



OXFORD JOURNALS
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

The Motives of the Earliest Crusaders and the Settlement of Latin Palestine, 1095-1100

Author(s): Jonathan Riley-Smith

Source: *The English Historical Review*, Oct., 1983, Vol. 98, No. 389 (Oct., 1983), pp. 721-736

Published by: Oxford University Press

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/567757>

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

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



Oxford University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to
The English Historical Review

The English Historical Review

No. CCCLXXXIX – October 1983

*The motives of the earliest crusaders
and the settlement of Latin Palestine,
1095–1100*

ACCORDING to one early twelfth-century story St Ambrose, disguised as a crusader, appeared in a vision to an Italian priest and asked him why there had been such a great response to the appeal of Pope Urban II for crusaders. The priest replied that he was troubled, because

different people give different reasons for this journey. Some say that in all pilgrims the desire for it has been aroused by God and the Lord Jesus Christ. Others maintain that the Frankish lords and most of the people have begun the journey for superficial reasons and that it was because of this that setbacks befell so many pilgrims in the Kingdom of Hungary and in other kingdoms; and for that reason they cannot succeed.¹

The story demonstrates that contemporaries were divided in their views about the motives of the earliest crusaders. The debate continues today and every historian of the First Crusade has sooner or later to face up to the question what moved men to take the cross. It is true, of course, that large numbers of people were involved, from different backgrounds and with the variety of motives that is always to be found in any group of human beings. But historians are forced to generalise to some extent and when they do so marked differences in emphasis appear, ranging from the arguments of those who have been inclined to stress the ideological appeal of crusading, at least on the level of self-consciousness, to the counter-arguments of those who look for material reasons for the popularity of the crusade, especially land-hunger resulting from over-population, primogeniture and the practice of the *frèreche*. The sources for the crusade point in both directions. Most contemporary commentators, who were, of

1. Albert of Aachen, 'Historia Hierosolymitana', *Recueil des historiens des croisades. Historiens occidentaux* [RHC oc.], iv. 415–16.

course, propagandists for the crusading movement, shared the view of the Frenchman Guibert of Nogent:

We see nations moved by the inspiration of God. . . . The highest offices of government, the lordships of castles or cities were despised; the most beautiful wives became as loathsome as something putrid; the lure of every jewel, welcome once to both sexes as a security, was spurned. These men were driven by the sudden determination of totally changed minds to do what no mortal had ever been able to urge by command or achieve by persuasion. . . . What can this universal response be except an expression of that plain goodness which moved the hearts of the most numerous peoples to seek one and the same thing?¹

These writers portrayed the crusaders in general as idealists, who had renounced worldly things, and the crusade as an expression of popular devotion.² But to the German Ekkehard of Aura,

it was easy to persuade the western Franks to leave their farms. For Gaul had been afflicted for some years, sometimes by civil war, sometimes by famine, sometimes by an excessive death-rate. Finally a plague . . . had terrified the people to the point at which they despaired of life. . . . Of other nations or persons not covered by the papal edict, some confessed that they had been summoned to go to the Promised Land by certain prophets recently arisen among them or by signs in the heavens and revelations; others were compelled to take such vows by all kinds of personal disadvantages. In fact many of them were burdened on the journey with wives and children and all their domestic goods.³

In support of Ekkehard's more cynical view, it may well be that Pope Urban drew his audience's attention in the sermons in which he preached the cross to the possibility of amassing wealth;⁴ certainly the decree on the indulgence issued at the Council of Clermont, with its limitation of the remission of penance to those who crusaded 'for devotion only, not to gain honour or money',⁵ is evidence that the pope and the French bishops were aware that some at least would take the cross for material reasons. In fact the narrative accounts of the

1. Guibert of Nogent, 'Gesta Dei per Francos', *RHC* *oc.* iv. 124-5.

2. See two forthcoming articles by J. Riley-Smith: 'The First Crusade and St Peter', *Outremer*, eds. R. C. Smail, H. E. Mayer and B. Z. Kedar; and 'Death on the First Crusade', *The end of strife*, ed. D. M. Loades. For the theme of renunciation, see also Raymond of Aguilers, *Liber*, eds. J. H. and L. L. Hill (Paris, 1969), p. 41; Guibert of Nogent, pp. 124, 161, 221, 225; Ekkehard of Aura, 'Hierosolymita', *RHC* *oc.* v. 32-33; Albert of Aachen, pp. 401-2; Orderic Vitalis, *Historia ecclesiastica*, ed. M. Chibnall (Oxford, 1969-80), v. 4; *La Chanson d'Antioche*, ed. S. Duparc-Quioc (Paris, 1977-8), i. 54, 303, 351, 406, 418.

3. Ekkehard of Aura, p. 17.

4. Fulcher of Chartres, *Historia Hierosolimitana*, ed. H. Hagenmeyer (Heidelberg, 1913), p. 137; Robert of Rheims, 'Historia Hierosolimitana', *RHC* *oc.* iii. 728; Baldric of Bourgueil, 'Historia Jerosolimitana', *RHC* *oc.* iv. 15; *Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum*, ed. R. Hill (London, 1962), p. 1; Peter Tudebode, *Historia de Hierosolimitano itinere*, eds. J. H. and L. L. Hill (Paris, 1977), p. 32.

5. R. Somerville, *The Councils of Urban II. 1. Decreta Claromontensia (Annuarium Historia Conciliorum. Suppl. i. Amsterdam, 1972)*, p. 74. This was confirmed in Urban's letter to Bologna. H. Hagenmeyer, *Die Kreuzzugsbriefe aus den Jahren 1088-1100* (Innsbruck, 1901), p. 137.

crusade echo quite literally the wording of this decree. There can be little doubt that a desire for earthly glory did motivate crusaders.¹ It was certainly gained. Count Robert of Flanders, for instance, was treated for the rest of his life with the special respect accorded to a *Jerosolimitanus*.² The acquisition of booty, moreover, is recorded so often that one is tempted to believe that it played a very large part indeed in the crusaders' thinking.³ But there is little evidence for them returning home rich in anything but relics. This is not surprising when one considers the expenses of the journey, which must have outweighed the sums raised through sales and mortgages before departure – sales so massive that the value of goods in Francia fell⁴ – and the needs of the armies on the march, which seem only to have been met by periodic divisions of spoil.⁵ It should not be forgotten that the only way the armies could have been supplied once they had left Greek territory was through looting.

'Honour and money.' It is striking that the decree of the Council of Clermont did not refer to land. In this respect Georges Duby's suggestion in his study of the Mâconnais that in an area where the custom of partible inheritance predominated it suited families for members to make themselves permanently scarce has been remarkably influential considering that Duby merely proposed it in passing and produced in evidence the example of only one family.⁶ And the value of this and other arguments for land-hunger as a motivating force must be weighed against the fact that, after the capture of Jerusalem on 15 July 1099 and the victory over the Egyptian army on 12 August, most crusaders decided to return home. One party was said to have numbered c.20,000,⁷ and Fulcher of Chartres, the chaplain of the first king of Jerusalem, reported that in

1. See Raymond of Aguilers, *Liber*, pp. 58, 89; Guibert of Nogent, pp. 161, 193; Ralph of Caen, 'Gesta Tancredi in expeditione Hierosolymitana', *RHC* *oc.* iii. 603, 622, 668; Hugh of St Maria, 'Itineris Hierosolymitani compendium', *RHC* *oc.* v. 363; Orderic Vitalis, v. 6, 54, 268. For glory as a motivating force on the 1101 crusade, see Orderic Vitalis, v. 322.

