeavouring to please all, he gave, promised, or yielded what everyone asked. His prodigality led him daily to lessen the domains of his ancestors, absurdly granting whatever was demanded of him, so that he impoverished himself while he augmented the power of others to injure him." (9)

Robert proved so generous with his funds that his treasury soon began to be empty. He sent word to his brother Henry to lend him some money, a request which Henry was loath to fulfill. When Robert suggested that in return he would sell him some of his territory, Henry then became very interested. Terms were decided upon, by which Henry paid the duke three thousand pounds of silver and received in exchange the whole of the district of the Cotentin, a large concession. (10)

At the time of the beginning of the Crusade in 1096, Robert was in warfare with Henry and William Rufus. Robert decided to join the Crusade and as he needed money for the Crusade he decided to intrust the government of his duchy to his brother, the king of England. William Rufus heard this with a great deal of satisfaction and told Robert he would receive Normandy for a period of five years, advancing Robert ten thousand silver marks. It is said that William Rufus obtained twice

(9) Ordericus Vitalis Vol.II,p.428.

(10) Ibid.,p.431.

this much revenue from the duchy of Normandy in the following year.

Count Stephen of Blois, son-in-law of the Conqueror, was one of the wealthiest of the participants and is said to have had three hundred and sixty-five castles, one for each day in the year. Later in the Crusade he was accused of desertion, so his fame as an outstanding crusader is rather clouded.

Robert II, count of Flanders, succeeded his father, Robert I, the Frisian, in 1093. The latter had made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem in atonement for his sins sometime in the decade before his death. He had visited Alexius and after his return to Flanders had kept in correspondence with the Emperor. Robert II, famed for his piety as well as courage, thus had a traditional interest in the warfare against the Turks and the recovery of the Holy Land. He was a cousin of Robert of Normandy.

Hugh the Great was the first crusader to begin on the Crusade. As no chronicler accompanied Hugh, we have little knowledge on his march to Constantinople as recorded by the Western writers. When Hugh first decided to participate, Anna Comnena states, he sent a letter to Alexius which read:

"Know, O King, that I am King of Kings, and superior to all who are under the sky. You are now permitted to greet me, on my arrival, and to receive me with magnificence, as befits my nobility." (11)

(11) Anna Comnena Alexiad in Krey, p.79.

Alexius upon receiving the letter immediately sent a message to the Governor of Durazzo telling him to watch closely by land and sea for Hugh. In the intervening time, Hugh arrived on the Lombardian coast, and from here he sent twenty-four envoys to the Governor of Durazzo. These envoys gave this message to the Governor:

"Be it known to you, O Governor, that our lord, Hugh, will soon be here, bringing with him from Rome the golden banner of St. Peter; moreover, know that he is the highest leader of all the armies of France. Prepare yourself, therefore, to receive him and the army obeying him according to the dignity of his power; and gird yourself about to meet him." (12)

While these envoys were delivering this message to the Governor, Hugh the Great left Bari for Illyricum and was caught in a very bad storm. Many of his ships were destroyed, in turn killing quite a few of his soldiers. However, the boat in which Hugh was in managed to reach the coast, where it was met by several men from the Governor. He was immediately conveyed to the Governor who gave him clothes and gifts to replace those which he had lost. (13)

As soon as Alexius received word that Hugh had arrived in Durazzo, he sent Butumiles to Durazzo with orders to bring Hugh back with him to Constantinople. Anna Comnena states that Alexius treated Hugh very kindly and gave him many rich gifts, and at the same time urged Hugh to pledge an oath of fealty to him. (14) However, it is possible to deduce from this

- (12) Ibid.
- (13) Ibid.
- (14) Ibid.

that Hugh was more-or-less a captive and did not altogether enjoy freedom, an idea which is expressed by Fulcher of
(15)
Chartres.

The second army to take leave of Europe was that of Godfrey of Iorraine. They began approximately on August 15, 1096. The route which this army chose to use was that one used by Peter the Hermit, through Hungary.

At Tollenburg in the realm of Austria, the army stopped and stayed for about three months in September. They did this to discuss and to work upon a plan of action in regard to the troubles which the earlier bands had forgone. They decided to send an embassy to King Coloman to discuss these wrongs and to institute peace. Its leader was Godfrey of Ascha who had had previous dealings with King Coloman and twelve other
(16)
knights.

A treaty was arranged between the envoys and the King whereby Baldwin, the brother of Godfrey, and his family would be sent as hostages to the king in order that the march of the army would be a peaceful one.

Baldwin agreed to this action and the negotiations were completed. Godfrey announced to the army that at the sentence of death, they should neither touch nor take by force anything in the kingdom of Hungary, nor create any trouble in any way. At the same time, the King told his citizens to

(15) Fulcher of Chartres Historia Hierosolymitana in Krey, p.56.

(16) Chronicle of Albert of Aix in Krey, p.58.

create markets at reasonable prices whereby the crusaders
(17)
could obtain all their provisions.

The march through Hungary proved to be very successful and no damage was inflicted by either side. At the frontier town of Francavilla, the King arrived with Baldwin thus returning the hostage to the army.

Shortly after the army crossed the Save, legates of the Emperor met them with the message that markets would be supplied for them along the way where they could buy their regular supplies. Alexius kept his word and grain, oil, and wine were supplied along the route.

However, at Philippopolis, Godfrey received word that Alexius was holding Hugh the Great a prisoner at Constantinople. Upon hearing this, Godfrey sent an embassy to Alexius demanding the release of Hugh the Great and his men, or that he (Godfrey) in return, would not keep loyalty and friendship to the
(18)
Emperor.

When the messengers returned, they told Godfrey that Alexius had not given up the captives. Godfrey and his army, now infuriated, refused to keep their treaty of peace with the Emperor. At a command by Godfrey, the crusaders began to plunder the region and staying there for eight days ruined the whole region.

When the Emperor heard of the destruction wrought by

(17) Ibid., p. 59.

(18) Ibid., p. 60.

Godfrey's army, he sent word that if the army would discontinue their plundering that he would without delay give back the captives whom the Duke demanded. Pleased by these words, Godfrey forbade plunder and continued on to Constantinople.

In a few days, Godfrey and his army drew up their quarters outside the gates of Constantinople, and was there welcomed
(19)
by Hugh and the rest of the captives.

Bohemond's army left Europe October 26, 1096. They marched to Italy, crossing the sea from Apulia to Durazzo. In this region of Bulgaria there were provisions and supplies for all. When all his men had arrived and met in the valley of Andronopoli, Bohemond gave a message to the army in which he stated:

"Seignors, take heed all of you, for we are pilgrims of God. We ought, therefore, to be better and more humble than before. Do not plunder this land, since it belongs to Christians, and let no one, at the cost of blessing, take more than he needs to eat." (20)

Two months later the army arrived at Castoria where they remained for several days. While there they endeavored to obtain a market, but the people would not allow one to be set up because they feared the army. As a result, the band took all the provisions and livestock that they could find.

Upon leaving Castoria, they marched to Pelagonia, in which was a strong fortified town belonging to a group of so-called Christian heretics. The author of the Gesta writes

(19) Ibid., p. 61.

(20) Chronicle of Anonymi Gesta in Krey, p. 62.

that the army, feeling it their duty, attacked the town, and
 burned it to the ground with all the people captive inside. (21)
 Later, the army reached the river Vardar. Bohemond went across
 with his people, however, the Count of Roscignolo and his
 brothers with a few of their men remained behind,

While Bohemond was marching ahead, an army of the Emperor's
 attacked the Count and his followers. Tancred and some other
 soldiers of Bohemond's band returned to help the Count. The
 crusaders managed by these combined efforts to defeat this
 army. Several of the soldiers in the Emperor's army were
 captured and these they brought before Bohemond who ask them
 why they had attacked the crusaders. They answered that they
 were in the service of the Emperor and that whatever he
 commanded them to do they had to fulfill. (22)

Soon after this, the Emperor sent one of his high officials,
 the curator of the palace, to conduct Bohemond's army the rest
 of the way in safety and provide for markets. Under the
 protection of this man, events remained peaceful and there was
 little disorder.

Around April 10,1097, the army approached the city of Rusa.
 Here Bohemond left the army, placing it under the command of
 Tancred, and proceeded on to Constantinople to confer and talk
 with the Emperor.

The fourth army led by Raymond, Count of Toulouse, and

(21) Ibid.,p.63.
 (22) Ibid.

including Adhemar, the Bishop of Puy, left Europe about two weeks after Bohemond's army. It was October 31, or the first of November, 1096. Because of their late start it was already winter when they marched through Slavonia. (23)

Slavonia was both a desert and mountainous and game along this route was scarce. The inhabitants of this region would not trade with the crusaders or offer them guidance. The Slavonians were constantly making attacks upon Raymond's army, trying to steal their possessions and supplies.

Raymond, with that careful consideration for the weak which seems to have marked his character, did his best to hold at bay the rude natives, who dogged his rear craving for the plunder of the sick and old. To discourage this conduct, he cut off the noses, hands and feet of his captives, and in this condition sent them as examples back to their comrades. Although Raymond was cruel to his enemies, he was considerate of his own army. He was always the last to encamp, writes his chronicler Raymond of Aguilers, and while the others were resting he worked and planned late into the night. (24)

At Scutari Bodin, the king of the Slavonians, after Raymond swore friendship with him and gave him a large tribute, promised to provide markets for the crusaders. This promise the king did not fulfill and affairs continued as before. Raymond's chronicler says:

(23) Chronicle of Raymond of Aguilers in Krey, p. 64.

(24) Ibid., p. 65.

"But this was a vain expectation, for we did penance enough for the peace we had sought when thereafter the Slavonians, raging in their usual manner, killed our men and took from the unarmed what they could." (25)

The army now marched to Durazzo. The crusaders felt much better now because they felt that they were in the lands of friends and affairs would be better. However, this proved to be far from true. They attacked the Christians constantly and stole from them. During one of these raids, a number of the knights of Raymond's band were killed. Soon after this letters came from the Emperor which

talked about peace, brotherhood, and, as I may also say, about alliance; this, however, was a snare in words. For in front and behind, to right and to left, Turks and Cumans, Uzi, Tanaces, Patzinaks, and Bulgarians were lying in ambush for us. (26)

Soon after this a dangerous incident occurred. While the army was in the region of Pelagonia, the Bishop of Puy ventured a distance from the rest of the group in order to find a resting place for himself and his horse. However, he was captured by the Patzinaks. They knocked him from his horse and hit him on the head. Luckily the rest of the group overheard the quarreling among the Patzinaks over the Bishop's gold and he was rescued. (27)

This state of events continued throughout the most part of the march. At Bucinat (probably modern Wodena) the Patzinaks again attacked the army and it was only due to the fact that Raymond had been forewarned that the army was saved intact.

(25) Ibid.

(26) Ibid., p. 66.

(27) Ibid.

When the army reached the city of Rusa, feeling that its citizens were also disposed to attack the crusaders, Raymond ordered an attack upon the city. The outer walls were destroyed and a great deal of plunder and supplies were taken.

Upon the army's arrival in Rodosto, the envoys which Raymond had sent to the Emperor met the army. The message that they brought from the Emperor was that Raymond should leave the army and come immediately to Constantinople. The messengers said that Bohemond, Godfrey and the other princes wished Raymond to come as soon as possible and that plans for the march through Asia Minor must be made. Finally, Raymond decided that it would perhaps be best to hasten to Constantinople so he left the army, and proceeded with a small unit of men
(28)
to Constantinople.

The fifth and last of the crusading armies under the leadership of Robert of Normandy began their march between the months of September and November, 1096.

