THE CLERGY, THE POOR, AND THE NON-COMBATANTS ON THE FIRST CRUSADE

BY WALTER FORGES

When Pope Urban preached the First Crusade at Clermont, he did not have in mind a purely military expedition. Ever since the time of Constantine, large numbers of pious or adventurous pilgrims of both sexes had made their way to the Holy Land. Although interrupted now and again by the convulsions periodically shaking the Levant, in the tenth and eleventh centuries the pilgrimages continued to flourish. The pilgrims travelled mostly in small groups, and apparently did not bear arms, even for self-defense; but during the first half of the eleventh century, the small pilgrim bands were supplemented by larger enterprises, numbering several hundred to several thousand participants. The great German pilgrimage of 1064–1065 included from seven to twelve thousand persons — the equivalent of a respectable medieval army.

The pope could not escape the influence of this vigorous tradition. The petty feudal wars of western Europe could not offer him a model for his stupendous undertaking. The pilgrimage was the only large-scale, long-distance expedition with which he was familiar; moreover, he knew the power of the pilgrim ideal. Therefore Urban combined the idea of the Palestine pilgrimage with that of the holy war. He implemented his plans for the recovery of the Holy Land not by an appeal limited to the chivalry of Europe, but by stirring up the latent pilgrim enthusiasm which pervaded all classes, raising it to an unprecedented pitch, and directing it into new, more warlike channels. By arming the pilgrimage the pope created the crusade.

The term *peregrinus*, the verb *peregrinari* now served to designate the crusader, as well as the pilgrim, and describe his activity. The crusaders in the main followed the land route through Hungary and Bulgaria, and down the Balkans to the Golden Horn, preferred by pilgrims since the conversion of the Magyars.

1 I wish to express here my gratitude to Professor Einar Joranson of the University of Chicago for his generous aid and encouragement in the preparation of this essay.

Of those who took the alternate path through Italy, many identified themselves even more closely with pilgrim tradition. Some, when they had worshipped at St. Peter's, considered their vows fulfilled; others, deserted by their leaders in Calabria, 'took up their pilgrim staves again, and ignominiously returned home.' The faithful, who persisted to the end, had as their reward the plenary indulgence, the usual goal of pious pilgrims.

Urban's dependence upon the pilgrim movement had its disadvantages. The crusade had before it a desperately difficult military task, and efficiency demanded a careful selection of recruits. But the new movement was caught betwixt and between: rooted in the pilgrimage, the crusade attracted large numbers of noncombatants, such as had always gone on pilgrimages; while as a military expedition the crusade found it inexpedient or even dangerous to admit very many of them.

Urban was aware of the contradiction. Although he found the inclusion of noncombatants implicit in his crusade conception, and his appeal took their participation for granted, he took pains, nevertheless, to limit their number and supervise their selection. The pope laid down the rule that all persons were to consult their local clergy before going on crusade. In addition, he emphasized the need for fighting men, and for men wealthy enough to bear the cost of the journey, and discouraged the participation of the aged and sick. But he permitted women to go, if properly escorted, and reserved an especially important place for the clergy. Urban also invited the poor; not, however, as noncombatants, but as potential fighters, to be equipped and maintained by the charity of the wealthier crusaders. In this respect the pope's expectations were deceived. Before the campaign was half over, the poor had been reduced to a noncombatant or at best semi-combatant condition.

Unfortunately, the pilgrim tradition, reinforced by the deep enthusiasm roused by itinerant preachers, overwhelmed Urban's attempts to limit participation in the crusade. More than five premature expeditions, collectively termed the peasants' crusade, did not suffice to draw off the excess of unarmed and unfit. Some of these expeditions were reasonably well-armed and well-disciplined, and failed largely because they were premature. Others, however, were belated pilgrim excursions, best viewed as halfway stages between the unarmed pilgrimage and the crusade proper. Fired by a new and unrestrained zeal, they attracted a strange mixture of priests and laymen, women, children, and those wont to prey upon them, false prophets and simple-minded believers. Many of the participants were unarmed, and expected to overcome the Saracens by the direct intervention of God, rather than by the use of earthly weapons. Most of them left their bones on the plains of Hungary and Bulgaria, or were slaughtered by the Turks on the threshold of Asia Minor.

8 Fulcher of Chartres, Gesta Francorum Jerusalem expugnantium, 1, 7. iii, v, ed. H. Hagenmeyer (Heidelberg, 1918), pp. 166, 168.
4 For an analysis of Urban's speech with complete source references, see D. C. Munro, 'The Speech of Pope Urban II at Clermont, 1095,' A.H.R., xi (1906), 231–242.
Nevertheless, there were more than enough noncombatants left over to swell the ranks of the main army. Urban’s admonitions went unheeded. The aged and sick trudged along, seeking the earthly Jerusalem; campfollowers and harlots trailed as ever in the wake of the army. No information exists to justify even a rough estimate of the actual number of noncombatants. The chroniclers, who estimate the size of the army in very round numbers, scarcely honor any but the fighting men with more than passing mention, while all the descriptions of the army before it reached Nicaea seem vitiated by confusion with the peasants’ crusade. But some information may be gleaned from Fulcher of Chartres’ eyewitness account of the situation at Nicaea: “Then out of many armies, one army was there created, which those who were skilled in reckoning estimated at six hundred thousand men fit for combat, of whom one hundred thousand were armed with cuirasses and helmets, not counting the unarmèd, that is, clerics, monks, women, and children.” There are pictorial numbers; but if only about one-sixth of the army was equipped with cuirasses and helmets, a large part of the remainder must have been half-armed poor. The form of the statement also suggests that the number of noncombatants was high.

If such was the condition of the army at Nicaea, it did not long remain unaltered. Thereafter the relative number of combatants fell steadily, and that of the noncombatants steadily increased. Battles and skirmishes took a constant toll of fighting men. Chronic illness reduced many to noncombatant status. Exhaustion of funds, necessitating the sale of arms and armor, might reduce a knight to a foot-soldier, or a foot-soldier to an unarmed pauper. That the greater part of the invalid and destitute soldiers never returned to full fighting efficiency is made plain by the fact that from the defeat of Kerbogha until the capture of Jerusalem (June, 1098 to July, 1099), the period of the greatest military supremacy ever enjoyed by the Christian army, the crusaders were sadly deficient in armed strength, and the unarmed host greatly outnumbered the fighters. Thus, in January, 1099, when the count of Toulouse wished to lead some of the poor on a plundering raid to obtain food, his intimates objected, saying, ‘In the army [i.e., in Raymond’s contingent] there are scarcely three hundred knights, and no great number of other armed men....’ Those opposing the diversion of the crusade to Egypt urged in protest: ‘There are hardly fifteen hundred knights in the army, and no great number of armed foot-soldiers....’ Albert remarks that the crusaders marched on Jerusalem along the coast, instead of by way of Damascus, because the Turks were fewer along the seashore, and only twenty thousand men out of an army of fifty thousand were fit to fight. After the fall of Jerusalem, Raymond numbers the fighting men at not more than twelve thousand knights and nine thousand foot.