2. See 'Annales Blandinienses', *Monumenta Germaniae historica. Scriptores* [MGHS], v. 27; Walter of Thérouanne, 'Vita Karoli comitis Flandriae', MGHS, xii. 540; 'Genealogiae breves regum Francorum', MGHS, xiii. 250; 'Genealogiae comitum Flandriae', MGHS, ix. 306, 323, 336; 'De genere comitum Flandrensis notae Parisienses', MGHS, xiii. 257, 259; Henry of Huntingdon, *Historia Anglorum*, ed. T. Arnold (London, 1879), p. 238; Herimannus, 'Liber de restauracione s. Martini Tornacensis', MGHS, xiv. 313; 'Monumenta Aquicinctina', MGHS, xiv. 586; Robert of Torigni, *Chronica*, ed. R. Hewlett (London, 1889), p. 92.

3. *Gesta Francorum*, pp. 1, 20, 94–95, 97; Peter Tudebode, pp. 32, 53, 145, 149; Raymond of Aguilers, *Liber*, pp. 111, 131; Guibert of Nogent, p. 171; Robert of Rheims, p. 830; Baldric of Bourgueil, pp. 15, 22–23, 30, 46; Bartolf of Nangis, 'Gesta Francorum Iherusalem expugnantium', *RHC* *oc.* iii. 505, 518; Albert of Aachen, p. 291; Orderic Vitalis, v. 56, 88, 116; *La Chanson d'Antioche*, i. 123.

4. See Guibert of Nogent, p. 141; Orderic Vitalis, v. 16.

5. See for instance Raymond of Aguilers, *Liber*, pp. 111, 131; Baldric of Bourgueil, pp. 22–23; Orderic Vitalis, v. 56.

6. G. Duby, *La société aux XIe et XIIe siècles dans la région mâconnaise* (Paris, 1953), p. 435.

7. Albert of Aachen, p. 503.

1100 there were no more than 300 knights and the same number of foot left to guard Jerusalem, Jaffa, Ramle and Haifa.¹ We must not be misled by this figure, which does not include the substantial bodies of horse and foot commanded by Tancred in Galilee, Galdemar Carpenel in Hebron, perhaps Garnier of Grez's successor in Nablus, and the settlers in northern Syria,² but even so there can be little doubt that most crusaders did not settle in the East. It does not, of course, follow that all of those who returned to Europe had never had the intention of acquiring land – some may not have liked what they found when they arrived, some may have doubted the ability of the new settlement to survive – but at the very least the exodus from Palestine throws doubt on the idea of the crusade as a manifestation of a search for *Lebensraum*.

Here I examine the subject from another angle. I have turned to the first year of the settlement itself, listing those individuals who are known to have been crusaders and then stayed on and asking myself if anything can be said about their motives. The results of this investigation are suggestive rather than conclusive, but they do not confirm that the majority of the settlers were landless and impecunious. And a side-effect has been that I have been able to make some proposals about the policies of the new government in that first year of settlement.

Godfrey of Bouillon's *domus*, his household, accompanied him on the crusade and stayed by his side in the East.³ It seems to have been composed largely of men from his duchy of Lower Lorraine. In Palestine its nucleus consisted of some of the more important Lorrainer vassals or of members of their families: Garnier, Count of Grez in Brabant, who was the most prominent and was related to Godfrey by birth and perhaps also by marriage,⁴ Franco of Mechelen,⁵ Gerard of Avesnes⁶ and Lambert of Montaigu.⁷ Then

1. Fulcher of Chartres, p. 389.

2. Compare the figures, which may, of course, be wrong, given by Albert of Aachen (pp. 513, 514, 517) for the forces of Godfrey and Tancred. Baldwin of Boulogne brought about 400 men to Jerusalem from Edessa in November 1100, although many of these troops must have been oriental. Fulcher of Chartres, p. 354, n.

3. See Albert of Aachen, pp. 358, 447, 531, 532, 545; and also the references to 'Eustachides' in Ralph of Caen, pp. 632, 641. A close parallel is to be found in J. O. Prestwich, 'The military household of the Norman kings', *ante*, xcvi (1981), 1–35.

4. ON CRUSADE (evidence of participation in the crusade): Albert of Aachen, pp. 299, 301, 310, 315, 365, 383, 384, 422, 424; William of Tyre, 'Historia rerum in partibus transmarinis gestarum', RHC oc. i. 45, 71, 199, 263; *La Chanson d'Antioche*, i. 69, ii. 227. IN PALESTINE (evidence of settlement in Palestine): Albert of Aachen, pp. 507, 514, 520, 521; William of Tyre, pp. 384, 404, 405; H. F. Delaborde, *Chartes de la Terre Sainte provenant de l'abbaye de Notre Dame de Josaphat* (Paris, 1880), p. 45 (R. Röhricht, *Regesta regni Hierosolymitani 1097–1291* (Innsbruck, 1893–1904), no. 134).

5. ON CRUSADE: Albert of Aachen, p. 413. IN PALESTINE: Albert of Aachen, p. 509.

6. In Palestine only, but from so early that he must have crusaded. Albert of Aachen, pp. 499, 507–8, 510, 516, 593.

7. ON CRUSADE: Albert of Aachen, pp. 317, 422, 464, 495; William of Tyre,

there were the officers of the household – two chamberlains, Geoffrey¹ and Stabelo, the second of whom had certainly been in Godfrey's service before the crusade,² and a seneschal, Matthew³ – and Godfrey's knights: Gunter,⁴ Wicher the German,⁵ Miles of Clermont;⁶ probably also Arnulf the Lorrainer⁷ and perhaps Rothold.⁸ Two more knights did not come from Lower Lorraine proper but from nearby: Ralph of Ménonville⁹ and Engilbert, who came from the ecclesiastical territory of Tournai but had been in Godfrey's company on the crusade.¹⁰ And we know of one real outsider, the Swabian Frederick of Zimmern, who had travelled perhaps with Peter the Hermit or Emicho of Leiningen and then in Godfrey's company and did not intend to stay permanently in Palestine. He returned to Europe with Bohemond of Taranto in 1105, but became dissatisfied and went back to the East, probably in 1109. He lived there into the reign of Baldwin II.¹¹ These men made up a pp. 263, 352; *La Chanson d'Antioche*, i. 146; Henry of Huntingdon, 'De captione Antiochiae a christianis', RHC oc. v. 377. That he was in Godfrey's army is suggested by the reference to his father in Albert of Aachen, p. 306. IN PALESTINE: Albert of Aachen, p. 510 (in which he appears to have been held as a hostage in Arsuf); Delaborde, *Chartes*, p. 29 (Röhricht, *Regesta*, no. 80).