They marched through Italy stopping at Lucca where they met with the Pope. They also went through Rome, where the army visited and prayed in the church of St. Peter. Finally upon leaving Rome, they marched through Campagna and reached Bari, the Apulian seaport town. Because it was late in the year and winter was beginning to set in and because of the lack of able seamen, it was decided to postpone the trip until the end of

(28) Ibid.

the winter season. Robert of Normandy decided to spend the months in Italy among his Norman brethren. Robert of Flanders, however, did not wish to wait, so with his followers, he crossed the Adriatic, and seems to have reached Constantinople a little before Raymond of Toulouse. While the leaders were resting in Italy, Fulcher writes of the lower ranks of the army:

"Then many of the crusaders, abandoned by their leaders, and fearing future want, sold their weapons there and, taking up again their pilgrims' staves, ignominiously returned to their homes. This desertion debased them before God and man, and it redounded to their shame." (31)

In March, 1097, Robert and Stephen of Blois with their followers returned to the coast. On the 5th of April, they set sail for the port of Brindisi. While crossing, one of their vessels sank and about four hundred persons were drowned. Their horses and supplies were lost and a great deal of their money was also lost. The effect on the crusaders is perfectly described by Fulcher, who writes:

"At the sight of this disaster we were much afraid, so much so that many weak hearted, who had not yet embarked, returned to their homes, giving up the journey, and saying that never again would they trust themselves to the treacherous sea." (32)

At the end of four days, the army reached Durazzo. Their army passed safely through the region of Bulgaria and across Thessaly to Salavonia and pitched their tents outside the walls of Constantinople. They arrived approximately around the 14th

- (29) Fulcher of Chartres Historia Hierosolymitana in Krey, p.61.
- (30) Ibid.
- (31) Ibid., p.62.
- (32) Ibid., p.67.

(33)
of May, 1097. In part it can be explained why Robert's army was able to pass unhindered through this region. In the first place, Robert's army passed much later through this region and in the second place, it is believed that his army was in a degree somewhat smaller than those of the previous armies, particularly that of Raymond of Toulouse.

(33) Ibid., p. 68.

CHAPTER IV

EMPEROR ALEXIUS AND THE CRUSADERS

BATTLE OF NICAEA

Hugh of Vermondois was the first crusader to arrive in Constantinople; thus he was the first to deal with the Emperor. Hugh the Great was not altogether free to do as he pleased, and he was the first to submit to the oath of fealty to the Emperor.

Godfrey and his army were the first large band to reach Constantinople. They arrived two days before Christmas, 1096, and placed their camp around the walls of the city. In a short time, messengers from the Emperor came to see Godfrey and ask him to come to the palace. However, in this region there were living some French people and these fellow countrymen warned Godfrey of the wiles and intrigues of the Emperor, and that Godfrey should not go to see him. As a (1) consequence of this, Godfrey refused to enter Constantinople.

When Alexius heard this news, he became quite angry and refused them the privilege of buying and selling. Soon the crusaders were in desperate straits and due to the pleadings of Baldwin, brother of Godfrey, they began to plunder and steal from the surrounding land. Alexius, seeing this destruction being wrought, immediately set up markets once more.

In the latter part of the eleventh century the coast of the Bosphorus beyond the Golden Horn to the Black Sea was bordered for some thirty miles with the palaces of the Byzantine nobles. Alexius, wishing to remove the crusading

(1) Chronicle of Albert of Aix in Krey, p.80.

army from such a close position to Constantinople, sent envoys asking Godfrey to move his army to these palaces. This
(2)
Godfrey agreed to do and the army changed its camp.

Shortly after the exodus of the crusaders from the walls of Constantinople, envoys again arrived to entreat Godfrey to visit the Emperor. For the second time, Godfrey refused Alexius's offer for a visit. Instead he sent some of his own nobles to Alexius with this excuse:

"Duke Godfrey to the Emperor; trust and obedience.
Willingly and eagerly would I come before you to look upon the wealth and glory of your house-hold, were it not that many evil rumors, which have come to my ears regarding you, have terrified me. However, I know not whether these reports have been invented and spread about from envy or malice toward you." (3)

For about two weeks, messages were sent back and forth between Alexius and Godfrey, each voicing his own innocence and good faith. Alexius, now angry at Godfrey's continued delay, again suspended all the markets and refused the crusaders provisions and supplies.

Godfrey, hearing of this new order, gave the command to his army to arm itself and immediately return to the walls around Constantinople. Upon leaving, however, the army destroyed the buildings and palaces in which they had been lodged, setting fire to them and creating a great deal of damage. At the bridge which spanned the straits between the palaces and Constantinople, a heavy battle was fought between

(2) Ibid., p.81.

(3) Ibid., p.82.

(4)

the crusaders and the soldiers of Alexius. After the battle, the Duke's army wandered about plundering the land of the Emperor for six days. Alexius, dismayed at all these proceedings, sent the following message to the Duke:

"Let enmity between you and us cease. Let the Duke, upon receiving hostages as a pledge from me, advance without any doubt that he will come and return unharmed, assured of all the honor and glory which we are able to give him and his people." (5)

After this message, Godfrey agreed to met with the Emperor if valuable hostages would be provided.

Soon after the envoys from Alexius had left, legates arrived from Bohemond with the message:

"Bohemond, the most wealthy prince of Sicily and Calabria, asks that you by no means enter into peace with the Emperor; but that you withdraw to Adrianople and Philippopolis, cities of the Bulgarians, and pass the winter there. You may be certain that this same Bohemond will come to your aid with all his troops early in the month of March, to attack the Emperor and to invade his kingdom." (6)

Godfrey, after consulting with his men, sent a message in which he said that he felt the best policy for the crusading chiefs to follow was that of accepting the oath from the Emperor and that their main aim was the capture of Jerusalem rather than the Byzantine Empire.

Alexius, wishing to complete the negotiations for the Duke's visit, sent his son John as a hostage to the crusading band. Godfrey hastened to the palace of the Emperor's and

(4) Ibid.

(5) Ibid., p.83.

(6) Ibid., p.84. There is some question as to the reliability of this message. The author of the Gesta does not mention this message and it seems that a decision as important as this would have been included.

there accepted the oath of fealty. Alexius in return presented Godfrey with gifts of money and garments.

This oath of fealty which Alexius resolved all the crusading chiefs would take resembled the vassal-lord compact of the West. In this oath the chiefs promised that whatever conquests they might make elsewhere on their own, everything that had once belonged to the Empire should revert to it (7) again. Alexius, in turn, promised to make good the losses of the armies and that he would see that markets and provisions would be supplied to them throughout their march.

Around 1081, Alexius had granted the Venetians the privilege to buy and sell in all parts of the Byzantine Empire without the payment of any duties or taxes. Customs and fiscal agents were even prohibited from examining the Venetians' merchandise. (8) Now with the aid of the small Byzantine navy and the larger one of the Venetians, Alexius proposed to keep good his promise of keeping the crusaders in supplies.

A little after this, Alexius asked the Duke to move his army across the sea to the plains of Cappadocia, because the crusaders were still inflicting heavy damage upon the palaces on the straits. Around the 21st of January, 1097, Godfrey led his troops across to Asia.

Around April 10, 1097, Bohemond appeared before the Emperor along with Godfrey and his brothers. Bohemond's biographer

{7} Anna Comnena Alexiad in Krey, p.90.

{8} Diehl, C. History of the Byzantine Empire, p.121.

states that since the Emperor feared Bohemond so greatly, he declared that if Bohemond would willingly take the oath, he would give him, in return, "land in extent from Antioch fifteen (9) days journey, and eight in width." The Emperor swore to him that if Bohemond loyally observed that oath, he would never pass on Antioch which from this time was to belong to Bohemond. This incident seems very odd since Antioch had formerly been one of the key cities of the Byzantine Empire and also by the fact that the other contemporary writers do not mention it. Consequently, there is some doubt whether this was written before or after Antioch was taken.

Bohemond accepted the oath from Alexius willingly enough. Anna Comnena writes:

"The Emperor then summoned Bohemond and exacted from him the usual oath of the Latins. The latter, knowing well his own resources, and realizing that he was neither of noble birth nor well supplied by fortune with wealth, for he had not great forces, but only a moderate number of Gauls with him, and being, besides, dishonest in character, readily submitted himself to the will of the Emperor." (10)

When the army of Bohemond approached Constantinople, Tancred and Richard of Principati, and almost the whole army crossed the Strait by stealth to avoid the oath to the Emperor. Thus, of the main leaders, Tancred was the only one who escaped the oath and then only for a brief time. The Gesta reports of Tancred:

(9) Chronicle of Anonymi Gesta in Krey, p.93.

(10) Anna Comnena Alexiad in Krey, p.95.

"He came to get himself a kingdom, should he find himself a yoke." (11)

Although his army had crossed over into Asia, Bohemond stayed behind with the Emperor, in order to plan with him how they might provide a market for the people who were beyond the city of Nicaea.

Raymond of Toulouse arrived at Constantinople April 21, 1097. The Emperor sent messages to Raymond to come into the city and meet with him. However, while at Constantinople, Raymond received news that during his absence the Emperor's troops had attacked his men. Raymond, furious at this news, asked the other crusading chiefs to help him avenge these wrongs done to his army. However, Godfrey and Bohemond said that they would not help him fight against Alexius and Bohemond even declared that he would aid the Emperor in the
(12)
case of trouble.

Nothing could induce Raymond to become the Emperor's liegeman, for he said that he had not come all this distance to only find himself another lord. Finally, Raymond accepted the oath in a modified way. He swore that neither in person nor through another would he discredit the life or honor of Alexius. Anna Comnena states that even though Raymond took the oath in a modified way, Alexius saw in him a man far superior to the others and thus took him into his confidence.

(11) Chronicle of Anonymi Gesta in Krey, p.94.

(12) Chronicle of Raymond of Aguilers in Krey, p.98.

Alexius told him his suspicions in regard to the intentions and plans of the Gauls. Anna's terminology is somewhat confused, as she uses both Latins and Gauls in referring to the crusading band. In this incident, however, I believe she is specifically referring to the Normans. He also warned him to keep close watch against the malice of Bohemond and that if Bohemond tried to break his agreement to stop him in everyway. This Raymond, so Anna reports, promised to do. (13)

May 14, Robert of Normandy's army arrived at Constantinople. The Emperor requested that he camp outside the wall of the city for fear that some more damage might be done to the city. A few of the host at different times were allowed to enter the city, but the number was always kept very low. (14) Within a short time, Robert of Normandy and Stephen of Blois took the oath and both received as was the custom of Alexius, a large array of fine gifts.

All the crusading chiefs now joined together with Alexius to plan the coming march through Asia Minor to Jerusalem. Alexius showed them the methods and means of warfare the Turks used, gave directions as to how the line of battle should be drawn up, how ambushes should be set and finally, how they ought not to follow the fleeing Turks too far. He also planned with them in regard to their line of supply which he promised to see that it was not broken. (15)

- (13) Anna Comnena Alexiad in Krey, p.99.
- (14) Fulcher of Chartres Historia Hierosolymitana in Krey, p.100.
- (15) Anna Comnena Alexiad in Krey, p.97.

Around May 14 Godfrey and his army went to Nicomedia, with Tancred commanding Bohemond's troops. As there was no road open from Nicomedia to Nicaea by which the crusaders could pass, men were sent ahead to cut and clear a road. The road was cut through a large mountain and along the way iron and wooden crosses were placed so that the crusaders (16) would not lose the way.

Before Bohemond's arrival, there was a dire shortage of bread among the bands. After Bohemond came, in a short while provisions were sent from Constantinople both by land and sea.

The city of Nicaea was very strongly fortified due to natural conditions and also to the ardor of the Turks. On the west of Nicaea there was a large lake flowing up to the wall; and on the remaining three sides there were moats filled with the overflow of certain streams. Also the city was encircled by very high walls.