---

6 Hagenmeyer summarizes their estimates (op. cit., p. 188. nn. 11–12).
9 Raymond of Agiles, Historia Francorum qui ceperunt Jerusalem, ch. 14, RHO, III, 271J.
10 Ibid., ch. 19, p. 292C.
11 Albert, v, 41, loc. cit., p. 400A.
12 Ch. 21, loc. cit., p. 804A.
The noncombatants, too, suffered serious losses all along the way; but their numbers were swelled by a steady influx from the dwindling ranks of the fighters. In addition, the sturdy poor, in the beginning of some military value, early sank into such a miserable condition, that most of them were not called upon to fight except in great emergencies, and constituted a standing burden upon the army. Thus, by the time the siege of Antioch was well underway, the noncombatants — the sick, crippled, and destitute, the women, children, and clergy — had captured and maintained an absolute and overwhelming majority.

The form into which Urban cast the crusade, the inclusion of the clergy and other noncombatants, is evidence not only of his dependence upon pilgrim tradition, but of his belief that the Holy Land was not be be won by force of arms alone; that the power of the Word was greater than the power of the Sword; that the righteousness of the crusading army was a sure protection. As the spiritual heir of Gregory VII, how could the pope have thought otherwise? The main strength of the papacy was moral. Whatever the pope undertook, he could not depend upon earthly arms alone; and however disinterested his motives, he could not allow his project to become entirely secularized. Therefore Urban planned the crusade as an essentially Christian undertaking, in which the clergy were to play an important part from start to finish. The formal purpose of the crusade was religious — to free the Eastern Church. The crusaders were called by the clergy to take the cross; they consulted their parish priests before taking the irrevocable vow; they looked forward to a spiritual reward, the papal indulgence; and they were led, in so far as the crusade had a single leader, by the papal legate, Adhemar, bishop of Puy.

The clergy not only conceived and planned, but helped to organize the expedition. While Urban toured France, papal letters and legates travelled swiftly to England, Normandy, and Flanders, to Genoa and Bologna, exhorting, commanding, and persuading. When early in 1096 the squabbles of William Rufus with his brother Robert of Normandy threatened to prevent large-scale Norman participation, Urban sent his legate to negotiate a peace. As a result of his intervention, Robert mortgaged Normandy to William for ten thousand silver marks, and joined the crusade together with many of his vassals. Later in the same year the pope sent the bishops of Orange and Grenoble to preach the crusade at Genoa, and bring the formidable Genoese sea-power into the war. Their mission was successful, and a Genoese supply fleet gave the crusaders substantial aid at Antioch and Jerusalem.

Once upon the march, the crusaders maintained constant liaison with the western clergy, regarding them as their supporters and propagandists on the

13 Robert the Monk, Historia Hierosolimitana, ch. 2, RIO, iii, 729F.
home front, and depending upon them for reinforcements in men and money. The pope, it seems, was not prepared to take up the bishop of Puy’s unfinished task — a task which Adhemar had performed with exemplary patience and skill until his death at Antioch, August 1, 1098. Urban had invested the bishop with a sort of maius imperium, urging the crusaders to obey him completely in all matters pertaining to the crusade. But the papal legate was in no sense a generalissimo. Though not hesitating to plunge into battle whenever necessary, he did not pretend to exercise any authority over the actual conduct of the campaign. His real function was to preserve discipline and uphold enthusiasm among the rank and file, and compose the quarrels of the leaders, so as to gain their cooperation for the common good. Adhemar fully realized the delicacy of his position. The friend and neighbor of the count of Toulouse, with whom he travelled to Constantinople, he maintained, nevertheless, a neutral attitude in all disputes between the leaders, and used the language of exhortation, not of command. He was the special protector of the poor, and constantly urged the great folk to care for them. The grief of the crusaders at Adhemar’s death suffices to demonstrate the esteem in which he was held. Had he lived, the army might not have wasted so many months in useless sieges and petty bickerings after the fall of Antioch.

The papal legate was not the only representative of the church on crusade. Urban expected both regular and secular clergy to join in the movement — a fact made clear by his warning that the journey would have no spiritual value for those who went without the permission of their bishop or abbot. If the pope had not desired such permission to be granted in many instances, a flat prohibition would have been more appropriate than this mildly restrictive clause. His only concern was that clerical participants be properly qualified.

18 ‘Ep. i Anselmi ad Manassem,’ ibid., pp. 144–146.
21 Raymond, ch. 12, loc. cit., p. 262D–F; ch. 11, p. 256.
We have no more means of estimating the number of clergy on crusade than we have of computing the total number of noncombatants; but the sources always mention them so as to suggest that they formed no inconsiderable part of the whole. Their presence in large numbers would not be surprising. Pilgrimages to the Holy Land had always attracted them. Religious motives would influence them just as they did pious laymen, and for some clerics material considerations would weigh no less heavily. There was also a horde of restless spirits among the western clergy, who found themselves constrained and chafing under the increasing burden of Cluniac reform, and for whom the crusade would offer a means of escape. The pope probably had no intention of getting rid of turbulent clerics by sending them off on crusade, but his admonitions were not always respected. No bishop could keep watch over the movements of all the clergy in his diocese, and there was little to hinder the departure of priests who were willing to forfeit their posts. For their personal entourages, some of the bishops and leaders, especially those under Cluniac influence, tried to choose only clerics of good character. But others were not always so careful, and in addition, the crusade army was not an organized body, in which every man had to find his place. Thus the monk weary of his cloister, the restless or adventurous parish priest, the ambitious prelate, thwarted in some favorite project, or in disgrace or danger at home, and even an occasional hermit, all found it pleasant or expedient to go crusading.

Individual motivation is not easily determined. Piety and an earnest desire for the success of the crusade were probably the prime considerations to Adhemar, and to William, bishop of Orange, who tried to take up the legate’s fallen burden. A similar enthusiasm seems to have urged Gerhard, abbot of Allerheiligen in Schaffhausen to take the cross, and led Bonfilius, bishop of Foligno, in turn reformer, hermit, and saint, to seek the promised land. Fulcher of Chartres, priest and chronicler, was inspired by Urban’s preaching at Clermont. But a more hysterical fervor must be ascribed to the priest Etienne of Valence, who conversed in his dreams with saints and the Savior, and to the abbot Baldwin who burned a cross in his forehead as a desperate measure to coax money from the superstitious for his journey. This spirit, a curious mixture of opportunism, superstition, and genuine religious feeling, seems to have animated a large part of the lower clergy.