1. In Palestine only, but from so early that he must have crusaded: Albert of Aachen, p. 526.

2. BEFORE THE CRUSADE: Albert of Aachen, pp. 481–2. ON CRUSADE: Albert of Aachen, p. 300. IN PALESTINE: Albert of Aachen, p. 593.

3. In Palestine only, but from so early that he must have crusaded: Albert of Aachen, p. 526.

4. In Palestine only, but from so early that he must have crusaded: Albert of Aachen, p. 526.

5. ON CRUSADE (in which he was Godfrey's standard-bearer): Baldric of Bourgueil, pp. 47, n., 50, n., 92, n.; *La Chanson d'Antioche*, i. 62, 180, 200, 233, 262, 316, 427, 428, 442, 446, 449, 452–3 (in which it is stated wrongly that he was killed), ii *passim*; 'Li Estoire de Jerusalem et d'Antioche', RHC oc. v. 626, 629; Alberic of Trois-Fontaines, 'Chronica', MGHS, xxiii. 811. IN PALESTINE: Albert of Aachen, pp. 507, 522, 526, 531, 553.

6. In Palestine only, but from so early that he must have crusaded: Albert of Aachen, p. 522.

7. ON CRUSADE: *La Chanson d'Antioche*, i. 441. IN PALESTINE: C. Kohler, 'Chartes de l'abbaye de Notre-Dame de la vallée de Josaphat en Terre Sainte', *Revue de l'Orient latin*, vii (1900), 114, 120; J. Delaville Le Roulx, *Cartulaire général de l'ordre des Hospitaliers de St.-Jean de Jérusalem (1100–1310)* (Paris, 1894–1906), i. 21, 172; Delaborde, *Chartes*, p. 32 (Röhricht, *Regesta*, nos. 56a, 57, 87, 102a, 293).

8. In Palestine only, but from so early that he must have crusaded: Albert of Aachen, p. 509.

9. In Palestine only, but from so early that he must have crusaded: Albert of Aachen, pp. 526, 531. For a Louis of Ménonville on crusade, see William of Tyre, p. 263.

10. ON CRUSADE (in which he was a knight of Godfrey's and played a distinguished part: he and his brother were the first knights to enter Jerusalem): Ralph of Caen, p. 693; Bartolf of Nangis, p. 515; Albert of Aachen, pp. 472, 477; 'Historia peregrinorum euntium Jerusolymam', RHC oc. iii. 221; Alberic of Trois-Fontaines, p. 811. IN PALESTINE: Albert of Aachen, p. 585. For his brother Lethold of Tournai, see *Gesta Francorum*, p. 91; Peter Tudebode, p. 140; Guibert of Nogent, p. 226; Baldric of Bourgueil, p. 102; Robert of Rheims, p. 867; Bartolf of Nangis, p. 515; Ralph of Caen, p. 693; Albert of Aachen, pp. 472, 477; 'Historia peregrinorum', p. 221; Orderic Vitalis, v. 168; William of Tyre, pp. 351–2.

11. 'Chronique de Zimmern', ed. H. Hagenmeyer, *Archives de l'Orient latin*, ii (1884), 21–36; and see the editor's comments on pp. 69–70, 87.

group that seems to have been as close-knit as any that accompanied a leader of the First Crusade. After Godfrey's death on 18 July 1100 it acted as a body to preserve the settlement for his brother Baldwin and it still had a sort of corporate existence for another year or two.¹ Godfrey naturally granted estates and offices to its members. Garnier of Grez was in the position to give the village of Aschar, close to Nablus, to the monastery of St Mary of the Valley of Josaphat before his death on 22 July 1100. This suggests that he had been rewarded with the important town of Nablus and its territory after it had surrendered to Godfrey's representatives, Eustace of Boulogne and Tancred.² Gerard of Avesnes, who had entered Arsuf as a hostage, was hung from the walls and injured by Christian arrows when Godfrey, trying to impose a more direct rule, assaulted the town. On Gerard's release by the Muslims he was rewarded by Godfrey with the gift of a castle near Hebron, perhaps Thecua.³ It is possible that Wicher the German was made castellan of Jaffa.⁴ Lambert of Montaigu and Arnulf the Lorrainer held rear-fiefs in Galilee.⁵ Perhaps they had been granted them by Godfrey himself, perhaps by Tancred, the first lord of Tiberias, or perhaps by Hugh of St Omer, Tancred's successor.

Godfrey's household provided him with a base on which to begin to build his government of Palestine in the first twelve months of settlement, but the followers of other crusade leaders also remained with him. Foremost among them was Tancred, Bohemond of Taranto's nephew, who, leaving his uncle behind in Antioch, had marched to Jerusalem with the crusade, leading what must have been a section of Bohemond's Italian Norman army: *Wiscardides*, or followers of the family of Robert Guiscard, were reported to be serving under him in Palestine.⁶ Tancred acquired the important region of Galilee, but a close examination of the evidence reveals that he did so in a way different to that assumed by recent historians. Determined to be independent of Godfrey, he marched north from Jerusalem, probably in the second half of August 1099, with eighty of his Italian Norman followers and took the undefended town of

1. Albert of Aachen, pp. 526, 532, 545, 592.

2. Delaborde, *Chartes*, p. 45 (Röhricht, *Regesta*, no. 134). See H. E. Mayer, *Bistümer, Klöster und Stifte im Königreich Jerusalem* (Stuttgart, 1977), pp. 343–8. For the occupation of Nablus, see H. Hagenmeyer, *Chronologie de la première croisade* (Paris, 1902), pp. 255–6.

3. Albert of Aachen, pp. 499, 507–8, 510, 516. The Latin appears to mean that he was given a castle near Hebron, not Hebron itself. Other possible locations would be Carmel or Samoe.

4. He died near, and was buried in, Jaffa: Albert of Aachen, p. 553.

5. Delaville Le Roux, *Cartulaire*, i. 21, 172; Delaborde, *Chartes*, pp. 29, 33 (Röhricht, *Regesta*, nos. 57, 80, 87, 293). Lambert is also to be found as a donor of land in Röhricht, *Regesta*, no. 576, but Mayer (*Bistümer*, pp. 233–4) shows that this document is a forgery.