Godfrey and Bohemond and their armies now began to attack the city. They constructed machines of wood and wooden towers, with which they hoped to be able to destroy the towers on the walls of Nicaea. This attack, however, did little to shake the Turkish stronghold. The Turks in Nicaea though began to send messages to their comrades for aid. They told their Turkish comrades to enter the middle gate, as the crusaders (17) were too weak to guard all the entrances to the city.

(16) Chronicle of Anonymi Gesta in Krey, p.101.

(17) Ibid.

Luckily for the crusaders, Raymond and his army had now arrived at Nicaea. The city was now besieged by Bohemond from the north, by Godfrey from the east and by the Count of Toulouse from the center. As Raymond was preparing to encamp with his men, the Turks, descended from the mountains in two squadrons, attacking Raymond's army. The Turkish plan was that one party would attack the Duke on the east, and the other party, entering the middle gate of the city and passing (18) out through another, would surprise Raymond. This plan failed, as both Godfrey and Raymond came out the victors and put the Turks to flight.

After this battle, Raymond and Adhemar, Bishop of Puy, counseled together and planned how they might undermine a certain tower which was close to their place of encampment. Soldiers were assigned to do the digging, with bowmen to defend them from the Turks. These men dug to the foundations of the wall and laid timbers under it and then set it afire. This operation was completed near nightfall, however, and now the crusaders could not see to fight with the Turks. During the night, the Turks quickly built up and restored the wall so securely that when day broke, Nicaea was in no danger at all. Approximately four weeks had now been spent with little (19) accomplished.

In the fifth week, Robert and Stephen arrived at the

(18) Chronicle of Raymond of Aguilers in Krey, p.104.

(19) Chronicle of Anonymi Gesta in Krey, p.102.

walls of Nicaea. More machines were built, rams, scrapers, wooden towers, and slings. Bows and arrows were used, and destructive stones were hurled inside the city. A favorite practice of the Turks, was that when they killed one of the crusaders before the wall, they let down iron hooks by means of ropes and took the body up. After stripping the corpse, (20) they threw the body outside to the crusaders.

The crusading bands of the West had had little experience fighting in this manner, and it was due to the military engineers of Constantinople that the leaders learned the method of siege war-craft. The engineers taught them how to construct the various machines, of which there were two main types. The first type was the BALLISTA, which was used to shoot large arrows or bolts with great force, and the PETRARIA, which hurled large stones. The motive power was provided by the torsion of twisted ropes or the sudden release of a heavy counter-poise, and great ingenuity was exercised to increase (21) their force. Battering rams of various sorts were also used. Bohemond, of all the leaders, was the only leader experienced in this type of warfare due to his many battles and encounters with the Saracens and Turks in Sicily and elsewhere, thus he proved to be of invaluable aid to the other leaders.

The armies were now completely surrounding Nicaea. Only one flaw remained. On one side of the city was a large lake,

(20) Fulcher of Chartres Historia Hierosolymitana in Krey, p.106.

(21) Introduction on military machines in Krey, p.21.

which allowed the Turks to enter and leave Nicaea and also to bring in supplies and provisions to the besieged city. The crusading chiefs realized that as long as this was open success was impossible, so they met together and decided upon sending to the Emperor for aid. They ask Alexius to have ships sent to Civitote, and that from there oxen could drag the ships over the mountains and through the woods to
(22)
the lake.

Alexius complied with this plea and sent a number of his sailors or merchant-seamen with the ships. During the night, the ships with their crews were placed on the water.

The Turks, realizing that they were now cut off from aid and also a food supply, sent a message to the Emperor that they would surrender the city, if he would allow them to leave with their families and their material belongings. Alexius accepted this surrender, so Nicaea officially surrendered it-
(23)
self to Alexius rather than to the crusaders. The siege had lasted seven weeks and three days.

Alexius had promised the chiefs many gifts of gold and silver and other treasures inside the city; besides, he had promised he would erect a hospital for the Franks. Now that he had gained the city, stated Raymond of Aguilers, he did none of these. The Emperor did pass out some gifts to the crusaders, but these were slight to what they had expected.

(22) Fulcher of Chartres Historia Hierosolymitana in Krey, p.106.

(23) Chronicle of Anonymi Gesta in Krey, p.103.

Thus Raymond of Aguilers says:

and so, when Alexius had received the city, he afforded the army such an example of gratitude that as long as they live the people will curse him and proclaim him a traitor. (24)

After the capture of Nicaea, Alexius encamped near the city of Pelecanum. Wishing to catch some of the men who had not sworn fealty to him at Constantinople, he sent word for all the crusaders to come to say farewell to him before their journey to Antioch. As Tancred had escaped from taking the oath in Constantinople, because he professed that he owed faith to Bohemond alone, he was now asked to take the oath. Anna Comnena says that Tancred demanded that the Emperor give him many gifts and presents in a very contemptuous way. This Alexius was not too willing to do, but finally with the (25) persuasion of Bohemond, Tancred agreed to taking the oath.

(24) Chronicle of Raymond of Aguilers in Krey, p.104.

(25) Anna Comnena Alexiad in Krey, p.110.

CHAPTER V

BATTLE OF DORYLÆUM

SIEGE AND CAPTURE OF ANTIOCH

MIRACLE OF THE HOLY LANCE

After the battle of Nicaea, the crusaders began their march to Antioch on June 26, 1097. When the army had marched a few days, they arrived at a bridge and remained there for several days. On the third day, before dawn, the army arose to march on their way. They now divided into two armies. In one army was Bohemond, Robert of Normandy, and Tancred and in the other army were Godfrey, Hugh the Great, Robert of Flanders, (1) Raymond of Toulouse and Adhemar, Bishop of Puy.

On about the third day after the armies had separated, the Turks suddenly came upon Bohemond's army. Bohemond, hearing their shouting and whistling, ordered his soldiers to dismount at once and pitch their tents. While the army had encamped, the Turks had not been idle and they now encircled the army on all sides. Fulcher writes of the Turks attack:

"The Turks crept up, howling loudly and shooting a shower of arrows. Stunned, and almost dead, and with many wounded, we immediately fled. And it was no wonder, for such warfare was new to us all. Already from another part of the marsh, a large column of them rushed violently up to our tents and, entering them, snatched our possessions and killed our people." (2)

Bohemond, seeing the slaughter of his people on all sides, quickly sent a message to the other army to hasten to their aid. The other band of crusaders, when they heard the news, merely laughed and said that it could not be (3) possibly true. Finally, Godfrey and Hugh the Great with their followers took the message seriously and set out to

(1) Chronicle of Anonymi Gesta in Krey, p.113.

(2) Fulcher of Chartres Historia Hierosolymitana in Krey, p.117.

(3) Chronicle of Anonymi Gesta in Krey, p.114.

help Bohemond. Soon after this, Raymond and Adhemar also marched to help the other band. Upon their arrival, a complete battle formation was drawn up. On the left wing was Bohemond, Robert of Normandy, Tancred, Robert of Anse, and Richard of Principati, On the left wing, was Raymond of Toulouse. Last, on the right wing was Godfrey and Robert of Flanders and Hugh the Great.

The Turks now realized that they were completely outnumbered, so they fled to their tents. The crusaders followed them, and to quote the Gesta, "killed them one whole day." The crusaders captured all the possessions in their tents, taking much gold, silver, pack animals and other provisions. The battle of Dorylaeum was fought on the first day of July,
(4)
1097.

From July 3 until the early months of the fall, the army marched through Asia Minor, the Turks fleeing in front of them. As the fleeing Turks approached towns and cities, they said to the inhabitants:

"We have conquered all the Christians and have so overcome them that no one of them will ever dare to arise before us; only let us come in." (5)

When the Turks entered these cities they destroyed the buildings and churches and carried off all the horses, mules, gold, and food that they could find. As the crusaders were now marching through the desert of Asia Minor, the march was a

(4) Ibid., p.115.

(5) Ibid., p.118.

very difficult one, full of hardships and was now made even more trying by this policy of the Turks.

Food and water became scarce, and the crusaders found themselves in dire straits. Men, women, and horses, perished of thirst in the heat of the hot July sun. Because of the shortage of food, many of the horses died, and the majority of the crusading knights became foot-soldiers. Due to the lack of horses, many of the crusaders rode on oxen, and used sheep, dogs and goats to carry their supplies and possessions. (6)

Soon the crusaders came into the valley of Iconium, where there was a greater supply of food and goods of all kind, and conditions became somewhat better. When the army reached Iconium, the citizens urged the crusaders to carry with them skins filled with water because from there on there would be a great shortage of water. (7)

The army now continued its march, until they reached a river, where they rested several days and sent messengers ahead. The messengers advanced to Heraclea, where they discovered that the Turks were planning a large battle against the army. The crusaders, upon hearing this news, marched to Heraclea, where a battle was waged, resulting in a victory for the crusaders. After the battle, the crusaders rested in the city for three or four days.

(6) Ibid., p.119.

(7) Ibid.

Fulcher of Chartres says that when the crusaders reached Heraclea:

we beheld a certain prodigy in the sky, which, shinning in brilliant whiteness, appeared in the shape of a sword with the point towards the East. We did not know what it portended for the future; but we left the present and future to the Lord. (8)

While the army was encamped at Heraclea, Tancred and Baldwin left the main army and together went into the valley (9) of Botrenthrot. Tancred at once left Baldwin and with his troops marched to Tarsus. There the Turks rushed out to fight with the troops, however, when they saw the size and strength of the army, they fled and returned to the city.

Tancred then drew his army together and pitched camp before the gate of the city. In a short time, Baldwin and his army appeared at Tarsus. Baldwin demanded that Tancred take him into partnership so as to share in the captured spoils. Tancred answered Baldwin by absolutely refusing to (10) cooperate.

During the night, all the Turks that inhabited Tarsus fled from the city. The next morning, the other citizens of Tarsus appeared before the leaders, and surrendered the city to them. Baldwin now began to quarrel again with Tancred, urging him to accompany him into the city to plunder and steal. Tancred would not agree to be a party to such action, the Gesta reports, and declared that he would not steal from

(8) Fulcher of Chartres Historia Hierosolymitana in Krey, p.120.

(9) Chronicle of Anonymi Gesta in Krey, p.120.

(10) Ibid.

(11)
fellow-Christians. However, Tancred was not able to hold out long against Baldwin because of his smaller forces, and he and his army soon had to leave Tarsus in Baldwin's care.

After leaving Tarsus, Tancred marched to Adana, where he camped within the city walls. Baldwin followed Tancred to Adana, and as to be expected, a violent quarrel arose between the two over the price of supplies. Immediately the two drew up their forces for battle outside the walls of the city. Tancred, who had a small force, refused to advance beyond the support of the hurling machines on the walls, while Baldwin, was unwilling to risk his superior troops. Finally, it was decided that a equal number of men from each force would wage a battle. This proved indecisive, however, as an equal number of men from each force was unhorsed. Due to the advice of some of the men in each force, peace and order was established between the two. (12) After these encounters both leaders returned to the main army.

However, around the middle of October, 1097, Baldwin and his troops left the main crusading band permanently. He marched toward the Euphrates; capturing many cities along the way. Fulcher, who accompanied Baldwin writes, that due to Baldwin's large forces and his successful capture of so many towns, he had become quite famous and well-known throughout the region.

(11) Ibid., p.121.

(12) Raoul de Caen Gesta Tancredi in Krey, p.291.

The Prince of Edessa, hearing of Baldwin's fame, sent an embassy to him.

"Baldwin was asked by the Duke to go there, and to agree that they should be mutual friends as long as they both should live, that they should be like father and son. And if by chance the Duke of Edessa himself should die, Baldwin should immediately come into possession of all his land, just as if he were his own son. Since he had no son or daughter, and since he was unable to defend himself against the Turks, this Greek wished himself and his land to be defended by this Baldwin, for he had heard that both he and his soldiers were most brave fighters." (13)

When Baldwin received this offer he was very anxious to journey to Edessa. After several insignificant encounters with the Turks, around February 20, 1098, Baldwin and his forces arrived at Edessa. Edessa is located north-east of Antioch and is a march of about one hundred and fifty miles from Antioch.