24 E.g., Albert, 1, 2, loc. cit., p. 372B; Ordericus Vitalis, Historiae ecclesiasticae libri tredecim, ix, 2, ed. A. Le Prevost (5 vols, Paris, 1888-1895), iii, 468; Fulcher, op. cit., 1, 10, iv-v (Hagenmeyer, pp. 187-185, and especially p. 188, n. 19).
27 For the chief references concerning all the clergy mentioned in the text, here and elsewhere, see the alphabetical list of clergy in the appendix.
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Some clerics followed their lords on crusade. The count of Toulouse had several chaplains with him, of whom his namesake, Raymond of Agiles, the diligent chronicler of the holy war, is the most notable. In the same capacity, Bernard of Valence accompanied the bishop of Puy, a certain abbot Roger followed Anselm de Ribémont, one Sannardus attended Robert of Flanders, and Alexander, amanuensis of Stephen of Blois, went along to write cum summa festinatione the letters of the fainthearted warrior to his Norman princess.

At least two prelates joined the crusade because despite its perils it seemed safer than staying at home. Odo, the rebellious bishop of Bayeux, knew he would find short shrift in a Normandy pledged to William Rufus, by whom he had been driven from England. He joined the forces of Robert Curthose, but never lived to reach the Holy Land, dying at Palermo, where he was buried by Gilbert of Evreux, the only other Norman bishop participating in the crusade. It appears that Peter, saintly bishop of Anagni, was likewise driven by an unpleasant situation at home to attach himself to Bohemund’s forces.

Ambition ruled Arnulf, chaplain of Robert of Normandy, when he took the cross. Arnulf was a man of high capability, and knew it. A scholar of some reputation, he had taught at Caen, and his pupil, Raoul of Caen, dedicates his Gesta Tancredi to him in very complimentary terms. He was noted for his learning, eloquence, and especially his scepticism; for he led the party opposed to the revelation of the Lance, and thereby earned himself much opprobrium. Nevertheless, he appears to have been quite popular with the common people. Cultivated, sophisticated, at ease with plebs and maiores, of low rank, but outstanding ability, Arnulf did not go on crusade without the hope of bettering himself. The same is probably true of his namesake and partisan, Arnulf, bishop of Martirano, and possibly of Peter of Narbonne, one of the chief supporters of the count of Toulouse.

No fervent piety led Adalberon, archdeacon of Metz, kinsman of Henry III, and confidant of the schismatic Henry IV, to join the crusade. In any case, if Albert’s account may be trusted, none of it was in evidence when he was caught and killed by the Turks while playing dice with a beautiful matron in a grove near Antioch. Adalberon was hardly unique. And what except misdirected curiosity induced Otto, bishop of Strassburg, adherent of the anti-pope Guibert to join Urban’s expedition? If he had hoped for some material advantage, a change of politics would have been in order; but he went a schismatic, and returned, says Bernold, no better than when he set out. Evidently Otto was not convinced of the holy nature of the crusade.

The passion for relics may have been a factor in drawing to the Levant Gerbault, priest of Lille, who distinguished himself by stealing the precious arm of St George from a hospitable Greek monastery in Asia Minor — a sin for which he received his just deserts. Peter of Narbonne, in his later capacity of archbishop

28 Raymond, ch. 14, loc. cit., p. 296D.
29 Raymond, with malicious exaggeration, says he was not even a subdeacon (ch. 21, ibid., p. 302).
30 Infra, pp. 8, 21, and for source references, the appendix.
of Apamea, is charged with despoiling the tombs of the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob at Hebron.

A priestly adventurer is portrayed for us by the outraged pen of Anna Comnena. This bellicose cleric fought so fiercely during a skirmish between a crusade squadron and some units of the Byzantine fleet that he evoked from the astonished Greek princess the following prolix but significant comment:

For the rules concerning priests are not the same among the Latins as they are with us; for we are given the command by the canonical laws and teaching of the Gospel, 'Touch not, taste not, handle not! For thou art consecrated.' Whereas the Latin barbarian will simultaneously handle divine things, and wear his shield on his left arm, and hold his spear in his right hand, and at one and the same time he communicates the body and blood of God, and looks murderously and becomes 'a man of blood,' as it says in the psalm of David. For this barbarian race is no less devoted to sacred things than it is to war. And so this man of violence rather than priest wore his priestly garb at the same time that he handled the oar and had an eye equally to naval or land warfare, fighting simultaneously with the sea and with men.31

The Western Church had in fact long forbidden priests to bear arms; but this paladin of Christ, confronted by the hated Greek schismatics, refused to be bound by papal decrees, or even by a truce. When he had used up all his darts and stones, 'he discovered a sack of barley-cakes, and began throwing out the barley-cakes from the sack as though they were stones, as if he were officiating and taking a service, and turning war into a sacred celebration.' Disembarking severely wounded, he sought the Greek leader and embraced him, saying, 'If you had met me on dry land, many of you would have been killed by my hands.' Then he gave the Byzantine captain 'a large silver cup worth one hundred and thirty stater. And with these words and this gift he breathed his last.32 There is something here of the same valiant spirit which led Bishop Adhemar to plunge straight into the mêlée. If the priesthood included many peasants' sons, it also included many younger sons of the nobility, trained in arms, and burning to make use of them. The crusade must have attracted more than one of this kind.

Subject to the general authority of Bishop Adhemar, the clergy on crusade obeyed his commands with regard to preaching, fasts and processions, and the care of the poor. But both the higher and lower clergy tended to group themselves around the leaders whom they had followed on crusade. They often espoused their masters' quarrels, and looked to them in turn for preferment. These statements are illustrated by some events in the career of Peter of Narbonne. He owed his position as bishop of Albara to Raymond, count of Toulouse, who had besieged and captured the town, and he behaved as one of Raymond's vassals. En route from Marra to Archas, he helped guard the army against surprise attacks, and garrisoned Marra for the count.33 In keeping with Raymond's best interests, he did his best to prevent the common people, who were clamoring for an immediate

32 Ibid., p. 257.
33 Raymond, ch. 14, loc. cit., p. 278H–J.
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march on Jerusalem, from destroying the walls of Marra to hasten the departure.\textsuperscript{34} At Jerusalem, Peter held the town of David for Raymond, who obstinately refused to surrender it to Godfrey, the newly-elected Defender of the Holy Sepulchre. Here the bishop served him badly, turning the tower over to Godfrey almost at once; but Raymond's other vassals had refused to help him in the matter at all, as they felt that he was clearly in the wrong.\textsuperscript{35}