6. Ralph of Caen, pp. 686, 703. For a reference to the *Wiscardides* as soldiers of Bohemond's army, see *ibid.* p. 613.

Bethsan.¹ But it is clear that he did not, as those historians have supposed, take Tiberias, which was occupied by Godfrey himself, probably in early September after the departure of most of the crusaders and before he laid siege to Arsuf. It is also clear that Godfrey then gave Tancred only the castellany of Tiberias, which he must have combined with his possession of Bethsan.² It was after Tancred had had great difficulty trying to impose Latin rule over the region east of the Sea of Galilee and had had to enlist Godfrey's aid that the latter, probably early in 1100, enfeoffed him with Tiberias and also with Haifa, which was not yet in Christian hands: in a charter drawn up early in 1101 Tancred confirmed that he had 'received Tiberias with all Galilee and its appurtenances from Duke Godfrey'.³

Two of Bohemond's knights can be identified among the Latins in Palestine. Robert fitz-Gerard, the second son of Count Gerard of Buonalbergo and Bohemond's cousin on his mother's side,⁴ had played a prominent part in the Italian Norman crusade.⁵ He must have followed Tancred to Jerusalem, but then he appears to have detached himself from the Norman company, because in July 1100 he was one of the group which sent an embassy to Baldwin of Boulogne, Godfrey's brother, inviting him to take over the government of Palestine after Godfrey's death – an act that certainly ran counter to Tancred's political ambitions.⁶ He returned to Europe some time before 1112.⁷ One of the ambassadors on the same mission was another Robert, presumably the 'knight from Apulia' who had already shared the captaincy of an expedition near Arsuf with Garnier of Grez and was granted in farm the tribute offered to Godfrey by that town.⁸ Given his obvious distinction, it is possible that he was Robert of Anzi, near Potenza,⁹ who had also played a large part in the Italian

1. Ralph of Caen, pp. 703–4; 'Historia peregrinorum', p. 226.

2. Albert of Aachen, p. 517. The only apparent evidence for Tancred's occupation of Tiberias, in a variant of Baldric of Bourguet (p. 111), is in fact a reference to events that followed Godfrey's death.

3. Delaville Le Roulx, *Cartulaire*, ii. 897; Albert of Aachen, pp. 517–18; William of Tyre, p. 384, who may well have seen the charter and referred to the grant of both Tiberias and Haifa. Godfrey himself confirmed the properties of the monastery of Mt Thabor in Galilee, which suggests that Galilee was at first under his lordship. J. von Pflugk-Harttung, *Acta pontificum Romanorum inedita* (Stuttgart, 1881–5), ii. 180.

4. E. M. Jamison, 'Some notes on the *Anonymi Gesta Francorum*, with special reference to the Norman contingent from South Italy and Sicily in the First Crusade', *Studies in French Language and Medieval Literature presented to Professor Mildred K. Pope* (Manchester, 1939), pp. 201–2.

5. He was Bohemond's constable and standard-bearer. *Gesta Francorum*, p. 36; Peter Tudebode, p. 72; Baldric of Bourguet, p. 47; Guibert of Nogent, p. 178; Ralph of Caen, p. 668; 'Historia peregrinorum', pp. 176, 182, 191; Albert of Aachen, pp. 316, 422; Orderic Vitalis, v. 78; Henry of Huntingdon, 'De captione Antiochiae', p. 376; William of Tyre, p. 263; Duparc-Quioc, *La Chanson d'Antioche*, ii. 150, 178–9, 188, 192–3, 197.

6. Albert of Aachen, p. 526.

7. Jamison, 'Some notes', p. 202.

8. Albert of Aachen, pp. 514–15, 526.

9. Jamison, 'Some notes', pp. 202–3.

Norman crusade and had gone with Tancred on his raid into Cilicia in September 1097.¹ He had witnessed a charter issued by Bohemond in Antioch on 14 July 1098.²

When Raymond of St Gilles, the Count of Toulouse, left Palestine in late August 1099, two of his most important followers decided to remain behind with Godfrey. Count William of Montpellier, who had played a leading rôle in the South French army,³ clearly intended to stay only temporarily: by 1103 he had returned home.⁴ But Count Galdemar Carpenel, a rich nobleman who had been persuaded to crusade by Archbishop Hugh of Die of Lyons,⁵ was admired for his decision not to return to his properties as many others had done.⁶ He became a close associate of Godfrey⁷ and he seems to have been granted a tract of land on the south-eastern frontier of the kingdom, including Hebron and Jericho.⁸ From admittedly fragmentary evidence one can deduce that Galdemar held this territory as a fief on similar terms to Tancred's Tiberias. He was reported by Albert of Aachen to have had his own troops, and this evidence is supported in a negative way by the fact that Fulcher of Chartres's estimate of the forces in the kingdom in 1100 contained no references to Galilee or Hebron, or Nablus for that matter, which suggests that Fulcher was considering only the royal domain.⁹ In the letter to Baldwin of Boulogne, moreover, in which Godfrey's followers summoned him to Jerusalem after the duke's death, they referred to themselves, according to Albert of Aachen, as 'knights and prince of the kingdom of Jerusalem': the 'prince' could only have been Galdemar.¹⁰ In 1100

1. *Gesta Francorum*, pp. 7, 20; Peter Tudebode, p. 53; Baldric of Bourgueil, p. 21; Albert of Aachen, p. 350; 'Historia peregrinorum', p. 182; Orderic Vitalis, v. 36; Henry of Huntingdon, 'De captione Antiochiae', p. 375; William of Tyre, pp. 90, 136, 148.

2. Hagenmeyer, *Die Kreuzzugsbriefe*, p. 156.

3. *Gesta Francorum*, pp. 26, 78; Peter Tudebode, pp. 78, 123; Baldric of Bourgueil, pp. 39, 85; Guibert of Nogent, pp. 168, 213; Robert of Rheims, p. 847; Gilo, 'Historia de via Hierosolymitana', *RHC* *oc.* v. 782; 'Historia peregrinorum', pp. 193, 208; Albert of Aachen, p. 316; Orderic Vitalis, v. 68, 138; *La Chanson d'Antioche*, i. 477; William of Tyre, p. 96; 'Li Estoire de Jérusalem', pp. 626, 630. Henry of Huntingdon ('De captione Antiochiae', p. 378) reported that he commanded Raymond of St Gilles's army in the Battle of Antioch, but see Albert of Aachen, p. 422; William of Tyre, p. 263.

4. IN PALESTINE: Albert of Aachen, p. 507. BACK IN FRANCE: C. Devic and J. Vaissète, *Histoire générale de Languedoc*, rev. A. Molinier *et al.* (Toulouse, 1874–1914), iii. 577.

5. Raymond of Aguilars, 'Ms. F.', *RHC* *oc.* iii. 307; Raymond of Aguilars, *Liber*, p. 141; Peter Tudebode, p. 135; William of Tyre, p. 337.

6. Raymond of Aguilars, 'Ms. F.', p. 307.

7. Albert of Aachen, pp. 507, 526, 531.

8. Albert of Aachen, p. 523; Delaville Le Roulx, *Cartulaire*, i. 22, 172 (Röhricht, *Regesta*, nos. 57, 293).

9. Albert of Aachen, pp. 523, 549; Fulcher of Chartres, p. 389. Fulcher's reference to Haifa suggests that this estimate was made in the period immediately following Baldwin's arrival in Palestine, when no decision had yet been taken on who was to hold that town.