The citizens of Edessa, writes Fulcher, were glad to see them. They carried forth crosses and banners and they kissed the robes and feet of the crusading band. After the band had been in Edessa about two weeks, the citizens rose up in a revolution against the Prince. Their plan was to kill the Prince and to place Baldwin as chief of the city and the surrounding lands. Some critics state that undoubtedly Baldwin had a hand in this conspiracy. In Fulcher writings there is (14) definitely no basis for this opinion. However, it is possible that arrangements could have been made between the citizens and Baldwin which were unknown to Fulcher.

- (13) Fulcher of Chartres Historia Hierosolymitana in Krey, p.122.
 (14) Ibid.

The citizens executed their plan and the Prince was slain. Baldwin immediately took over the powers in the city, and began waging warfare against the Turks in the territory around Edessa. His position as Lord of Edessa meant very little, because of the large number of Turks in the region. In the following years, Baldwin managed to consolidate his gains somewhat by the annexing of new cities. To strength his ties with his Armenian subjects, he married the niece of an Armenian prince. At best, however, Edessa never become a
(15)
Western stronghold.

During the third week in October, 1097, the main body of the crusaders was continuing its march through Armenia. In the march they came upon a number of fortified towns belonging to the enemy, and since they did not want to take the time to besiege them, some of the crusaders remained behind to accomplish these tasks. As they marched through Armenia they managed to be well supplied and affairs continued smoothly.

Raymond of Toulouse, by some report, heard that the Turks had withdrawn from Antioch and he decided to send some of his men ahead to guard Antioch. He sent Peter, Viscount of Castillon, William of Montpellier, Peter or Roasa, Peter Raymond of Hautpoul and five hundred knights. These men proceeded to the valley around Antioch, but there they heard that the Turks still remained in the city and were prepared to

(15) Archer and Kingsford, op.cit., p.63.

defend Antioch with vigor. After this news, Peter of Roasa separated from the rest and entered into the valley of Rugia. He fought several battles with the Turks and captured the city of Rusa and a few other forts.⁽¹⁶⁾

The crusaders now marched into the valley of Antioch. There they meet a group of Turks who were coming to aid the citizens in Antioch. A battle was immediately fought between the two forces, with the crusaders victorious. They captured much booty and spoils in this encounter.

Raymond of Toulouse and his army stayed somewhat behind the others, because Raymond was very ill. Raymond's illness was so severe that the rest of the army, believing him at the point of death, had the Bishop of Orange read the necessary funeral services. However, Raymond of Aguilers says that, since God truly preferred him as the leader of the army, he lifted him from death and restored him to health.⁽¹⁷⁾

Now that the army was surrounding Antioch, a number of the leaders thought it best not to besiege it. They arrived at this conclusion because winter was close, the army was scattered among the castles, and finally, that the army should wait until the Emperor's promised forces would arrive in the spring.⁽¹⁸⁾

However, Raymond of Toulouse, feeling an attack against the city was necessary, declared:

(16) Chronicle of Anonymi Gesta in Krey, p.123.

(17) Chronicle of Raymond of Aguilers in Krey, p.125.

(18) Ibid.

"We have come by the inspiration of God; through His mercy we obtained Nicaea, a very strongly fortified city, and through the same clemency we have obtained victory and security from the Turks; there has been peace and concord in our army. Thus we should commit our let to Him. We ought not to fear kings, or the chiefs of kings, nor yet places, or times, when God has snatched us from so many dangers." (19)

The rest of the crusaders moved by this plea agreed with Raymond and the siege of Antioch began.

Raymond of Aguilers gives a very good description of Antioch:

"Since the occasion offers itself to us, we ought to speak about Antioch and its location so that the battles and assaults which were made there may be easily understood by those who have not seen it. There is a certain plain among the mountains of Lebanon which in width is one day's travel, and in length a day and a half. This plain has on its western side a certain swamp; on the east, a river which, after encircling a certain part of this plain, so winds back to the foot of the mountains which are in the middle of that land that there is no passage between the mountains and the stream, and thus it flows into the ocean which is very close to Antioch. Antioch is so situated in those passes which the river, clinging to the mountains, makes that on the west the river, flowing against the lower wall, leaves a certain portion of land in the form of a bow between it and the city. The city, two miles in length, is so fortified by walls, towers, and fore-walls that it fears the attack of no machine and the assault of no man, even if every race of man should come together against it." (20)

On Wednesday, October 21, 1097, the siege of Antioch began. The crusaders realized that they could not surround the entire city, so they only attempted to encircle the northeastern part. Bohemond pitched his tent furthest south, on a rock opposite a castle. Then came Robert of Normandy and Robert of

(19) Ibid.

(20) Ibid., p.126-7

Flanders; near the Dog Gate was stationed Raymond of Toulouse and Bishop Adhemar; Godfrey and his followers, in turn, before a gate which was called after this, the Duke's Gate; and last, completing the semi-circle, was stationed Tancred and
(21)
his followers.

Raymond of Aguilers writes that when the crusaders arrived and pitched camp around Antioch, no regular order of watches or encamping was observed and the Turks could
(22)
have easily wiped out the entire crusading army. The castles of this region and the nearby cities had also surrendered to the crusaders and this caused their forces to be scattered.

For a period of time (approximately fifteen days) the Turks did not venture from Antioch. The Armenians and Syrians who were in the city, pretending friendliness toward the crusaders, came forth from the city and by this way learned their strength and numbers which they carried back to the Turks inside Antioch.

Soon, however, the Turks began to make short expeditions in every direction, at the same time being helped by Aregh, a nearby Turkish garrison. Conditions became so bad that the crusaders did not dare venture outside the encampment in small bands to pillage and seek food. Because of this, around Christmas, 1097, the crusaders first began to be in

(21) Chronicle of Anonymi Gesta in Krey, p.124.

(22) Chronicle of Raymond of Aguilers in Krey, p.127.

real want of food and supplies.

Finally, after a discussion among the chiefs, Bohemond and Robert of Flanders were chosen to lead an expedition to obtain food. Due to the absence of these two leaders, the illness of Godfrey and also the absence of Robert of Normandy, the Turks, feeling this to be their golden opportunity,
(23)
rushed down upon the crusaders.

The battle which resulted was a terrible one, many hundreds of the crusaders being killed. It was only due to a stream of water which separated the camp from the Turks that a substantial number escaped. These men swam the stream and the Turks returned to Antioch.

At the same time, the army under Bohemond and the Count of Flanders was encountering difficulties of its own. In the battle which followed, the Count of Flanders very bravely defended the honor of the crusaders, and made a great name for himself by his exploits. Of the Turks, who were marching to join their comrades at Antioch, many were killed and the remainder were put to flight. Even though Bohemond and the Count of Flanders returned to camp with the news of this successful encounter, in the matter of food supplies they
(24)
returned empty-handed.

As the new year began, affairs became much worse among the crusaders. In addition, inflation began to affect the

(23) Chronicle of Anonymi Gesta in Krey, p.133.

(24) Ibid., p.134.

crusaders, and many of the common people could not buy enough food from the Armenian and Syrian traders to keep alive.

In the train of these troubles, William Carpenter and Peter the Hermit, who had attached themselves to Bohemond's army, one dark night escaped from the camp. Tancred went out in search of them and, reports the author of the Gesta, brought them both back in disgrace. Soon after this, however, William Carpenter escaped again and took all his followers (25) with him.

Tatius, a member of the Emperor's household, was with the crusaders and feeling that the army was doomed to destruction, addressed the crusaders as follows:

"Seignors and most illustrious men, you see that we are here in the greatest need, and aid is coming to us from no side. So permit me now to return to my country of Romania, and I will for certain, cause many ships to come hither by sea, laden with grain, wine, barley, meat, butter, and cheese, and all the goods which you need. I shall also cause horses to be brought for sale, and a market to be brought hither in the fealty of the Emperor. So I will swear all this loyally to you, and attend to it. Also, my servants and my tent are still in camp, from which you may believe firmly that I will return as quickly as possible." (26)

Anna Comnena, as to be expected, states that Tatius was constantly threatened by Bohemond and really forced to flee. Bohemond is said to have advised his desertion on the ground that the crusaders were very angry with the Greeks, Anna,

(25) Ibid., p.136.

(26) Ibid., p.137.

of course, regards all of this as a plot on the part of
 (27)
 Bohemond to obtain Antioch for himself.

Affairs took a sharp turn for the worse and the crusaders were even afraid to leave their tents. Many of the common people fled to Cyprus, Romania and into the mountains. Because of the fear of the Turks, the crusaders had no access to the sea.

News now reached the crusaders that a huge army of the Turks were marching to Antioch. Bohemond, in a conference with the other leaders, suggested this plan of operation:

"Seignors, most illustrious knights, what are we going to do? For we are not so great that we can fight on two sides. But do you know what we may do? Let us make two lines of ourselves; let a portion of the foot-soldiers remain together to guard the pavilions, and by feinting they will be able to resist those who are in the city. Let the other portion, however, consisting of knights, go with us to meet our enemy, who are lodged here near in the fortress Aregh beyond the Iron Bridge." (28)

This plan was accepted by the other leaders, and the army started out. They went forth to meet the enemy in five lines, with Bohemond marching a short distance in the rear with his line. The sky was darkened with the shower of arrows and weapons. Finally, the crusaders forced the Turks back, and the day was won by the crusading army.

Before this last encounter with the Turks, an envoy had arrived at the crusading encampment from the Fatimite

- (27) Anna Comnena Alexiad in Krey, p.292, note 22.
- (28) Chronicle of Anonymi Gesta in Krey, p.138.

Caliphate in Cairo. As in recent years, the Fatimite Caliph had lost most of his land in Syria to the Seljuk Turks, he was anxious to form an allegiance with the crusaders. The leaders of the crusaders, now sent envoys to accompany those of the Caliph which were returning, giving them instructions (29) to enter upon a treaty and friendship with the Caliph.

As the siege of Antioch was going so slowly, the leaders decided that a fortress should be built before the gate of the city where the bridge was located. It was necessary to obtain men from the Port of St. Simeon to build the fort, so Raymond and Bohemond set out with their armies to get these men and supplies.

When Bohemond and Raymond arrived at the Port of St. Simeon, ships from the Italian cities of Venice, Genoa, and Pisa had docked. The ships had sailed into the harbor during the early days when the crusaders had first besieged Antioch, but because of the Turk's control over the region at that period the crusaders had been unable to reach the coast. (30) The instigator and leader of this naval expedition on the First Crusade, was Daimbert, Archbishop of Pisa.

The Turks soon learned that these two leaders were absent from the camp, so they prepared ambushes and rushed out to meet Raymond and Bohemond as they were returning. The Turks

(29) Chronicle of Raymond of Aguilers in Krey, p.142.

(30) Ibid., p.128.

were so numerous, that the author of the Gesta writes, the crusaders fled in every possible direction and over a thousand knights were killed. (31) Raymond's troops bore the brunt of the battle, as Bohemond with his men had taken a shorter route and arrived at the camp in time to be of some assistance to the battle being waged there. The author of the Gesta describes the battle as follows:

"Therefore the true knights of God, armed on all sides with the cross, rushed fiercely upon them and attacked them violently, but they fled quickly by means of the narrow bridge to their entrance. Those who could not cross the bridge alive, because of the multitude of people and horses there, received eternal death in the hands of Satan. And so we overcame them, driving and hurling them down into the river. The water of the rapid stream flowed everywhere red with the blood of the Turks. Showers of javelins and arrows covered the sky and obscured the clearness of the day; voices shrieked within and without the city." (32)

The crusaders then began the building of the fortress, which when completed was placed under the care of Raymond of Toulouse to guard. Also, Tancred fortified a certain monastery across the river, thereby closing the roads and paths on the side to the Turks.