The clergy were not, however, entirely subservient to the lay power. Peter, for example, displayed his independence strikingly at Marra, where in spite of his careful defense of the count's property, he even acted as spokesman for the rank and file in their demand for the immediate march on Jerusalem. But although they displayed some independence in matters touching the common welfare, the power of the clergy, as opposed to that of the leaders, was small, except when they had the people on their side, This is not surprising. At home the Church had not yet won, and never was fully to win its battle for independence from the secular authority. The defeat of Gregory VII had yet to be retrieved. On crusade the position of the clergy was even weaker, as the emergency conditions and the greater need for armed protection further crippled their ability to stand against the lay power. Their sole attempt to take the reins into their own hands failed completely.\textsuperscript{36} Nevertheless, despite some particularist tendencies, the solidarity of the clergy was greater than that of any other group. The sacred character of their office, the mysterious power conferred by ordination, commanded the superstitious respect of all classes, and the moral and intellectual force of the better among them imposed itself even upon the leaders. Consequently, so long as the clergy confined their attention to matters of common concern, to pressing problems such as the care of the poor, discipline, morality, and morale, their influence was strong, and the exercise of their legitimate regulatory functions went unchallenged.

The clergy preached, prayed, confessed the soldiers, gave the last sacraments to the dying, and buried the dead. They celebrated mass regularly,\textsuperscript{37} and marriages occasionally — perhaps all too seldom, judging from their constant complaints about the morals of the crusaders. These routine services acquired a new importance on crusade, but much more important were the functions imposed by the perils and hardships of the crusaders' way. Maintenance of morale was vital. In these times of recurrent crisis, the failure to achieve at least a minimum of discipline and cooperation would mean disaster, the destruction of the Christian army; and if the crusade failed, the prestige of the Urbanists would collapse with it. The thoughtful and earnest among the clergy, therefore, had a double responsibility, a duty to both the army and the Church.

From the beginning, the care of the poor was the most difficult task. Never before had such a large host of paupers encumbered an army in the field. It seems impossible to determine what classes entered most prominently into its formation.

\textsuperscript{34} Ibid., p. 271E–F. \textsuperscript{35} Ibid., ch. 20, p. 301F. \textsuperscript{36} Infra, p. 21. \textsuperscript{37} Raymond, ch. 16, loc. cit., p. 278A–B.
There is some mention of peasants, but no clue as to their numbers. Perhaps the Italian and Provengal towns had some restless and penniless folk to contribute: the most frequent references to the poor are made by the Provengal chronicler, Raymond of Agiles.

The poor, aged, and infirm who lagged behind Raymond's army were slaughtered like cattle by the wild tribesmen of Sclavonia, who wrested from them their last scanty belongings. They died in droves of famine at Nicaea and Antioch. They were cut off and massacred by the Turks at Marra, and died miserably in a thousand skirmishes and ambushes along the way. What their condition must have been in June, 1098, when the crusaders were pent up in Antioch by the Turks, when many soldiers had lost or eaten their horses, and having sold their arms were reduced to fighting with Turkish weapons, when a noble German knight could no longer live by begging, and had to be fed by scraps from Godfrey's table — this may best be left to the imagination.

In the earlier stages of the crusade, the Emperor Alexius was compelled by self-interest to relieve the situation with alms, first at Constantinople, then across the straits in Asia Minor, and again at Nicaea. But as the crusaders penetrated deeper into Asia Minor, and the poor were deprived of even this inadequate imperial aid, the nobles and clergy had to take over the task. Raymond of Toulouse distinguished himself by his care for the poor. At Clermont his ambassadors promised aid for indigent crusaders. En route through Sclavonia, he and the bishop of Puy struggled early and late to protect them: the count fought always in the rear to guard the poor stragglers, and was always the last to make camp at night. After the fall of Antioch, Raymond offered to lead the poor, who were failing from hunger and sickness, on a plundering raid into enemy territory; and when he went to besiege Albarà, it was with a mass of poor people, and very few knights.

A certain spirit of noblesse oblige characterized the attitude of the knights toward the poor. At the siege of Antioch, the leaders set up a fund to replace the horses of knights who lost them. Raymond remarks, "This fraternal agreement produced very beneficial results; for the poor of our army, who wished to cross

---
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Ibid., ch. 5, pp. 242J, 244B; cf. Ekkehard of Aura, 'totque catervas ruricolarum'; but this probably includes the peasants' crusade (Hierosolymitana, ix, 2, ed. H. Hagenmeyer [Tübingen, 1877], p. 112).

Raymond, ch. 1, loc. cit., p. 235A.

Bréhier, op. cit., p. 164.

Albert, iv, 54, loc. cit., p. 427B–E.

Ibid., 1, 15 and 11,16, pp. 283, 311; Bréhier, op. cit., pp. 18, 42; 'Ep. I Stephani ad Adelam,' HEp., pp. 138–139; Raymond, ch. 3, loc. cit., p. 239G. Ordericus Vitalis conceived that nothing less than the sack of Nicaea could have relieved the necessities of the poor (ix, 6 [Le Prevost, iii, 505–506]).

Baldric of Dol, Historia Hierosolimitana, i, 5, RHO, iv, 16.

Raymond, ch. 1, loc. cit., p. 236C–D.

Ibid., ch. 18, p. 264H.

Ibid., ch. 14, p. 266D. Hagenmeyer, Le vrai et le faux sur Pierre l'Hermite, trad. F. Raynaud (Paris, 1883), p. 294, suggests that after the capture of Marra almost all the poor stayed with Raymond.
the river to gather herbs, feared the frequent attacks of the enemy;\textsuperscript{47} i.e., when
the knights no longer feared losing their horses, they were willing to use them in
protecting the poor foragers. Raymond also takes pleasure in telling how the
poor were permitted to enrich themselves from the spoils after a successful skir-
mish near Antioch, and ran about joyfully, showing off captured silks, shields, and
even horses.\textsuperscript{48} In the plundering of a Saracen stronghold on the way to Jerusalem,
the looting was conducted in accordance with the wealth of the participants:
'. . . our poor, having taken up their booty, began to return, one after the other;
thereafter the poor foot-soldiers took the same path, and after them, the men-at-
arms.'\textsuperscript{49} A nicety of gradation!