10. Albert of Aachen, p. 526.

Godfrey, intending to capture Haifa and obviously worried that Tancred in Galilee would then gain access to the sea, promised the port to Galdemar in spite of the fact that he had already enfeoffed Tancred with it. Haifa was not taken until after Godfrey's death, and a violent dispute for it between Galdemar and Tancred was resolved in Galdemar's favour by King Baldwin I, one of whose first acts was to visit Hebron.¹ When Galdemar died in battle in 1101 he was regarded as a martyr.² A third member of Raymond's army may have been Roman of Le Puy, who was to play an important part in the future affairs of the kingdom. His name suggests that he may have been a knight from the diocese of Le Puy who had accompanied the papal legate Adhémar and had transferred his allegiance directly to Raymond after Adhémar's death on 1 August 1098. He is the first known castellan of Ramle, which he must have held before 1107.³

Seven other settlers can be identified. From Count Robert of Flanders's army came Roger of Rozoy in the Laonnois, who became prominent after Godfrey's death – by 1107 he was castellan of Jaffa and he appears to have held a rear-fief south of Nablus before 1115⁴ – and perhaps Winrich from Flanders itself and Ado of Quiersy, also in the Laonnois. Winrich was Godfrey's butler in Palestine, but it is not clear when he had joined the duke.⁵ Ado is not mentioned in the narratives of the course of the crusade, but he must have been related to, and may have accompanied, Gerard of Quiersy, who was quite prominent.⁶ He held property near Tibnin, but he could hardly have been granted this much before 1105 when Hugh of St Omer built the castle there.⁷ Ralph of Montpinçon in Normandy probably arrived with Duke Robert of Normandy's forces, although he too could have been a follower of Tancred.⁸ Ralph of Fontenelles (or Fontenay) in Anjou crusaded in the Angevin company which must have followed either Stephen of Blois or Hugh of Vermandois. He fled from Antioch in the summer of 1098, but returned to the crusade⁹ and settled in Palestine. In later years he had property in the city territory

1. Albert of Aachen, pp. 521–4, 531, 532, 535–6, 537–8.

2. Albert of Aachen, p. 549; Raymond of Aguilars, 'Ms. F.', pp. 307–8.

3. Delaville Le Roulx, *Cartulaire*, i. 21, 172 (Röhricht, *Regesta*, nos. 57, 293). It is clear that he was castellan before the Baldwin who was castellan in 1107. Albert of Aachen, p. 636. Roman was later to be lord of Oultrejordain.

4. ON CRUSADE: Albert of Aachen, pp. 358, 359; *La Chanson d'Antioche*, i. 70, 153, 162, 442. IN PALESTINE: Albert of Aachen, pp. 591, 593, 636, 637; Kohler, 'Chartes', p. 113; Delaborde, *Chartes*, p. 30 (Röhricht, *Regesta*, nos. 52, 80). Kohler, loc. cit. suggested alternatively that he came from Rozay in Thiérache.

5. Albert of Aachen, pp. 522, 526.

6. Albert of Aachen, pp. 315, 331–2, 467–8, 494; *La Chanson d'Antioche*, i. 94, 441; William of Tyre, pp. 46, 134, 218.

7. Albert of Aachen, p. 593; Kohler, 'Chartes', pp. 114, 117; Dellaville Le Roulx, *Cartulaire*, i. 22, 172; Delaborde, *Chartes*, p. 30 (Röhricht, *Regesta*, nos. 56a, 57, 80, 81a, 293).

8. Albert of Aachen, p. 531.

9. Baldric of Bourgueil, p. 65 variant; Ralph of Caen, p. 662; William of Tyre, p. 240.

of Jerusalem and a fief between Bethlehem and Hebron.¹ Robert fitz-Godwin was an English knight who had served in the Anglo-Saxon fleet operating on behalf of the Byzantine Empire under Edgar Atheling. He settled in Palestine but was killed in 1102.² The knight Peter Lombard³ had presumably joined one of the armies that had passed through northern Italy.

We have, therefore, the names of 28 individuals who had taken part in the crusade and had opted to stay with Godfrey, and it would be dangerous to draw too many conclusions from so small a sample of the settlers. The men who were mentioned in the narrative accounts or were listed among the witnesses of charters must have been, moreover, untypical in that they were distinguished by their prowess or by their close relationship to the leaders. And our dependence for most of their names on the narrative of the Lorrainer Albert of Aachen accounts for the fact that 12 names out of 28, or nearly 43 per cent, were those of Lorrainer members of Godfrey's household. The importance of the household, however, should not be underestimated. All its members must have been bound closely to Godfrey by ties of dependence reinforced by the suffering and dangers they had experienced on the three-year campaign. It is hard to exaggerate the importance of these ties, which are also to be found in the following of other crusade leaders. Leaving aside Bohemond himself and Tancred, we have the names of 10 members of Bohemond's company who settled in the East. Seven were Normans from southern Italy and Sicily, at least two of them, Richard of the Principality and Robert fitz-Gerard, being Bohemond's relatives. One, Ilger Bigod, was from Normandy proper, one, William the Carpenter, Viscount of Melun, was from the Île de France and one, Fulcher of Chartres, came from the County of Blois.⁴ The last two had joined Bohemond's company after disaster had overtaken the armies of Emicho of Leiningen and Peter the Hermit, to which they had been attached. We have seen that two, Robert fitz-Gerard and Robert of Anzi, accompanied Tancred to Jerusalem and stayed in Palestine. Another, Fulcher of Chartres, transferred his loyalties to Baldwin of Boulogne and was rewarded with an important fief in the County of Edessa.⁵ But seven apparently settled with Bohemond in

1. E. de Rozière, *Cartulaire de l'église du Saint-Sépulcre de Jérusalem* (Paris, 1849), pp. 224-5; P. Riant, 'Une dépendance italienne de l'église de Bethléem. Varazze en Ligurie (1139-1424)', *Atti della società ligure di storia patria*, xvii (1885), 658 (Röhricht, *Regesta*, nos. 111, 983 and also *passim*).

2. William of Malmesbury, *De gestis regum Anglorum*, ed. W. Stubbs (London, 1887-9), ii. 310, 449. But he may have arrived in the East late. See R. L. G. Ritchie, *The Normans in Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1954), pp. 95, 97, n. 4.

3. In Palestine only, but from so early that he must have crusaded: Albert of Aachen, p. 509.

4. For his brother Bartholomew Boel of Chartres, see Raymond of Aguilers, *Liber*, p. 64; Orderic Vitalis, v. p. 36, n. 1.

5. ON CRUSADE (at first with Peter the Hermit): Raymond of Aguilers, *Liber*, p. 64; Robert of Rheims, pp. 799-800, 805; Albert of Aachen, pp. 281, 283, 286, 288 (a

Antioch: Adam fitz-Michael,¹ Humphrey fitz-Ralph,² Ilger Bigod,³ Richard of the Principality,⁴ Robert of Sourdeval,⁵ Robert fitz-Tristan⁶ and William the Carpenter.⁷ Ilger Bigod seems to have been bound to Bohemond by particularly strong ties. He went with Tancred to Jerusalem,⁸ but he must have returned to Antioch, because he became Bohemond's *magister militum* there; he was later alongside Bohemond in France.⁹ He appears to have been a man who had attached himself to his leader so closely that he was prepared to follow him anywhere. But that an attachment of this sort may not necessarily imply naked self-interest may be demonstrated by looking at the careers of some survivors of the army of Raymond of St Gilles.