During the time the crusading armies had been besieging Antioch, Bohemond had been exchanging letters and messages with a man inside the city. (33) Many various names and many nationalities have been ascribed to this person, but I think that the most common and most used is that of Pirus and that

(31) Chronicle of Anonymi Gesta in Krey, p.144.

(32) Ibid., p.145.

(33) Ibid., p.151.

he was an Armenian or a Turk. Bohemond, in his messages, asked Pirus to receive him within the city, and that if he did this, he would give him many gifts and make him rich. Pirus, yielding to this plea, told Bohemond that he controlled three towers in the city and said that at any time Bohemond wished he could have them. Bohemond, very happy, went immediately to the chiefs with the following request:

"Men, most illustrious knights, see how all of us, whether of greater or less degree, are in exceeding poverty and misery, and how utterly ignorant we are from what side we will fare better. Therefore, if it seems good and honorable to you, let one of us put himself ahead of the rest, and if he can acquire or contrive the capture of the city by any plan or scheme by himself, or through the help of others, let us with one voice grant him the city as a gift." (34)

The chiefs, when they heard this message of Bohemond's, were stoutly opposed and declared that when the city was conquered it would be the property of all. When Bohemond heard this, writes the author of the Gesta, he laughed and walked away from the rest, content to wait.

Soon after this, news began to reach the crusaders that a huge army of Turks was marching to the aid of the city, the leaders worried, held a council and in it said that if Bohemond could obtain the capture of Antioch it would be granted him. However, if the Emperor arrived and fully carried out all his promises, the city must instead go to
(35)
him.

(34) Ibid.

(35) Ibid., p.152.

Bohemond now completed his arrangements with Pirus, and he told the other leaders of the plans he had made. A night was fixed for the surrender, and on the following day, part of the Christian army went foraging so as to throw the enemy off their guard. At midnight a little band gathered below the Gate of St. George and there waited for Pirus's signal. At last a messenger came to bid them stay until the passing of the watch. At dawn the wished-for sign was given, and Bohemond ordered his men to advance. They found a ladder ready and around sixty ascended and seized the three towers belonging to Pirus. After the taking of these towers, the rest of the men entered through the gate which was opened to them by their comrades. (36) In the morning when the main crusading force awoke they saw Bohemond's flags flying from the towers. There was a rush toward the gates and the city was in the possession of the Christians. The siege of Antioch had now lasted from October 21, 1097 to June 2, 1098.

When the crusaders had marched into Syria, the Turks living there had all fled to Bagdad. The Caliph, affected by their pleas, sent messages to the warring Sultans asking them to band together to fight the crusaders. Very few of them took the Caliph's advice, but a number of the less important Turkish chiefs did join together and a large army was raised under the leadership of Kerbogha. It was this

(36) Ibid., p.153.

army to which the Prince of Antioch sent his plea for help, and which as a result of several unhappy incidents, reached Antioch two days after it had surrendered to the crusaders. (37)

On the 5th of June, Kerbogha and his army arrived before Antioch. Their delay was due to the fact that for two months they had unsuccessfully besieged Baldwin at Edessa. In this, Baldwin's presence at Edessa was a definite aid to the main crusading band. The crusaders were all forced inside the city, and the city was completely surrounded by Kerbogha's army. A number of the crusaders terrified, fled to the Port of St. Simeon, and set sail for home. Conditions grew worse daily inside Antioch, it became necessary to eat their horses and dogs for food, and day by day the death rate rose. (38)

Previous to the final capture of Antioch by the crusaders, Stephen of Blois had become ill and had moved to Alexandretta, a fortress high in the mountains. The crusaders, now besieged inside Antioch, daily sent messages for Stephen to come to their aid. However, when he saw the army of Kerbogha, he and all his men fled. At Philomelium, he met Alexius coming to help the crusaders, and he told him that the crusaders were doomed to destruction and that it was useless to go to their aid. (39) Anna declares that this news made Alexius want even more to hurry to their aid but that he was dissuaded from

(37) Ibid., p.163.

(38) Ibid., p.170.

(39) Ibid., p.171.

following such a foolish plan by some of his officers.

For nearly a week now the fight had raged along the southern wall, the people were discouraged and all felt that defeat would soon be coming. It was then that one of the most amazing stories of the entire First Crusade occurred. A priest, Peter Bartholomew, appeared before the leaders and told them that St. Andrew had appeared before him five times and had told him where to find the Lance which had
(40)
pierced the side of the Saviour.

After this, a priest named Stephen came forward to the leaders saying that Jesus Christ had appeared before him. Stephen said that Christ told him that he had helped the crusaders and made possible their past victories, but since the capture of Antioch, they had slipped into unclean ways and evil pleasures, and that he could do nothing more for them unless they returned to the Way of God. He promised that if the crusaders returned to Him, he would send help
(41)
in five days.

When this news had been told, all the leaders renewed their pledge to not withdraw from Antioch without the common consent of all, or to flee individually to the surrounding country.

On the fifth day, when Christ had promised help to the crusaders, preparations were made whereby twelve men

(40) Chronicle of Raymond of Aguilers in Krey, p.176.

(41) Ibid., p.179.

accompanied by Peter Bartholomew began to dig in the Church of St. Peter for the Lance. Finally, after digging all day, the Lance appeared.⁽⁴²⁾ At this discovery, joy and piety spread throughout Antioch and the crusaders felt that they had received supernatural aid and thus became renewed with courage and energy to fight on.

Afterwards, a three-day fast was proclaimed and processions made from one church to another. All the crusaders confessed their sins, and many masses were celebrated. Then six battle lines were formed from the crusaders in Antioch. In the first line was Hugh the Great and Robert of Flanders; in the second line, Godfrey and his army; in the third line was Robert of Normandy; in the fourth line was Raymond and the Bishop of Puy carrying the Lance; in the fifth line was Tancred; and in the last and sixth line was Bohemond. Arranged as this,⁽⁴³⁾ they marched out of the main gate of the city on June 27, 1098.

As the crusaders marched forth, the Turks began to retreat. They divided into two parts, one went toward the sea and the rest drew up a line before the crusaders. A seventh line was formed by the crusaders from the forces of Godfrey and Robert of Normandy, and these marched after the group which was moving down to the sea. From the main Turkish line, soldiers were dispatched to the mountains, and these rushed down upon the crusaders. The Turks on the side of the sea

(42) Ibid., p.181.

(43) Chronicle of Anonymi Gesta in Krey, p.183.

realizing that they were to be defeated set fire to the grass, burning the tents and forcing their comrades to gather their possessions and flee. Seeing this, the crusaders swept down on the Turks, killing and capturing many of them. The rest of the Turkish army immediately fled from their camp and the crusaders, victorious, returned to Antioch. (44)

When the Emir who had been guarding the citadel saw his countrymen fleeing, he sought the standards of the Franks. Raymond of Toulouse, who was stationed before the citadel, sent his standard to the Emir. Some of Bohemond's soldiers recognized it, however, and told him that it was not Bohemond's but rather the Count of Toulouse's. The Emir immediately returned it to the Count, and presently Bohemond arrived and gave his standard to the Emir. Bohemond made an agreement with the Emir that those of the Emir's men who would accept Christianity might remain, but that those who refused would be allowed to depart safely. After this, the Emir and a few of his men were baptized. Those who refused, according to the Gesta, Bohemond had conducted safely to the land of the Turks. (45)

Now that the crusaders had brought about the defeat of Kerbogha's large army, there was little immediate danger or fear to be expected from the Seljuk Turks and the Caliph of Bagdad. If any serious trouble was to arise it would come

(44) Ibid., p.184.

(45) Ibid., p.185.

from the Fatimite Caliph of Egypt. However, he had made agreements and treaties with the crusaders, so there was little cause to worry about this peril. The removal of these dangers, instead of bringing the crusaders more tightly together, caused them to quarrel among each other, and their truly selfish reasons for the Crusade move into clearer light.

Early in August, 1098, Adhemar, Bishop of Puy died, and this event had quite an effect on the whole army. With his death, there was no longer anyone who had complete spiritual power over all the various bands. The Bishop's presence had tended to make the crusaders each feel a responsible part in the Crusade, and now with his death, matters became more tense and strained among the leaders.

After the defeat of Kerbogha, the leaders of the crusaders sent Hugh the Great to Constantinople with a message to the Emperor to come and receive Antioch and fulfill the agreements which he had made with them. Hugh left for Constantinople and never returned, completely deserting the army. The crusading chiefs assembled at this time and decided to postpone the march to Jerusalem until November, because the march in the summer would be a hot and dry one
(46)
with a small water supply.

(46) Ibid., p.196.

After the victory, all the leaders had received towers surrounding the city. Bohemond, writes Raymond of Aguilers, now took all these towers away from the rest, saying that he had given an oath to Pirus that he alone would control them. When he had taken the towers, he also wished to obtain the castles and the gates which Raymond and Godfrey had guarded during the siege. Godfrey handed his part over to Bohemond, (47) but Raymond refused.

In the months that followed, various bands of the crusaders, went into the surrounding territory fighting a number of battles and capturing some fortresses. The majority of the crusaders stayed in Antioch, however, and quarreled and stole from each other.

Around the first of November, all the men returned to Antioch. Bohemond now endeavored to seek confirmation of the agreement which all the leaders had given him, that the city when captured by his wiles should be his. Raymond of Toulouse would not agree to this, because of his oath to the Emperor. The other leaders would not make a decision because they feared to offend either of these great lords and also (48) feared that the journey to Jerusalem might be interrupted.

Raymond of Toulouse then said:

"Rather than see the way to the Holy Sepulchre unachieved, if Bohemond will consent to go with us, I will faithfully agree to whatever our peers (to wit,

(47) Chronicle of Raymond of Aguilers in Krey, p.198.

(48) Chronicle of Anonymi Gesta in Krey, p.204.

Duke Godfrey, the Count of Flanders, Robert of Normandy, and the other seignors) approve, saving fealty to the Emperor." (49)

When this had been said, both Bohemond and Raymond nevertheless strongly fortified all the towers and citadels which each controlled in the city.

In November, Raymond of Toulouse, Robert of Flanders, Robert of Normandy and their armies left Antioch and marched to Rugia, Barra, and Marra. At Marra, which was a stronghold of Turks, Raymond drew up his lines for battle. A short time after this, Bohemond and his army followed Raymond and the other leaders to Marra and joined them in the battle. (50)

The battle was not very successful during the first few days, and it seemed that the crusaders would accomplish nothing. Raymond then began to build a fortress-type of machine on wheels. When it was finished, knights were placed on the top story of the machine, and they hurled stones upon the inhabitants inside Marra. Finally, by undermining the walls of the city and using scaling ladders, the city was conquered.

At Marra, Bohemond continued to entreat Raymond to agree that Antioch should be his. Arriving at no satisfactory result, Bohemond in anger returned to Antioch. Raymond then sent a messenger to Godfrey and the other leaders still at Antioch to come to Rugia to confer with him over this question.

(49) Ibid.

(50) Chronicle of Raymond of Aguilers in Krey, p.209.

Little was accomplished by his council, because they could not bring Bohemond into accord with Raymond, unless Raymond gave in to the agreement that Antioch should belong to Bohemond. The leaders then returned again to Antioch, with Raymond returning to Marra, where his army was located. (51)

At this time, discouragement and discord began to spread among the common people in the armies. Bohemond decided to put off the march now to Easter, and then changed it again to the following Christmas. Godfrey and his men were away visiting Baldwin in Edessa, and the march to Jerusalem seemed destined to be constantly postponed. A number of the common people of the armies went to Raymond therefore and begged him to command and lead them the rest of the way. Finally, Raymond overcome by their pleas, promised that he would set a date for the journey to begin. (52)

However, when Raymond wished to leave a number of knights and foot-soldiers in Marra to maintain it as his garrison, the common people, angry, cried:

"Oho! Quarrels about Antioch and quarrels about Marra! In every place which God shall give us will there be contention among the princes, and a lessening of the army of God? Surely there will be no further argument about this city. Come, and let us destroy its walls, and peace will be made between the princes and security for the Count, lest he lose it." (53)

With this, the people immediately destroyed the city of Marra. Raymond was infuriated when he returned and found what had

(51) Ibid., p. 212.