Such measures were not enough. The bishop of Puy found it necessary to make
strenuous efforts to provide for the poor. The Anonymous, with good reason, calls
him the \textit{sustentamentum pauperum}; and even after his death, Peter Bartholomew,
who was looking for a vehicle to express his own views, put in the bishop's mouth
characteristic utterances about the duty of the rich to the poor.\textsuperscript{50} In his sermons
Adhemar used to warn the knights repeatedly:

Not one of you can be saved unless he honors the poor and relieves them. Just as you
cannot be saved without them, so can they not live without you. For this reason they
must pray with daily supplications for your sins to God, whom you have offended in
many ways. Therefore I command that you cherish them for the love of God, and succor
them so far as you are able.\textsuperscript{51}

Charity, then, was a religious duty; and the clergy therefore preached alms-
giving assiduously, and coupled their exhortations with fasts and processions at
Antioch and Jerusalem. But this, too, was insufficient. We meet with renewed
agitation for the care of the poor soon after the defeat of Kerbogha;\textsuperscript{52} and at
Archas, early in 1099, poor relief was at last put on a more regular basis — for how
long we do not know:

It was preached at this time that the people should give tithes of all they had taken,
since there were very many poor and many sick in the army: and it was ordered that they
give a fourth part to their priests, whose masses they attended, and a fourth to their
bishops. The remaining two parts they were to give to Peter the Hermit, whom they had
put in charge of the poor, both lay and clerical.\textsuperscript{53}

Peter the Hermit, who was probably a monk,\textsuperscript{54} seems to have enjoyed a consider-
able ascendancy over the rank and file of the army,\textsuperscript{55} and was well suited to be
 treasurer of the poor. It is noteworthy that the clergy had their own poor to re-
lieve, and that they were pressing for a regular income from tithes.

\textsuperscript{47} Raymond, ch. 6, \textit{loc. cit.}, pp. 245G–246A. \textsuperscript{48} \textit{Ibid.}, ch. 8, p. 240E.
\textsuperscript{49} \textit{Ibid.}, ch. 14, p. 274: '. . . pauperes nostri, accepta praeda, unus post alium redire coeperunt;
deinde pedes pauperes viam tenebant; post eos, milites plebei.' The term \textit{milites plebei} probably
designates persons not of knightly rank, but who fought on horseback (Du Cange, \textit{Glossarium}, v, 385).
\textsuperscript{50} Raymond, ch. 18, \textit{loc. cit.}, p. 264C. \textsuperscript{51} Bréhier, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 166. \textsuperscript{52} Supra, n. 50.
\textsuperscript{55} Presumably because he took up their demand for an end to the delays on the way to Jerusalem
(\textit{ibid.}, pp. 293–297).
All these measures notwithstanding, the poor underwent extreme suffering and demoralization; and out of their misery and struggle for existence arose the ill-famed band of Tafurs, whose exploits have been enlarged upon to form one of the most curious legends of the crusades, but whose historicity may no longer be doubted. Our knowledge of the Tafurs is shadowy, and it is difficult to distinguish fact from fiction concerning them. They probably included only a small part of the poor and unarmed. Guibert of Nogent identifies them with the gypsy-folk or Truands; possibly their nucleus was composed of gypsies, who were very likely to attach themselves to the crusade, and whose organization would be similar to that attributed to the Tafurs. Peter the Hermit's constant association with them, and his influence over them, suggests further that some of the Tafurs may have been left over from the destruction of his band in Asia Minor. But thereafter they appear to have recruited their forces regularly from the poorest among the crusaders.

The Tafurs lived under the rule of a king whom they had chosen for themselves. They camped somewhat apart from the rest of the crusaders, who treated them with a respect born of fear. Incredibly savage and brutalized, they went barefoot and unarmed save for clubs, stones, knives, and variously improvised weapons, and lived by foraging and plunder. Yet they were not entirely devoid of discipline, and Guibert rejects emphatically the suggestion that they were a useless appendage to the army. The crusaders found them ready to carry the heaviest burdens and do the most exhausting labor; and they were doggedly determined in besieging cities, where they acted as slingers, and performed many other tasks besides. They fought in every battle, and distinguished themselves at the storming of Antioch, not only by their bravery in the assault, but by their extreme cruelty in the sack. Upon rare occasions, when other provisions failed, the Tafurs

56 The origin of the word is obscure. It is most probably derived from the Armenian term tahtavor (king), applied to the leader of the Tafurs (Hatem, op. cit., p. 195); but possibly from a term for Saracens, extended to cover gypsies and Truands of any nationality (F. Godefroy, Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue française, vii [Paris, 1892], 629).

57 Since the brilliant rehabilitation of the Chanson d’Antioche by M. Anouar Hatem, whose work is cited above, p. 6, n. 26. M. Hatem develops the thesis that the crusade epic was born in the camp of the crusaders; that the Chanson d’Antioche was written by an eye-witness, Richard le Pelerin, a trouvère from Flanders; that the chroniclers frequently borrowed from him, rather than vice-versa; and that although his work was completely recast and greatly mutilated by Graindor of Dousi, in the reign of Philip Augustus, it still contains much of historical value, especially concerning the poor and the Tafurs (op. cit., pp. 177–237, 326–350). See the review by J. L. LaMonte, Speculum, x (1935), 97–100.

Fortunately, the only printed edition of the Chanson d’Antioche, ed. P. Paris (2 vols, Paris, 1848) is very unsatisfactory.

58 Only one Latin chronicler mentions them, Guibert of Nogent, Gesta Dei per Francos, vii, 23, RHO, iv, 241–242. Probably he drew upon the original version of the Chanson d’Antioche.

59 Chanson d’Antioche, i, 135; n. 3 ff., 127, 221, 235.

60 According to Guibert, the king of the Tafurs used to post himself at any narrow place through which the army had to pass, and inspect his men: ‘... si cui duorum pretium solidorum habere contingere, hunc conferestim a sua ditione secluderet, et eum emere arma jubendo, ad armati contubernium exercitum segregaret; si quos, consuetae tenuitiae amantes, nihil prorsus pecuniae aut resservasse aut affectasse consipiceret, hos suo collegio peculiares ascisceret’ (loc. cit., p. 242).

61 Ibid. 52 Chanson d’Antioche, i, 135, 250; n. 127 f., 254–255, 295.
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ate human flesh — e.g., at Antioch and Marra, where they consumed portions cut from some of the Saracen dead. Such actions enhanced a reputation for ferocity which it already pleased them to foster, and inspired a wholesome terror among the Turks and native Christians alike. In view of their services in battles and sieges, and their effect upon the morale of the Turks, it would appear that the Tafurs, unlike the bulk of the poor, were an asset to everything except the good name of the crusaders.