Raymond left Palestine in August 1100, leaving behind, as we have seen, William of Montpellier, Galdemar Carpenel and perhaps Roman of Le Puy. His actions appear to confirm the story that he had vowed never to return to his native land.¹⁰ He went to

report that he was killed). SETTLEMENT IN EDESSA AND DEATH: Albert of Aachen, p. 357; C. Cahen, *La Syrie du Nord à l'époque des croisades et la principauté franque d'Antioche* (Paris, 1940), pp. 219, 230. His son inherited his fief of Saruj: Albert of Aachen, p. 682.

1. ON CRUSADE: Albert of Aachen, pp. 365, 366, 426; *La Chanson d'Antioche*, i. 471. IN SYRIA: perhaps J. C. Lünig, *Codex Italae diplomaticus* (Frankfurt, 1725–35), ii, col. 2082 (Röhricht, *Regesta*, no. 35).

2. ON CRUSADE: *Gesta Francorum*, pp. 7–8; Baldric of Bourgueil, p. 21; Bartolf of Nangis, pp. 123–4; 'Historia peregrinorum', p. 176; Orderic Vitalis, v. 36; William of Tyre, p. 90. IN SYRIA: perhaps Lünig, *Cod. Ital. dipl.* ii, col. 2082 (Röhricht, *Regesta*, no. 35). See also Jamison, 'Some notes', p. 204.

3. ON CRUSADE: Orderic Vitalis, v. 168–70. IN SYRIA: Eadmer, *Historia novorum in Anglia*, ed. M. Rule (London, 1884), pp. 179–81.

4. See Jamison, 'Some notes', pp. 197–8. For his crusade, see S. Runciman, *A History of the Crusades* (Cambridge, 1951–4), i. 155; and for his career in Antioch, see Cahen, *La Syrie du Nord*, *passim*.

5. ON CRUSADE: Hagenmeyer, *Die Kreuzzugsbriefe*, p. 156; *Gesta Francorum*, p. 7; Baldric of Bourgueil, p. 21; 'Historia peregrinorum', p. 176; Orderic Vitalis, v. 36; William of Tyre, p. 90; Duparc-Quioc, *La Chanson d'Antioche*, ii, *passim*. IN SYRIA: Walter the Chancellor, *Bella Antiochenæ*, ed. H. Hagenmeyer (Innsbruck, 1896), p. 75 (RHC oc. v. 94). See also Jamison, 'Some notes', p. 207.

6. ON CRUSADE: *Gesta Francorum*, p. 7; 'Historia peregrinorum', p. 176; Orderic Vitalis, v. 36; William of Tyre, p. 90. IN SYRIA: Lünig, *Cod. Ital. dipl.* ii, col. 2082 (Röhricht, *Regesta*, no. 35). He was rich and had returned from the East by 1111. Jamieson, 'Some notes', pp. 204–5.

7. ON CRUSADE (at first with Emicho of Leiningen): *Gesta Francorum*, pp. 33–34; Peter Tudobode, pp. 68–69; Baldric of Bourgueil, pp. 43–44; Guibert of Nogent, pp. 173–5; Robert of Rheims, pp. 781–2; Ralph of Caen, p. 650; Albert of Aachen, pp. 294, 295, 305, 414–15, 417; 'Historia peregrinorum', pp. 188–9; Orderic Vitalis, v. 30, 74; 'Li Estoie de Jerusalem', pp. 626, 631; *La Chanson d'Antioche*, i. 69, 515, 526; William of Tyre, pp. 66, 80, 242. IN SYRIA: Albert of Aachen, pp. 598–9; Lünig, *Cod. Ital. dipl.* ii, col. 2081 (Röhricht, *Regesta*, no. 35).

8. Orderic Vitalis, v. 168–70.

9. Eadmer, pp. 179–81. Cf. the career of Ralph the Red of Pont-Echanfray with Bohemond. Hagenmeyer, *Die Kreuzzugsbriefe*, p. 156; Orderic Vitalis, vi. 40, 70, 100, 104. Ralph later became a captain of Henry I of England's household troops and was drowned in the wreck of the White Ship: Orderic Vitalis, vi. 198, 220–2, 228–30, 246, 250, 302.

10. See J. H. and L. L. Hill, *Raymond IV de St-Gilles, 1041 (ou 1042)–1105* (Toulouse, 1959), p. 26.

Constantinople, where the emperor Alexius appointed him adviser to the new crusaders now arriving from the West. After the disasters which overtook them in August 1101, he returned to Constantinople. In February 1102 a newly formed band of crusaders was collecting at Antioch. Raymond attached himself to it after a humiliating episode in which he was arrested and delivered into the hands of Tancred, now regent of Antioch. Tortosa was taken and the crusaders pressed on, leaving Raymond to subdue the area around it. After an unsuccessful investment of Hisn al-Akrad (Crac des Chevaliers), he laid siege to Tripoli in 1103. It seems that throughout these peregrinations some of his original companions stood by him, even though at times they must have had little hope of eventual reward. William Peyre, lord of Cunlhat, had been the employer of Peter Bartholomew, the visionary and discoverer of the relic of the Holy Lance, and had been a knight of Peter of Narbonne, one of Raymond's clerics who had been appointed the first Latin bishop of Albara in Syria. He had then transferred his service directly to Raymond. In 1103 he was still at Raymond's side and was one of the count's constables.¹ William Hugo of Monteil was a brother of the papal legate Adhémar. He must have travelled to Syria in the legate's company, but after Adhémar's death he entered Raymond's service.² In 1103 he and his wife were with Raymond in Syria, and it is probable that he was enfeoffed with the important castle and territory of Crac des Chevaliers after its acquisition by the county of Tripoli in 1112.³ It is possible that another member of this group was Bertrand Porcellet, who came from Arles and may have been rewarded with the important lordship of Artusie, north of Tripoli.⁴

It is not surprising to find attached to great men groups of dependents, some of whom were prepared to follow them anywhere. As powerful a reason as any for the settlement of those individuals whose names have come down to us seems to have been their lords' decision to remain. The motives of the great men, therefore, are of importance. The three major leaders who remained, Godfrey of Bouillon, Raymond of St Gilles and Bohemond of Taranto, were rich men who certainly had no financial need to stay in the East. There are

1. Raymond of Aguilars, *Liber*, pp. 71, 105; Devic and Vaissète, *Histoire générale de Languedoc*, v. 781; Rozière, *Cartulaire*, p. 182 (Röhricht, *Regesta*, nos. 38, 48); J. Richard, 'Le chartrier de Ste.-Marie-Latine et l'établissement de Raymond de St.-Gilles à Mont-Pèlerin', *Mélanges Louis Halphen* (Paris, 1951), p. 610. See J. Richard, *Le comté de Tripoli sous la dynastie toulousaine (1102-1187)* (Paris, 1945), p. 49.

2. Raymond of Aguilars, *Liber*, pp. 128, 130, 144. For Count Raymond and Adhémar's *familia*, see *ibid.* p. 85.

3. Richard, 'Le chartrier', pp. 610, 612; Devic and Vaissète, *Histoire générale de Languedoc*, v. 781 (Röhricht, *Regesta*, no. 38).