(52) Ibid.

(53) Ibid., p. 213.

happened, but by the pleas of the clergy and the people he was finally reconciled.

On January 13, 1099, Raymond and his army marched from Marra. Raymond feeling the need of some of the other leaders, offered ten thousand solidi to Robert of Normandy, and five thousand to Tancred if they would accompany him. They accepted his bribe and thus joined Raymond's army. Similar offers were made to Duke Godfrey and Robert of Flanders, who refused (54) to accept them.

The dread of the Christians had preceeded them, and the rulers of the cities along the Ortones sought peace with the crusaders. From there they marched into the valley of Desem, where there was an abundance of food and supplies. After resting in the valley for several weeks, they crossed the Great Lebanon to reach the coast where the Venetian, Pisan, and Genoese ships were harbored with supplies, some sent by the Emperor Alexius, and some by Daimbert, Archbishop of Pisa.

Raymond, Tancred and Robert of Normandy on February 14 encamped around the fortress of Archas. Here the army remained several months, meeting only with limited success. Many of the army were killed, but due to foraging in the region (55) around Archas, there was food and provisions for all.

In the meantime, Godfrey and Robert of Flanders, leaving Bohemond at Antioch, marched to the city of Laodicaea. From

(54) Ibid.

(55) Ibid., p. 220.

Laodicaea, they proceeded to Gibellum, which they besieged. While they were camped around Gibellum, they received word for them to come and aid Raymond, as he had had news that a large army from the Caliph of Bagdad was marching to Archas. (56)

Godfrey and Robert of Flanders hastened to Raymond's encampment only to find that the news was a false rumor. Godfrey and Robert were angry, maintaining that Raymond had made up the story, and were also angry when they saw their own poverty beside the many possessions and riches of Raymond's army. Quarreling thus began again. The question of the Lance was raised again, the chief attacker of its authenticity being Arnulf, Robert of Normandy's chaplain and later to be Patriarch of Jerusalem. (57) The Normans on the whole tended to ridicule and laugh at the miracle of the Lance, an action which infuriated Raymond, his chronicler, Raymond of Aguilers, and his army.

Peter Bartholomew, to whom the vision of the Lance had occurred, became very angry at their attitude and said to them:

"I wish and beg that a very large fire be built; and I will pass through the midst of it with the Lance of the Lord. If it is the Lance of the Lord, I will pass through the fire unhurt, but if it is not, I will be burned in the fire. For I see that either signs nor witnesses are believed." (58)

On the morning of April 8th, sixty thousand crusaders gathered to see Peter perform the ordeal. The fire was made of dry olive branches and had a length of thirty feet;

(56) Chronicle of Anonymi Gesta in Krey, p.223.

(57) Chronicle of Raymond of Aguilers in Krey, p.224.

(58) Ibid., p.230.

and there were four feet in the height of the piles. Raymond of Aguilers describes it as follows:

"The fire was so hot that it filled the air for thirty cubits. Verily, no one could go near it. Then Peter Bartholomew, dressed only in an undergarment, knelt down before the Bishop of Albara and called God as his witness that he had seen Him face to face upon the Cross, and had heard from Him. After this, when the Bishop had placed the Lance in his hand, he knelt and, after invoking the sign of the cross upon himself, went forth boldly and without fear into the fire. He stopped for a brief moment in the midst of the fire, and thus by the grace of God passed through." (59)

As Peter came out of the fire, the people shouted to him "God Help Us!", and great throngs crowded around him to touch him or to obtain a piece of his garment. Raymond of Aguilers writes that due to their pressing around Peter, he received some very bad wounds. Raymond mentions that Peter had several burns but that the cause of his death on the following day was a definite result of these wounds. (60)

Raoul de Caen, Tancred's biographer in later years, however, writes that his death was due only to the fact that he was burned so badly by the fire that recovery was impossible. Raoul lays the whole episode of the Lance at the feet of Raymond. He writes that Raymond contrived the plot to gather the people around him and to turn them against Bohemond. (61)

Another amazing circumstance in this connection is the silence of the Gesta. The author of the Gesta makes no mention of the ordeal, even though he had fully accepted the

(59) Ibid., p.231.

(60) Ibid., p.237.

(61) Raoul de Caen Gesta Tancredi in Krey, p.240.

original finding of the Lance at Antioch. Perhaps he did not wish to involve himself in such a delicate question.

Fulcher of Chartres, who was not with the armies at the time of the ordeal, and wrote his account years later, regards the outcome of the ordeal as a definite refutation
(62)
of the Lance.

(62) Fulcher of Chartres Historia Hierosolymitana in Krey, p.296, note 22.

CHAPTER VI

MARCH TO JERUSALEM

CAPTURE OF JERUSALEM

While the crusaders were still assembled at the siege of Archas, a difference of opinion arose among them in regard to the march to Jerusalem. An embassy arrived from Alexius, which stated that he would give them many presents and gifts, and would accompany them to Jerusalem if they would wait until June 24th. Raymond wished to await the arrival of the Emperor, and in the intervening time to continue the siege at Archas.

However, the majority of the common people in the army wished to start on the march without the Emperor. They felt that Alexius would, when he arrived, give them nothing, failing them in this as he had failed them before in his promises. Because the majority ruled Raymond down, he had to abide by
(1)
their decision.

On May 13, 1099, the crusaders left Archas, which they had never succeeded in capturing, and marched to Tripoli. As was his custom, Raymond promised money and gifts to some of the leaders if they would help him besiege Tripoli. But the leaders refused to listen to him. Finally, the King of Tripoli made an agreement with the leaders. He gave them a great deal of money, presents of horses, and captive Christians, and promised that if they could capture Jerusalem, he would become a Christian and would recognize his land as a gift from them. When Raymond of Toulouse received his share of

(1) Chronicle of Raymond of Aguilers in Krey, p. 235.

the presents, Raymond of Aguilers writes:

"For when he had received great wealth from the King of Tripoli, he was never willing to give anyone any of it, but he even daily afflicted his people with blows and insults." (2)

It is amazing that the accusations against Raymond are levied by his own devoted chronicler, Raymond of Aguilers. Thus, it seems, that one of the most devout and religious members of the Crusade, began to develop selfish and mean habits.

During the siege of Archas, the crusaders had not only obtained supplies from the Genoese and Venetians but also from the "Angles." Raymond of Aguilers writes that when the Angles had heard of the First Crusade they had set sail from England, around Spain, through the Mediterranean and had docked their ships at Antioch and Laodicea. As the crusaders, both at Antioch and Archas, had bought some extra supplies at Cyprus, these ships were very helpful in carrying these provisions across to the crusaders. When the Angles saw the crusading army preparing to leave for Jerusalem they burned and abandoned their ten remaining ships, and hastened
(3)
to join the crusaders. Raymond is the only chronicler who mentions the aid of the Angles in the First Crusade in the matter of ships, as Ordericus Vitalis is silent on this whole subject of an English shipping expedition.

From Tripoli, the crusaders with little difficulty

(2) Ibid., p. 245.

(3) Ibid., p. 246.

marched to Gibilet, Beirut, Sidon, Tyre, Acre, Cayphas, Caesare and finally, arrived at Ramlah, which was about fifteen miles from Jerusalem. At Ramlah, a council was held.

When the leaders met together at the council, some of them wished to advance toward Egypt , and try to capture Alexandria and other cities there. Others were opposed to this plan of action, they said, because of the small size of the army and because if they marched into Egypt little help could be expected to come from the West to them. ⁽⁴⁾

All the leaders, probably guided by their common sense, then decided that it would be the best plan of the two to continue on to Jerusalem. On June 7, 1099, the crusaders reached the city of Jerusalem.

The crusaders could not encircle Jerusalem because of their small numbers. Robert of Normandy besieged it from the north side, near the Church of St. Stephen. Next to Robert was Robert of Flanders, while Godfrey and Tancred besieged the city from the west. Raymond of Toulouse placed his camp on the south, on Mount Zion, near the Church of St. Mary. ⁽⁵⁾

June 14, the crusaders made their first assault upon Jerusalem. Because no machines or scaling ladders had been built, the attack was unsuccessful.

(4) Ibid., p. 248.

(5) Chronicle of Anonymi Gesta in Krey, p. 249.

After this first attack upon the city, the crusaders began to roam over the surrounding region to collect supplies, and the responsibility of the building of machines was forgotten. Before the crusaders had arrived at Jerusalem, the Turks had filled up the springs and destroyed the cisterns. Thus there was a great shortage of water. In the fields around the camp there were many horses, mules, cattle and sheep who became parched of thirst and died, so that they rotted where they stood, producing a stench (6) throughout the camp.

The crusaders were forced to journey about six miles from Jerusalem to obtain water. When the crusaders led their animals to this distant spring, the Turks lay in ambush killing many of them and driving the rest away. Food was also very scarce.

Meanwhile, messengers arrived at the camp, telling that the crusader's ships had arrived at Joppa, and that the sailors wanted a guard sent to them to provide protection. Immediately a guard was sent headed by Count Galdemar, accompanied by twenty knights and fifty foot-soldiers. On their march to Joppa, they encountered a large army of Turks. The Turks had such a large band that they soon surrounded the group of crusaders. It seemed that they all would be

(6) Chronicle of Raymond of Aguilers in Krey, p.251.

killed, but Raymond Piletus and his men, hearing of the disaster, hastened to their aid. By Raymond Piletus's arrival, the crusaders were saved and the Turks put to flight. (7)

After the battle, the crusaders divided the spoils and marched on to Joppa. The sailors were overjoyed to see them, and forgetting to place watches on their ships, prepared a feast for the crusaders. During the night, enemy ships arrived and surrounded the Christian ships, but they managed to unload their cargo before they were forced to abandon the ships. Thus the crusaders under Count Galdemar and Raymond Piletus returned to Jerusalem with the story of one victory and one defeat. (8)

At the camp around Jerusalem, new quarrels and new dislikes were springing up. There was quite a bit of dissatisfaction over the fact that Tancred had occupied Bethlehem, and had placed his standard over the church of the Nativity, and that Raymond had his camp on Mount Sion. Also there was discussion in regard to a king for the yet unconquered city, with the clergy and the leaders holding opposite views. (9)

The bishops and priests pleaded with the people and admonished them saying that once more they had withdrawn from the path of God. They begged the crusaders to establish friendly relationships again. They suggested a plan for the people to humble themselves by marching around Jerusalem in

(7) Ibid., p.253.

(8) Ibid.

(9) Ibid., p.254.

bare feet. Soon after this, the army, bare-footed and with trumpets, standards and arms, marched behind the clergy around the city walls. As they did, the Turks walked around the top of the city walls, laughing and ridiculing them. (10)

Godfrey, Robert of Normandy and Robert of Flanders, then placed Gaston of Beert in command of the workmen to construct machines of war. They constructed wooden towers and many other siege machines. Raymond, with the implements (ropes, mallets, spikes, axes and hatchets) which the sailors had managed to save from their ships, was also busy in building a wooden tower. It was extremely difficult and long, as it was necessary to bring the wood from a considerable distance.

The Turks inside the city, noticing the activity on the part of the crusaders, also began to strengthen their own fortifications, and increased the height of their turrets at night. (11)

On July 15, 1099, the final assault began. The crusaders began to undermine the towers and the walls. The machines were pushed close to the walls, and these hurled into the city, stones, arrows, burning wood and straw fastened together with an iron band. During the first day, matters remained the same and neither side gained or lost. The night was one of deep anxiety on both sides, as the crusaders feared the Turks would set fire to their machines, and the

(10) Ibid., p. 255-6.