Despite the grave problems presented by the poor, no attempt was made until after the fall of Antioch to discourage their participation, if only they were sturdy and capable. The crusaders expected to live in large measure off the country, and it is doubtful that any except the leaders and wealthier knights paid much of their expenses with funds from home. A letter asking for reinforcements, dated October, 1097, expresses marked preference for men of sound body and purse, but takes care to add: ' . . . if only you are able to come to us, even with very little, thereafter omnipotent God will provide for you, so that you may live.' The crusaders were too hard up for manpower to refuse any likely recruit, no matter what the state of his finances. This consideration may throw additional light on the efforts of the leaders and clergy to relieve the poor. Religion, pity, and custom probably played the major role in determining their action; but some of them perhaps realized that every man rescued from abject poverty was an addition to the fighting strength of the pilgrim army.

The presence on crusade of large numbers of women, and even children, also caused grave complications. Not all the women were undesirables. A few were noblewomen, more or less suitably escorted, as Urban had urged. Baldwin of Lorraine and Raymond of Toulouse had their wives with them, and so did a few knights. The religious, on the other hand, seem to have been represented among the women by but a single nun, of less than doubtful morality. The rest of the women were probably campfollowers and harlots, of whose activities we have adequate evidence.

The women shared the crusaders’ hardships and perils. Several score of them, embarking at Brindisi with the forces of Robert of Normandy and Stephen of

43 Ibid., ii, 3–9, for the gruesome feast at Antioch. Both the Chanson (ii, 394) and Fulcher (op. cit., i, 25, ii, ed. Hagenmeyer, pp. 266–267) notice the eating of human flesh at Marra, but without mentioning the Tafurs. Guibert, however, names them (loc. cit., p. 242).
45 Ibid.; cf. ‘Ep. patriarchae Hierosolimitanae,’ ibid., p. 147. These letters, calling urgently for reinforcements, date from October, 1097, and January, 1098, respectively.
46 Albert, ii, 39, loc. cit., p. 330B–C. 47 Ibid., iii, 27, p. 358B. She was an Englishwoman.
48 Fulcher, op. cit., i, 32, i (Hagenmeyer, pp. 320–321). Her name was Elvire.
50 Infra, p. 18.
51 E.g., Albert, ii, 24, loc. cit., p. 317B;Ordenicus Vitalis, op. cit., ix, 10 (Le Prevost, iii, 547); Raymond, ch. 14, loc. cit., p. 269E.
Blois, drowned en masse when one of the overloaded vessels capsized. At Dorylaeum they braved enemy fire to bring water to the men in the fighting lines—an act for which the Anonymous gives them special commendation. In the exhausting march under the pitiless sun of Asia Minor many died of heat and thirst; Albert describes horrible incidents which he claims to have heard from eyewitnesses. At Marash, in Lesser Armenia, Baldwin’s wife Godwera died, worn out by lingering illness. Before Antioch the women died of Saracen arrows and the plague; in Jerusalem a host of them joined in the street-fighting, like the bloody viragoes of the French Revolution.

Far from helpless, the women stood up well under the endless misadventures of the campaign; but the bishops and leaders learned from bitter experience that the army was better off without them. From the siege of Antioch they write with emphasis, ‘Let only the men come; for the present leave the women at home!’ When the crusaders had routed Kerbogha, Bruno of Lucca, returning from Antioch to his native city, carried the warning that women, as well as paupers, were no longer wanted. But it was too late. The army now had a full complement not only of women and poor, but of incompetents and undesirables of all sorts.

The clergy had the task of preserving elementary order and discipline among this heterogeneous multitude, and of maintaining very modest standards of morality. Describing the situation at Nicaea, Albert remarks: ‘It is not to be doubted that along with so many distinguished captains there were present camp-followers of a lower sort: serfs and serving-maids, married and unmarried, and men and women of every station. The bishops, abbots, monks, canons, and priests took charge of these to keep them in order, and keep up their courage.’ This was a necessary administrative task, not easy, but probably pleasanter than correcting the morals of the crusaders. The medieval warrior was seldom noted for his chastity, and the clergy could not normally have expected much in the way of continence from him. But the crusade was a religious expedition, undertaken for the sake of the souls of the participants as well as to free Jerusalem. In times of crisis, then, the question of morality merged with the problem of morale. The preaching of the clergy against misconduct in general, and adultery in particular, was directed toward a very important end: to reconcile the soldiers to their Creator; to preserve the sense of righteousness which gave confidence to the Christian army, and in this way, to keep up its fighting spirit.

For this reason it is probable that some movement toward reform was felt after every military reverse; but we have only one instance of really radical action.

72 Fulcher, op. cit., 1, 8, ii (Hagenmeyer, p. 169).
73 Bréhier, op. cit., p. 46; for a vivid and circumstantial account see the Chanson d’Antioche, i, 159–160.
74 Fulcher, op. cit., 1, 12, vi (Hagenmeyer, p. 199); Chanson d’Antioche, i, 163; Albert, iii, 1, loc. cit., pp. 339–340.
75 Ibid., iii, 27, p. 338B.
76 Ibid., vi, 21, p. 478C.
79 Albert, ii, 24, loc. cit., p. 317B–C.
80 E.g., at Marra, where, when the siege was dragging, Peter Bartholomew had a vision in which St.
At the siege of Antioch, which was going very badly, the crusaders began to blame their difficulties upon the iniquitous practices prevalent in the camp. Fulcher says: "Then, having taken counsel, they cast out the women from the army, married and unmarried, lest perchance, befouled by the mire of riotous living, they might displease God. The women, however, found refuge in the neighboring camps."\(^81\) One would expect the clergy to have a hand in this measure, which was probably not so sweeping as here represented, and Albert confirms this suspicion. According to his account, the leaders and clergy laid down a reform program: \(^82\) The army was to be purged of all vice and injustice. Prohibitions were renewed against the use of false weights and measures, and cheating of any kind in money-changing or other transactions; steps were taken to prevent thievery, fornication, and adultery. Severe penalties were provided, and judges appointed to apply them. Some persons were chained, some had their heads shaved, others were beaten or branded. As an object-lesson, a man and woman caught in adultery were driven with whips all around the camp. This sounds like an ecclesiastical program, and possibly the judges were priests.

In emergencies the clergy tried to encourage the army more directly. They comforted the soldiers with sermons, masses, fasts, and processions, and often stood right behind them in battle, praying, exhorting, and hearing the last-minute confessions of the fighters. Clad in white garments, holding their crucifixes in their hands, they were a powerful deterrent to panic at Dorylaeum, Antioch, Marra, and Jerusalem. At the Holy City, Arnulf and Peter the Hermit helped close the ranks in preparation for the final assault by allaying the dissensions which had arisen along the way.\(^83\) The bishops and priests never let the people forget why they had undertaken the perilous journey. The death of Adhemar relieved the procrastinating leaders, who were only too happy to linger on the way, of their most powerful corrector; but even so, the rest of the clergy, and the lower clergy in particular, sometimes led, and always seconded the popular demand for a rapid advance to their goal.\(^84\) At Jerusalem, to encourage the assault, Andrew told him that there was so much adultery that God would be pleased if they all took wives (Raymond, ch. 14, loc. cit., p. 269E).