4. *Gallia Christiana* (Paris, 1715-1865), i. instr., p. 97, no. 13 (Röhricht, *Regesta*, no. 44); Richard, *Le comté de Tripoli*, p. 77; J. Richard, 'Le comté de Tripoli dans les chartes du fonds des Porcellet', *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, cxxx (1972), 349-50, 358-66.

grounds for supposing that Godfrey and Raymond were moved by religious devotion of a sort,¹ which would not of course preclude ambitions for themselves, and especially on behalf of their followers, once their minds had been made up. Bohemond's motivation may have been more complex. He was rich, but he had been disinherited of the duchy of Apulia and deprived of real political power in southern Italy. He seems to have been genuinely pious, but he was also ambitious and desired honour. He was right to remain in Antioch while the crusade proceeded to Jerusalem — somebody had to defend the lines back to Asia Minor and Christian territory — but he was wrong to deny the Greek emperor authority over his principality.² Two leaders of the second rank, Tancred and Baldwin, carved out households and futures for themselves by independent actions in the course of the crusade. Tancred, in command of a detachment of Bohemond's force consisting of 100 horsemen and 200 bowmen, certainly tried to set up a lordship for himself around Tarsus in Cilicia;³ for the march from Antioch to Jerusalem he again took with him part of Bohemond's army and it was with this force that he tried to establish an independent lordship at Bethsan after Jerusalem had fallen.⁴ On the other hand, he left behind him a good reputation as a ruler of Galilee who was fair and generous to the Church.⁵ Baldwin, as will be seen below, seems to have built up a force to conquer Edessa for himself partly out of Godfrey's army and partly by attracting the survivors of other parties that had broken up for one reason or another.⁶ Tancred and Baldwin appear on the surface at least to have taken advantage of the crusade to establish themselves in a territorial sense. Nevertheless, one cannot avoid concluding that most of the crusaders known to us may have settled because their leaders settled and that by no means all the leaders were motivated simply by a desire for land.

We know of 13 individuals in Palestine who had not crusaded in Godfrey's company. One of them, Tancred himself, has already been considered. Of the motives of 10 we have no knowledge, although Robert fitz-Gerard and perhaps Ado of Quiersy were younger sons and Robert fitz-Godwin seems to have been a disinherited Anglo-Saxon.⁷ Galdemar Carpenel, on the other hand, was a rich nobleman

1. Hill, *Raymond IV*, pp. 142–3. But cf. J. C. Andressohn, *The Ancestry and Life of Godefroy de Bouillon* (Bloomington, 1947), pp. 48–49.

2. See R. B. Yewdale, *Bohemond I, Prince of Antioch* (Princeton, 1924), *passim*; Cahen, *La Syrie du Nord*, pp. 205–41; R.-J. Lilie, *Byzanz und die Kreuzfahrerstaaten* (Munich, 1981), pp. 12–88 *passim*.

3. Ralph of Caen, pp. 629–41; *Gesta Francorum*, pp. 24–25; Baldric of Bourgueil, pp. 37–38; Guibert of Nogent, p. 164; Robert of Rheims, pp. 767–8. For Tancred's background, see Jamison, 'Some notes', pp. 196–7.

4. See *supra*, pp. 726–7.

5. William of Tyre, p. 384.

6. See *infra*, pp. 735–6.

7. But he may still have possessed land in Lothian; Ritchie, *The Normans in Scotland*, pp. 95–96.

who, like Godfrey and Raymond of St Gilles, committed himself to permanent exile. And William of Montpellier, like Frederick of Zimmern, was starting what would be a long tradition of European nobles staying in the East for several years, not as settlers but in fulfilment of a temporary pious duty. Another example was provided by Arpin of Bourges, who sold his property and departed for Palestine in the crusade of 1101. Wounded and captured by the Egyptians in 1102, he eventually returned home to become a monk at Cluny.¹

The picture that emerges is not a clear one. There are a few examples of an apparent desire for material gain, but they are outweighed by cases of idealism or of dependence on the close emotional ties binding lord and vassal, patron and client. But this study does reveal something of Godfrey of Bouillon's rule. One has the impression that the settlement was regulated. It is true that Professor Prawer, following the nineteenth-century historian Count Beugnot, has maintained that there were allodial properties in the kingdom of Jerusalem and that these were relicts of an early period of uncontrolled conquest, when individual settlers seized what they could.² Beugnot and Prawer based their arguments on the existence in the kingdom of a type of property known as a *fié franc*. The fact that the word *fié* was applied to it suggests that it was not technically an allod at all, but was a fief freed from the payment of services: this was unusual but not unknown in Europe.³ It is possible, however, that *fiés francs* were descended from allods. The only conquest known to have been made independently of Godfrey was Tancred's occupation of Bethsan, and it is worth asking whether its later history proves Beugnot and Prawer's thesis. There survives evidence for two acts of its lords, but in each case it is provided by a royal confirmation. This suggests, although it does not prove, that Bethsan was not freehold; both confirmations are of grants to the Church.⁴ On the other hand,

1. Guibert of Nogent, pp. 244–5; Albert of Aachen, pp. 544, 591, 593–5; Orderic Vitalis, v. 324, 344–6, 348, 350–2. According to *La Chanson d'Antioche* (i. 35, 39, 49, 50, 52, 508, 523, 524) he was on the First Crusade: on this introduction of material from the 1101 crusade, see Duparc-Quioc, *op. cit.* ii. 101, 126, 255.

2. J. Prawer, *Crusader Institutions* (Oxford, 1980), pp. 11–12, 351; A. A. Beugnot, 'Mémoire sur le régime des terres dans les principautés fondées en Syrie par les Francs à la suite des croisades', *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, sér. 3, v. (1854), 52–53.

3. J. Riley-Smith, *The Feudal Nobility and the Kingdom of Jerusalem 1174–1277* (London, 1973), p. 7; H. Richardot, 'Francs-fiefs. Essai sur l'exemption totale ou partielle des services de fief', *Revue historique de droit français et étranger*, sér. 4, xxvii (1949), pp. 28–63, 229–73; R. Boutruche, *Seigneurie et féodalité* (2nd edn) (Paris, 1968–70), ii. 203.

4. Delaville Le Roulx, *Cartulaire*, i. 140–1, 172 (Röhricht, *Regesta*, nos. 256, 293). See also E. Strehlke, *Tabulae ordinis Theutonici* (Berlin, 1869), pp. 7–8. (Röhricht, *Regesta*, no. 496), in which the king himself granted two villages in the lordship. The Hugh of Bethsan, who witnessed a charter in 1155 as a royal vassal (Röhricht, *Regesta*, no. 299), was probably never lord of Bethsan. See J. L. La Monte and N. Downs, 'The Lords of Bethsan in the Kingdoms of Jerusalem and Cyprus', *Mediaevalia et Humanistica*, vi (1950), 61.