(11) Ibid., p. 258.

Turks feared that the crusaders might by some plan try to take the city.

The next morning, when the crusaders assembled around the walls to continue the battle, they saw that during the night the Turks had built many more machines, ten to their one. The crusader's machines were now almost destroyed by the blows of stones, and the men became discouraged. All seemed lost, when they noticed a knight on the Mount of Olives waving with his shield to the army, and signalling them to advance. At this, the men took courage, they began to once more undermine the walls, and others began to ascend the walls by scaling ladders. The archers shot firebrands at the Turks assembled on the walls, thus driving them from the walls. Robert of Normandy and Robert of Flanders quickly released the long drawbridge which had protected the side of the wooden tower next to the walls, and it swung down from the top, being fastened to the middle of the tower, making a bridge over which the men began to enter Jerusalem bravely and fearlessly.⁽¹²⁾

On the southern side of Jerusalem (where Raymond of Toulouse was encamped) the Turks continued fighting even though the crusaders had entered the city. Finally, the Emir who commanded the Tower of St. David surrendered it to Raymond of Toulouse on the condition that the defenders lives^{(12)a}

(12) Ibid., p.260.

(12)a Chronicle of Anonymi Gesta in Krey, p.257.

be spared.

After the crusaders entered the city, the destruction which they wrought is well described by Raymond of Aguilers and the author of the Gesta:

"Some of our men (and this was more merciful) cut off the heads of their enemies; others shot them with arrows, so that they fell from the towers; others tortured them longer by casting them into the flames. Piles of heads, hands, and feet were to be seen in the streets of the city. It was necessary to pick one's way over the bodies of men and horses." (13)

"The battle raged throughout the day, so that the Temple was covered with their blood. When the pagans had been completely overcome, our men seized great numbers, both men and women, either killing them or keeping them captive, as they wished."

"On the roof of the Temple a great number of pagans of both sexes had assembled, and these were taken under the protection of Tancred and Gaston of Beert..... In the morning, some of our men cautiously ascended to the roof of the Temple and attacked the Saracens, both men and women, beheading them with naked swords; the remainder sought death by jumping down into the temple. When Tancred heard of this, he was filled with anger." (14)

The journey and the capture of Jerusalem had now been completed, on the 15th of July, 1099.

Seven or eight days after the surrender of the city, the leaders met together to elect a ruler for the city of Jerusalem. As they were contemplating whom to choose, the clergy came forward and said:

"We approve your election, but if you proceed rightly and properly, you will first choose a spiritual vicar,

(13) Ibid., p. 261.

(14) Chronicle of Anonymi Gesta in Krey, p. 257.

as eternal matters came before temporal; after this, a ruler to preside over secular matters. Otherwise, we shall hold invalid whatever you do." (15)

The leaders, angry at such a bold announcement, only hastened to choose a secular leader more quickly, writes Raymond of Aguilers.

If we are to believe many of the leader's biographers, a number of the leaders would not accept the position of king in Jerusalem. "Robert of Normandy's refusal," writes an English chronicler, "aspersed his nobility with an indelible stain, to which not reverence, but sloth or fear impelled (16) him." Raymond of Aguilers writes that Raymond of Toulouse was also urged to accept the kingship, but refused. However, in his writings at approximately the same time, the opinion is set forth that Raymond of Toulouse really desired the kingship but had so turned the other leaders and his own men (17) against him that it was not even offered him. Finally, the leaders choose Godfrey de Bouillon. Godfrey refused to accept the title of king, but instead assumed the title of Baron of the Holy Sepulchre.

Now that Godfrey had accepted this position, fresh disputes occurred among the leaders. Godfrey demanded that Raymond of Toulouse hand over to him the Tower of David which Raymond was holding. Raymond refused, using the pretext that it was necessary for the prestige of his army

(15) Chronicle of Raymond of Aguilers in Krey, p.262.

(16) Archer and Kingsford, op.cit., p.93.

(17) Chronicle of Raymond of Aguilers in Krey, p.263.

to hold the tower. Raymond of Aguilers, says that Robert of Flanders, Robert of Normandy and all of Raymond's men turned violently against him in this decision. Finally, in desperation, Raymond handed over the tower to the Bishop of Albara, who upon receiving it, immediately handed it to Godfrey. Raymond, furious at the Bishop's action, left
(18)
Jerusalem and went into Jordan.

After the selection of Godfrey, Arnulf, chaplain of Robert of Normandy, was chosen Patriarch of Jerusalem. Raymond of Aguilers, as to be expected, was livid with rage over this incident and he placed horrid crimes and infamies upon Arnulf. Raymond's conduct and intense hatred toward Arnulf was very natural as he, more than any other individual, was responsible for discrediting the Lance.

In the meantime, after the capture of Jerusalem, Tancred and Count Eustace started north to capture Neapolis. When they reached the city the inhabitants surrendered to them. While they were resting there, messengers arrived from Godfrey telling them to hurry back to Jerusalem that the Emir of Babylon had arrived at Ascalon prepared to fight against the
(19)
crusaders.

As Tancred and Eustace were returning to Jerusalem, they found at Ramlah a number of Turks who were the forerunners of the Emir's army. They managed to capture a few of the Turks,

(18) Ibid.

(19) Chronicle of Anonymi Gesta in Krey, p.265.

who told them how large the enemy army was and their plans for battle. Tancred, on hearing this, sent a message to Godfrey and the other leaders to hasten to Ascalon. (20)

When they received the message, Godfrey, Arnulf, the Patriarch, Robert of Flanders and the Bishop of Martirano with their armies left Jerusalem. Raymond of Toulouse and Robert of Normandy remained in the city because they feared the news was false. The Bishop of Martirano, when they found that the news was true, was sent back to Jerusalem, but on the road was captured by the Turks, and was never seen again. Word, nevertheless, was sent back to Raymond and Robert, and they soon joined the other leaders in the region of Ascalon.

The crusaders now prepared for battle. Godfrey, Robert of Normandy, the Count of Toulouse, Robert of Flanders, Tancred and Gaston of Beert each drew up his battle line, arranging foot-soldiers and bowmen to precede the knights. On the left was Godfrey with his army, and Raymond of Toulouse rode near the sea on the right. Robert of Normandy, Robert of Glanders, Tancred, and the rest rode in the center. They all rushed upon the enemy, Tancred making a charge through the middle of their tents, putting these men to flight. (21)

The Turks, according to the Gesta, terrified at the slaughter around them, climbed trees in order to hide from the crusaders. Others threw themselves on the ground, not

(20) Ibid., p.266.

(21) Ibid., p.267.

daring to stand up against the crusaders. As the Gesta puts it:

"Our men cut them to pieces, just as one cuts animals to pieces for market. The Count of St. Giles killed them without number, but some flung themselves into the sea, and others fled hither and hither." (22)

The standard of the Emir was captured, which Robert of Normandy bought for twenty marks of silver, and gave to the Patriarch to place in the church as a symbol of the Turkish defeat. In their haste to flee, the Turks left behind most of their possessions, and these the crusaders eagerly divided among themselves. This battle was fought on August 15, 1099.

Now that the work of the First Crusade had been completely fulfilled, the armies began to disintegrate. As Robert of Normandy and Robert of Flanders were making their march through Asia Minor home, at Laodicea, they found Bohemond and the Pisan fleet besieging the city. Daimbert, the Archbishop of Pisa and instigator of the naval expedition on the First Crusade had recently arrived at Antioch, and there Bohemond and Daimbert had become good friends. Bohemond had persuaded Daimbert to lend the aid of the Pisan fleet to capture Laodicea, which was still held by the Greeks. On the arrival of the two Roberts, they threatened to take up arms against Bohemond if he did not raise the siege, which was in violation of their agreement with the Greeks. Thus the siege of Loadicea

(22) Ibid.

(23)
was dropped.

Robert of Normandy with his army was one of the first to return to Europe. He rested a few months at Salerno to be healed of a wound which he had received on the crusade. When he reached Normandy he found that two months earlier William Rufus had died and that Henry had succeeded to the throne. Warfare broke out between Robert and Henry, and six years later at the battle of Tenchebrai, Robert's defeat by Henry consigned him to captivity for the rest of his life. (24)
He died in 1126.

Robert of Flanders also returned home with his army. During the next eleven years he figured prominently in feudal warfare, although not always successfully. His fame (25)
rests chiefly on his exploits as a crusader. He died in 1111.

Of the remaining leaders of the First Crusade, Bohemond continued ruling the principality of Antioch for several years, and after his death, in later years, the principality was ruled by his descendants. Baldwin continued ruling Edessa until the death of his brother Godfrey, when he became the first king of Jerusalem.

Tancred also remained behind in the Holy Land, and in the following year was rewarded by Godfrey with a hereditary right upon the city of Tiberias on Lake Gennesaret, together

(23) William of Tyre, Vol.I, p.402.

(24) Archer and Kingsford, op.cit., p.103.

(25) Ibid.

with the entire principality of Galilee.

Raymond, after the battle of Ascalon returned to Laodicaea in Syria. He left his wife in Laodicaea and set out for Constantinople where he remained with the Emperor (26) for several years.

In November, 1099, the news reached Baldwin at Edessa that Jerusalem had been captured and was now in the hands of the crusaders. Knowing that Bohemond had not yet visited Jerusalem, they arranged to make a pilgrimage together.

Baldwin marched from Edessa with his army and met Bohemond at the city of Valenium. Included in Bohemond's band was Daimbert, who had been staying with Bohemond for a time in Antioch, and had decided to accompany the leaders to Jerusalem. Now that all these people were gathered, Fulcher of Chartres estimated their number at possibly twenty-five thousand. (27)

Conditions along the road were far from comfortable, and the people suffered greatly. Fulcher, in writing of their trials, says:

"Thus for the love of God, we endured many ills, such as hunger, cold, and heavy rains. Many, lacking bread, ate horses, mules, and camels. Then I saw many who had no tents die from exposure in the cold rain. Often many Franks were killed by the Saracens who lurked along ~~the~~ way in narrow paths, or wherever our men went in search of food. Twice on the way, and no oftener, we had bread and grain, bought at exorbitant prices from the people of Tripoli and Caesarea. It was indeed a great blessing when we finally arrived at Jerusalem." (28)

(26) William of Tyre Vol.I, p.399.

(27) Fulcher of Chartres Historia Hierosolymitana in Krey, p.273.

(28) Ibid.

When the band had arrived in Jerusalem, they visited the Lord's Sepulchre and the Lord's Temple, and other churches and sacred places.

While Bohemond was in Jerusalem, it was decided that a
(29)
new Patriarch of Jerusalem should be elected. From the time Daimbert had landed at Antioch Bohemond had been cultivating his friendship. The reason for this was that Bohemond's hold on Antioch was very slight, for the Greek Emperor still claimed it under the agreement which the crusading leaders had made with him at Constantinople. Thus Bohemond realized that he was badly in need of moral sanction for his continued hold upon it, and the arrival of Daimbert, now the highest ranking churchman in the Holy Land, offered him this opportunity.

With Bohemond's arrival in Jerusalem, he held the commanding position over the other leaders. Godfrey had only a few forces in Jerusalem and even with the aid of Baldwin's troops, they were no match against Bohemond, Tancred and Daimbert. Also to further decrease the power of Godfrey, at this time he badly needed a seaport for Jerusalem. By all these factors, Bohemond was in the position to make good his desires. His desires included the election of Daimbert as patriarch and the submission of their respective principalities to Daimbert as papal vicar and patriarch, to be received

(30)

back from him as fiefs.