At Jerusalem, the lower clergy took the lead in encouraging the army: the priest Peter Desiderius instituted the fasts, processions, alms, and grand procession around the walls which preceded the assault (Raymond, ch. 20, loc. cit., pp. 296–297; Bréhier, op. cit., pp. 200–202).

For the pacifying sermons of Arnulf and Peter the Hermit see Albert, vi, 8, loc. cit., pp. 470–471. It is likely that many other persons also preached to the army, from the Mount of Olives, at the same time (Hagenmeyer, Pierre l’Hermit, pp. 304–305).

During the battle of Ascalon, Peter the Hermit, who was left behind with the gens minuta, the poor, and the infirm, while the knights, prelates, and all those fit to bear arms had gone out to battle, kept up the spirits of the people with prayers, alms, and processions (Bréhier, op. cit., p. 210; Hagenmeyer, Pierre l’Hermit, pp. 321–323).

\(^{84}\) Peter the Hermit probably took a large part in this movement (ibid., pp. 294–295); Raymond of Agiles’ account betrays his own sympathy for it.
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the clergy pointed out the place where Christ had suffered and died, and discoursed of the heavenly city which the earthly Jerusalem portended.85

It was at Antioch that the clergy made their most striking contribution to morale. There, when the city was closely invested by Kerbogha, and the crusaders were fighting a losing battle with the enemy in the citadel and at the gates, the visions reported by a Lombard priest, and by a French cleric, Etienne Valentin, touched off the series of events which led to the discovery of the Holy Lance, and raised the army from despair to victory. The Lombard clerk set the stage by telling how St Ambrose had appeared to a bishop in Italy, when the crusade had just been launched, and revealed that the papal expedition was indeed divinely inspired, and not merely the result of the levitas animi of the French, and promised that the crusaders would take Jerusalem within three years. More than two years, the Lombard pointed out, had now passed, and a turn for the better could soon be expected.86

But the common people were still very uneasy, fearing with good reason that the leaders would desert, and leave them to perish.87 On the night of June 10, 1098, many persons did slip away, laymen and clergy alike; and, says Raymond, if Bohemund and the Bishop of Puy had not closed the gates, very few would have remained.88 The next day, Etienne Valentin came forward and told his story to the leaders: Christ had appeared to him in the night, and bade him remind the leaders of all that he had done for his people, and admonish them that if they repented of their sins, ceased their fornication with pagan and Christian women, and chanted the response Congregati sunt daily, he would send them substantial aid within five days.89

This revelation was at first-hand, and promised aid within a brief, definite period. It called for a reform movement, for immediate, healthy action, which would release pent-up emotion, and dispel the apathy and indecision which had fastened themselves upon the army. It not only calmed the spirits and raised the courage of the people, but had the more important effect of forcing the wavering leaders to take a firm stand. That the leaders had any real confidence in Etienne's promise of aid within five days is most unlikely; but his vision expressed the fears and hopes of the multitude, and demanded some gesture to restore their confidence. The bishop of Puy seized his opportunity. While excitement over the revelation was still running high, Adhemar combined clerical with popular pressure to make the leaders swear renewed allegiance to the Christian cause:

...the bishop of Puy ordered the Gospels and the Cross to be brought forward, so that he [Etienne] might swear that this thing was true. At that time all our leaders decided that they would swear an oath that none of them would flee, not even if it were a matter of life and death, so long as they were still living.... Hearing this oath, the Christian congregation exulted beyond measure.90

85 Ordericus Vitalis, op. cit., ix, 15 (Le Prevost, iii, 604).
88 Ibid. 89 Ibid., pp. 255–256. 90 Bréhier, op. cit., p. 130.
The connection between Etienne's oath and the oath of the leaders is apparent.\footnote{91} Now the maiores had to stick it out. This event, more than the discovery of the Lance, for which it was the necessary preliminary, marked the turning-point, and saved the crusading army.

The Lance at first had less to do with the clergy. Peter Bartholomew was not a priest, or a noncombatant. But Adhemar made as skillful use of the Lance as he had of Etienne's vision. He was in reality cool to Peter from the start;\footnote{92} but all doubts and dissensions were carefully smothered until after the defeat of Kerbogha. In the battle, the Lance was carried by the Provençal chronicler, Raymond of Agiles,\footnote{93} but in such close proximity to Adhemar that both the Anonymous and Bruno of Lucca, eye-witnesses of the event, made a natural error and credited the bishop with carrying it.\footnote{94} This they could scarcely have done if the bishop had made his scepticism known, as indeed he did, later. Adhemar gave the Lance his tacit approval until the crisis was over, in order to maintain the morale of the crusaders. Perhaps he would have continued to pay it deference, if the Provençals had not treated it as private property, and tried to use its prestige for their own advantage.

Not all clerical actions were equally serviceable to the crusade. The quarrel over the Lance brought a sharp cleavage in their ranks, with Arnulf, who led the sceptics, vigorously opposed by the Provençal group, e.g., the bishops of Orange\footnote{95} and Agde,\footnote{96} Peter of Narbonne,\footnote{97} and Raymond of Agiles. The lower clergy tended to split along the same lines.\footnote{98} The bishop of Puy could no longer conceal his views. After Adhemar's death, when Arnulf was asked why he doubted, he replied, 'Because the bishop of Puy had doubted,'\footnote{99} and none of the opposition ventured to deny it. Instead they manufactured visions to prove that Adhemar was punished in the next world for his scepticism. But as the bishop, with customary

\footnote{91} Cf. Raymond, ch. 11, loc. cit., p. 256H–J, which confirms the Anonymous in every important particular.

\footnote{92} 'Episcopus autem nihil esse praeter verba putavit . . .' (ibid., p. 256F).

\footnote{93} 'Vidi ego haec quae loquor, et dominicam lanceam ibi ferebam' (ibid., ch. 12, p. 261A).