Bethsan was certainly regarded as a fief in the 1180s, the period in which a list of services incorporated into John of Jaffa's lawbook was drawn up, because it was listed with Caesarea as a rear-fief of Sidon; and it was not a *fé d'franc*, since it owed the service of 15 knights.¹ If Bethsan had ever been allodial, no evidence for that state survives, and the lordship had been incorporated into the feudal system probably in the first half of the twelfth century, certainly by the 1180s. There is, in fact, no evidence to support either the existence of allods or disorder after July 1099. Godfrey of Bouillon seems to have had a territorial policy, which he pursued with two aims: to reward his household followers, as we have seen, and to assure the adequate defence of the new state. He seems to have kept for himself Jerusalem and a belt of land reaching to the coast: the town of Ramle and the port of Jaffa were held as castellanies. By the end of the first year he had entrusted the defence of the eastern and southern frontiers to two, perhaps three, men, each representing, interestingly enough, a different crusading army. Tancred held Galilee and Bethsan, Galdemar Carpenel Jericho and Hebron; Garnier of Grez may have held Nablus. Before Godfrey's death Galdemar, a powerful enough man to resist Tancred's ambitions, had been promised Haifa. Godfrey's government was in a sense shared with men like Tancred and Galdemar Carpenel, who had forces at their own disposal. It may have been out of this co-operation in government, as much as anything else, that there originated the independence of the great fiefs – so similar to western marcher lordships – which was a feature of the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem.

After 1100, however, the pattern of government changed radically. It did so because of an influx of new men from two directions. First, Baldwin of Boulogne brought part of his following to Jerusalem from Edessa. His own company had been created in the course of the crusade. It seems to have consisted partly of men drawn from Godfrey's army: a large detachment from that force was attached to Baldwin for his foray into Cilicia in September 1097.² Among them may have been a body of men from his brother Eustace's lordship of Boulogne: Eustace Garnier,³ Fulk of Guines⁴ and Hugh of

1. John of Jaffa, 'Livre des Assises de la Haute Cour', RHC *Lois*, i. 422 (see also p. 420). For the date of the list, see R. C. Smail, *Crusading Warfare (1097-1193)* (Cambridge, 1956), pp. 89–90. The existence of a feudal relationship involving Caesarea appears to be confirmed by the wording of Delaville Le Roulx, *Cartulaire*, i. 141.

2. Ralph of Caen, pp. 632–3, 636–7.

3. Hagenmeyer (in Fulcher of Chartres, p. 660, n. 7) thought it unlikely that he came early, but one cannot entirely ignore the 'Versus de viris illustribus qui diocesis Tarvensensis exorti in sacra fuerunt expeditione', eds. E. Martène and U. Durand, *Veterum scriptorum . . . amplissima collectio* (Paris, 1724–33), v, col. 540, even though he could have come on the 1101 crusade with Hugh of St Omer. For his later career, see Runciman, *Crusades*, ii, *passim*. He was already a fief-holder by 1105. Albert of Aachen, p. 621 (in which his *auxilium* was called for). He was lord of Caesarea before 1110. Delaville Le Roulx, *Cartulaire*, i, pp. 21–22 (Röhricht, *Regesta*, no. 57).

4. 'Versus de viris illustribus', col. 540. He may also have come on the 1101

Robecque¹ all came from that district and may have been on the First Crusade, although they only made appearance in Palestine after Baldwin's accession to the throne. They were supplemented by men who had belonged to bands that had already broken up. The knight Fulcher of Chartres, who became a great lord in Edessa, had been a follower of Peter the Hermit and had then attached himself to Bohemond before joining Baldwin.² The priest Fulcher of Chartres had originally been chaplain to Stephen of Blois, although he left him in October 1097, before Stephen withdrew from the crusade.³ Drogo of Nesle had been in Emicho of Leiningen's ill-fated company and had then apparently served with Hugh of Vermandois before transferring his allegiance to Baldwin.⁴ The second source of new men was the crusade of 1101, which brought in a new generation of settlers from Lombardy – Albert of Biandrate⁵ and Otto of Altaspata⁶ – and from Lower Lorraine, the Boulogne area and Flanders: Gotman of Brussels,⁷ Hugh of St Omer,⁸ Baldwin of Hemstrut⁹ and Ralph of Aalst.¹⁰ A new ruler, who aspired to be king, a new household and new men naturally led to changes in the political climate.

Royal Holloway College,
University of London

JONATHAN RILEY-SMITH

crusade, but was he the Fulk the Orphan, born in Flanders according to most manuscripts, of *La Chanson d'Antioche*, i. 304–5, 442?

1. 'Versus de viris illustribus', col. 540, although he could have come on the 1101 crusade. For his career, as Hugh of Hebron, in Palestine before 1110, see Röhricht, *Regesta*, no. 43; Albert of Aachen, p. 621.

2. See *supra*, p. 730.

3. Hagenmeyer, intro. to Fulcher of Chartres, pp. 4–7.

4. ON CRUSADE: Robert of Rheims, p. 833; Albert of Aachen, pp. 299, 304, 305, 315, 398; *La Chanson d'Antioche*, i. 86, 90, 91, 93, 94, 95, 488; William of Tyre, pp. 80, 218. WITH BALDWIN TO EDESSA: Albert of Aachen, p. 442. IN PALESTINE: Röhricht, *Regesta*, nos. 57, 76a, 115 (add.), 293. For his origins, see Duparc-Quioc, *La Chanson d'Antioche*, ii. 229, n.

5. ON CRUSADE: Albert of Aachen, pp. 559, 561, 562, 568, 569, 582, 591; Orderic Vitalis, v. 326, 336 (killed, which is an error). IN PALESTINE: Albert of Aachen, p. 603.

6. ON CRUSADE: Albert of Aachen, pp. 559, 568, 591. IN PALESTINE: Albert of Aachen, pp. 603, 608.

7. ON CRUSADE: Albert of Aachen, p. 591. IN PALESTINE (before 1110): Albert of Aachen, pp. 594, 621; Röhricht, *Regesta*, nos. 43, 52, 56a, 57, 76a, 76b, 80.

8. ON CRUSADE: Albert of Aachen, p. 591; 'Versus de viris illustribus', col. 540; 'Le lignages d'Outremer', *RHC Lois*, ii. 455. IN PALESTINE: Albert of Aachen, pp. 531 (in error), 538, 549, 621, 632, 633–5, 639, 642; Fulcher of Chartres, pp. 446–9, 509–11; Röhricht, *Regesta*, nos. 43, 57; Bartolf of Nangis, pp. 524, 535; 'Secunda pars Historiae Iherosolimitanae', *RHC oc.* iii. 563, 568; Baldwin III, 'Historia Nicaena', *RHC oc.* v. 179, 181; William of Tyre, pp. 414, 434, 459–60; 'Les lignages', p. 455; 'Li Estoire de Jerusalem', pp. 642, 643.

9. Albert of Aachen, pp. 591, 593, 621. Is he the Baldwin who was later the castellan of Ramle? Albert of Aachen, p. 636; Röhricht, *Regesta*, nos. 57, 80, 293. See W. H. Rudt de Collenberg, 'Les premiers Ibelins', *Le moyen âge*, lxxxi (1965), 460.

10. Albert of Aachen, pp. 591, 593 (when killed). Is he the Radulfus Aloensis, who held property, including Montjoie, near Jerusalem? Röhricht, *Regesta*, nos. 67, 80.