Arnulf, who had been patriarch, lacked independent strength and papal approval for his office, thus he could not complain nor fight back. In the end, he was granted the second place in the church as archdeacon of the Holy Sepulchre, together with a specified income. Godfrey, in the same position as Arnulf, undoubtedly hated the second part of the agreement; but there was little he could do.

After Bohemond had accomplished this great victory at the expense of both Arnulf and Godfrey, early in January, 1100, he and Baldwin returned to their respective principalities.

CONCLUSION

In 1100 when Bohemond was ruling as Prince of Antioch, Gabriel, an Armenian who controlled Malatia sent him a plea asking for aid against the Turk, Ibn Danishmand. However, this Turkish chief learned of this news and as Bohemond and his followers were marching to Malatia they fell into a previously prepared ambush. Many of the force were killed (1) while Bohemond and his cousin Richard were taken prisoners.

Upon Godfrey de Bouillon's death, his brother, Baldwin of Edessa, became the first king of Jerusalem. Tancred, still angry at Baldwin because of their disputes at Tarsus and Adana, handed his fiefs of Tiberias and Haifa back to the King. In 1101, Tancred went north to Antioch to rule the principality in Bohemond's absence.

The capture of Nicaea had been a great boom to Emperor Alexius. Its capture had enabled him to reconquer a considerable part of the coast of Anatolia, Smyrna, Ephesus. While the crusaders had moved ahead fighting the Turks, the Emperor followed in the rear. Thus he was able to conquer these regions almost without a battle. During the period that the crusaders had been besieging Antioch, Alexius had also recovered Mamistra, Adana and Tarsus.

Tancred proved to be a very energetic ruler of Antioch. Laodicea was finally captured from the Greeks, and Mamistra, Adana, and Tarsus were taken from the Emperor's grasp.

(1) William of Tyre Vol.I, p.411.

Emperor Alexius could hardly have been overjoyed by these happenings. Thus it seems reasonable to believe the story that he endeavored to buy Bohemond from Ibn Danishmand. It is said that Bohemond heard of this, and in turn offered Ibn Danishmand more money for his release than Alexius was willing to pay. His ransom was paid by the Armenian Kogh Vasil, Baldwin du Bourg, and Bernard, patriarch of Antioch.
(2)
He was released probably in May, 1103.

In 1104, Baldwin du Bourg, who had inherited Edessa from his cousin Baldwin, King of Jerusalem, called upon Bohemond and Tancred for help. Baldwin du Bourg had been having his territory destroyed by the enemy and felt that if they could capture the city of Harran and make it into a garrison, much of this trouble would stop.

However, at this particular period, Sukman Ibn Ortuq and Jikirmish, lord of Mosul, joined together and thoroughly defeated the combined forces of Bohemond, Tancred, and Baldwin du Bourg. Baldwin du Bourg and his cousin Joscelin were taken prisoners, but Bohemond and Tancred were fortunate enough to escape to Edessa. At Edessa, Tancred was chosen to rule the city during the Count's absence. The battle of Harran had a disastrous result, as Adana, Mamistra and Tarsus were once more recovered by the Greeks, and the Turks under Ridhwan were left unchallenged to plunder in the region around

(2) Ibid., p. 451.

(3)
Antioch.

In the fall of 1104, Bohemond once more intrusted Antioch to Tancred's care and set sail for Apulia. He remained in Italy for a year and in 1106 he crossed France, where he married Constance, daughter of Philip I. At the same time, another daughter of Philip's, Cecilia, was sent to Antioch to become the wife of Tancred.

In his travels in both Italy and France, Bohemond recruited a large army of knights and foot-soldiers. On October 9, 1107, Bohemond and his army set sail from Brindisi, arriving at Avlona the next day. The army attacked and pillaged the cities of the coast, destroying Epirus, and then laid siege to Durazzo. At the same time he continued plundering the surrounding territory.

The Emperor Alexius had been following the actions of Bohemond quite closely, and now with the aid of one of Quilij Arslan's commanders and force, he marched to meet Bohemond. At this very important crisis, through the intervention of common friends, a treaty was arranged between the two. The Emperor Alexius took the oath that in future Christian movements he would give all possible aid and advice. Bohemond took the oath that he would observe friendship and fidelity to the emperor forever. This oath was taken over an assortment of the most sacred relics in Constantinople. Undoubtedly,

(3) Ibid., p. 459.

for Bohemond it was a humiliating treaty and it is a rational conclusion that Bohemond was unable to do anything else but sign the treaty. The failure of Bohemond's enterprise against the Emperor only continued to increase the ill-feel-
(4)
ings of the crusaders against the Greeks.

In the meantime the West had participated in the Crusade of 1101. This crusade had been led by Duke William of Aquitaine, Conrad the Constable of the Emperor Henry, and the two Stephens of Blois and Burgundy. It had resulted in sheer disaster and this was blamed entirely on Emperor Alexius and the Greeks. It was declared that Alexius became allied with
(5)
the Turks in order to bring about the failure of this crusade. Regardless of whether this was true or not, misunderstanding between the Latins and the Greeks grew by leaps and bounds.

Thus we see that for the Byzantine Empire the First Crusade was in some ways very successful. The crusaders had rolled back the Turkish frontier in Asia not less than two hundred miles: instead of the Seljuk Turk lying at Nicaea, he was now chased back behind the Bithynian hills, and the empire had recovered all Lydia and Caria with much of the Phrygian inland.

The whole fate of the East seemed changed by the First Crusade. The Sultanate of Rum was hemmed up in the central and eastern parts of Asia Minor, while Nicaea and perhaps a

(4) Ibid., p.471.
(5) Ibid., p.432.

third of Asia Minor went back to the rule of Alexius.

The military danger of the Frankish powers was not the worst result of the Crusade on the Byzantine Empire. Even more important was the sapping of its sources of wealth and the decay of its commercial prosperity, as the consequence of the development of the trade of the Italian republics, like Pisa, Genoa, and Venice, who really reaped nearly the whole material advantages of the Crusades. Acre and the other Syrian ports began to supersede Constantinople as the great meeting-places of Eastern and Western trade. The skill and energy of the Italian merchants transferred the commerce of the Levant from Greek to Western hands. The revenue of the imperial exchequer began to fall off, and the disastrous expedients of Alexius to restore it made permanent ruin more certain. In the hope of making the Bosphorus and Golden Horn as attractive to the Italian traders as the waters of the Levant, Alexius in 1081 had first sought to entice the Venetians back to his ports by a grant of special privileges. (6) The Venetians were established in a special quarter of Constantinople, exempt from the jurisdiction of the Greek authorities, with its Catholic church, its walls, and its magistrates. The Pisans in 1111 were given privileges less extensive but still considerable. Such concessions made the Italians easily able to undersell the

(6) Oman, C.W.C. The Byzantine Empire, p.268.

native merchants and to establish their factories on an almost independent basis. But it was unlikely that the shrewd Venetians would be content with what they had got.

The Emperor Alexius died on August 15, 1118, and his son John II succeeded him. William of Tyre states that John was much more humane than his father, and that on the whole his rule from 1118 to 1143 was a peaceful one. (7) John was mostly occupied in his constant campaigns on the frontiers, fighting the Patzinaks of the lower Danube, the Hungarians and the Servians in Europe, and the Seljuk Turks and the Armenians in Asia. Master of Cilicia, he forced Raymond of Antioch to acknowledge his supremacy. Only his death in Cilicia, due to an accident in the hunting field, prevented his invasion of the Latin kingdom of Syria.

The third member of the Comnenus dynasty to rule the Byzantine Empire was John's son Manuel, who ruled from 1143 to 1180. It was during his reign that the West participated in the Second Crusade. This crusade was led by Conrad III, King of Germany, and Louis VII, King of France. With the Germans, Manuel came to an understanding, and got rid of them quickly; but with the French, he had a great deal of trouble. Due to these conditions, when the Second Crusade came to its disastrous end, it was laid chiefly to the perfidy of the Greeks, whose rapacity had, in truth,

(7) William of Tyre Vol.I, p.523.

(8)

been scandalous. The true reasons for the failure of the Second Crusade are to be found in the financial condition of its participants and the rivalry between the French and German nations.

The height of this hatred and misunderstanding between the Latins and Greeks manifested itself in 1195. In 1195, Alexius III had dethroned his brother Isaac, and imprisoned the fallen Emperor's son, Alexius. In 1201, the young man Alexius escaped to the West to ask for aid. It was just at this time that the Fourth Crusade had assembled at Venice. The Venetians, eager at this opportunity to mingle in Byzantine affairs and the crusaders, overcome by the promise of rich gifts, set sail for Constantinople. It can be said that the Venetians were the main instigators in this scheme, but the feeling held by the West in regard to the empire undoubtedly had its own effect.

In 1203, the Latins anchored before Constantinople. Peace between the reinstated Emperor Isaac and the Latins only existed a short while. The crusaders made new demands and there was constant bad feeling. Thus in 1204, Constantinople was taken in assault by the Latins. Baldwin of Flanders took over the throne of the Comneni and the remaining Greek aristocracy fled to Trebizond and Nicaea.

(9)

From the intense hatred that arose during the First Crusade

(8) Diehl, Charles op.cit., p.124.

(9) Ibid., p.136.

one can readily see the disastrous and long-ranged results it produced. This Latin conquest of Constantinople though of short duration, was one from which the Byzantine Empire never completely recovered.

To the end of the Middle Ages, titular dukes, princes, and emperors of the Eastern world kept up the memory of one of the strangest and most daring of Western conquests, but one which was useless to the West, and only weakened the Christian East, at a time when the rise of the Ottoman Turks required every effort to be made to stem the tide of that barbarian conquest which was soon to prove fatal to Latin and Greek alike.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources:

Krey, August C. The First Crusade, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1921. This is a collection of the accounts of eye-witnesses and participants of the First Crusade. Included are:

1. Chronicle of Anonymi Gesta
2. Fulcher of Chartres Historia Hierosolymitana
3. Anna Comnena Alexiad
4. Raoul de Caen Gesta Tancredi
5. Chronicle of Raymond of Aguilers
6. Chronicle of Robert the Monk
7. Chronicle of Ekkehard of Aura
8. Chronicle of Albert of Aix
9. Chronicle of Guibert of Nogent
10. Letter of Emperor Alexius to Abbot of Monte Cassino
11. Letters of Count Stephen of Blois to his wife, Adele
12. Letters of Crusading leaders to the Pope
13. Letter of Urban II to assembling crusaders
14. Letter of Pope Pascal to the Franks.

Ordericus Vitalis The Ecclesiastical History of England and Normandy. Translated with notes, and with introduction of Guizot, by Thomas Forrester. London, H.C. Bohn, 1853-56. Volumes II and III.

William of Tyre History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea. Translated and annotated by Emily Babcock and A.C. Krey. New York, Columbia University Press, 1943. Volumes I and II.

Secondary Sources:

Archer, T.A. and Kingsford, C.L. The Crusades, New York, G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1895.

Diehl, Charles History of the Byzantine Empire. Translated from the french by George B. Ives. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1925.

Gibbon, Edward The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, New York, A.L. Burt Co., 1924. Volume VI.

Haskins, Charles H. The Normans in European History. Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1915.

Ludlow, James M. The Age of the Crusades. New York, The Christian Literature Co., 1896.

Munro, Dana C. The Kingdom of the Crusaders. Student's edition. New York, London, D.Appleton-Century Company, 1935.

Munro, Dana C. "Did Emperor Alexius Ask for Aid at the Council of Piacenza?" An article in the American Historical Review, July, 1922.

Newhall, Richard A. The Crusades. New York, H.Holt and Co., 1927.

Oman, C.W.C. The Byzantine Empire, New York, G.P.Putnam's Sons, 1901.

Thatcher, Oliver J. "Critical Work on the Latin Sources of the First Crusade." An article in the American Historical Association Journal, 1900.

Tout, T.F. The Empire and The Papacy (918-1273) London, Rivingtons, 1921.