\footnote{94} Bréhier, op. cit., p. 162; 'Ep. cleri et populi Luccensis,' HEp., p. 167. The Anonymous, being one of Bohemund's men, and Bruno, being an Italian, were in all likelihood posted in the rear, with Bohemund’s forces, which were held in reserve, and could scarcely have seen clearly just who was carrying the Lance. The Anonymous must have learned sooner or later of Adhemar’s scepticism and of the fact that Raymond carried the Lance; but he probably wrote from notes taken from time to time on the campaign, and perhaps never got around to correcting this part of his work. The Chanson d'Antioche also represents Adhemar as carrying the Lance — but with great reluctance, after all the other leaders refused to do so on the grounds that it would hamper them in fighting (11, 200–205, 206). This may be an echo of the scepticism of both Adhemar and the leaders. If the extant version of the Chanson follows Richard le Pelerin's eye-witness account of these events, we must assume that as a Fleming he was placed in advance with the forces of Robert of Flanders, and like Bruno and the Anonymous, could not see who was carrying the Lance. However, all these accounts may be reconciled by assuming that Adhemar carried the Lance part of the time.

\footnote{95} Raymond, ch. 11, loc. cit., p. 257; ch. 14, p. 269G–H.

\footnote{96} Ibid., ch. 13, p. 265A–C.

\footnote{97} Ibid., p. 260G–H.

\footnote{98} E.g., Peter Desiderius and Ebrardus, priests of the Provençal faction (ibid., ch. 17, p. 281), and a chaplain, Simon (ibid., ch. 18, p. 265B).

\footnote{99} Ibid., ch. 17, p. 281A–C.
moderation, had refused to become a vigorous partisan of either side, the Provençals refrained from besmirching his memory, and were content to have his hair and beard singed a little in Purgatory before assigning him his proper seat in heaven.\textsuperscript{100} These dissensions were a source of weakness to the army. By calling forth an overplus of tendentious visions from the seers of the Provençal party, they undermined faith and embittered the relations between the various contingents. These, perhaps, were the quarrels Arnulf tried to appease before Jerusalem;\textsuperscript{101} if so, we must credit him with a conciliatory sermon.

A few instances are also recorded in which individual ecclesiastics fell from grace. At Nicea the pilgrims rescued from the Turks a nun from a convent in Trèves, who had been rash enough to join Peter's expedition. A council of clergy readily forgave her the forced lapse from chastity which she suffered at the hands of the Turks; but she found the forbidden fruit, once tasted, sweeter than the hope of heaven, and fled the camp with her former Saracen captor, now her lover.\textsuperscript{102} Adalberon, who has already been mentioned, was no ornament to the church of Metz.\textsuperscript{103} Albert records with a trace of satisfaction that the Turks killed him and carried off his lady. Some churchmen, worn out by famine and hardship, fled from the camp at Antioch to the mountains.\textsuperscript{104} This withdrawal was justifiable in that a reduction in the number of noncombatants would relieve the strain on the food supply, but it set a bad example. Worse still, there were clergies among the 'rope-dancers,' who slipped down the walls of Antioch and fled, during the night of June 10–11, 1098.\textsuperscript{105}

These instances of clerical misbehavior are gratifyingly few, and except for the quarrel over the Lance, unimportant. We hear of no act of desertion among the higher clergy, such as was committed by Stephen of Blois or Hugh of Vermandois. Peter the Hermit fled in a moment of weakness from the siege of Antioch;\textsuperscript{106} but he can scarcely be reckoned among the higher clergy, and once he was caught and brought back he returned to his duty and did good service, which is more than can be said for his lay companion in flight, William the Carpenter.\textsuperscript{107}

Yet there was good reason for the weaker spirits to quail. Famine, plague, and Saracen arrows had no respect for holy orders. Death found Roger, chaplain of Anselm de Ribémonte, at Sparnum castellum, somewhere in Asia Minor, and the bishop of Rugginolo, who had come from Italy with Bohemund, at the camp before Antioch. Ludwig, archdeacon of Toul, and many of his companions, were cut off and massacred by the Turks in the mountains near the same city. Soon after the fall of Antioch, the bishop of Puy, worn out by his endless labors, fell under the shadow of the plague and died, while at Marra the same fate overtook his unofficial successor, William, bishop of Orange. Just before the battle of Asca-

\textsuperscript{100} Ibid.; cf. ch. 13, p. 262G. \textsuperscript{101} Supra, p. 15.

\textsuperscript{102} Albert, ii, 37, loc. cit., pp. 327–328. She came 'de coenobio Sanctae Mariae ad horrea Trevirensis Ecclesiae,' apparently the convent of Orreven or Horreum (Gallia Christiana, Vol. xiii, cols 611–612). Albert's accurate identification of this convent makes his story seem more probable, and incidentally supports the belief that he came from Aachen, rather than from Aix in southern France.

\textsuperscript{103} Supra, p. 7. \textsuperscript{104} Albert, iii, 53, loc. cit., pp. 375–376. \textsuperscript{105} Supra, p. 1b, n. 87.

\textsuperscript{106} Bréhier, op. cit., p. 76. \textsuperscript{107} Hagenmeyer, Pierre l'Hermite, pp. 255–256.
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Ion, an Egyptian skirmishing force carried off the bishop of Martirano, who was heard of no more. The plague in the camp before Antioch swept off large numbers of noncombatants, including monks and priests. Albert estimates the dead at one hundred thousand — a pictorial number, literally meaningless, but which indicates that the clergy, too, suffered heavy losses. It is noteworthy that Adhemar had to ordain priests along the way. The Anonymous records this fact in such a way as to suggest that it was a routine function. Raymond of Agiles was elevated to the priesthood while on crusade. Was there a shortage of priests? Not at the outset. The shortage developed en route, and was due to the high mortality rate.

Those of the survivors who chose to remain in the Holy Land might find rare opportunities awaiting them. Within the territory conquered by the crusaders the ecclesiastical situation was greatly confused. The Greek clergy, maintaining a precarious ascendancy, controlled the patriarchates of Antioch and Jerusalem, and held the more important sees, while the Jacobites, Armenians, and Maronites maintained separate church organizations. All the sects suffered grievously during the upheavals attendant upon the crusade. The patriarch of Antioch was savagely tortured by the Turks; the Christians were expelled from Jerusalem, and the Jacobite congregation had to flee to Egypt. But the Christians were by no means exterminated.

Although not fond of schismatics, the crusaders let the Jacobites, Armenians, and Maronites exercise their religion in peace, presumably for reasons of policy. In the beginning, the Greeks fared even better. The patriarch of Jerusalem associated on terms of intimacy with the papal legate. Differences of rite and usage were forgotten, and a corps of mixed Greek and Latin clerics instated at Antioch. But as relations between the crusaders and the Emperor Alexius grew more and more strained, the Greek position steadily deteriorated. The first ominous note was struck in September, 1098, when the leaders invited Urban to come and help exterminate the heretics, including the Greeks. From this time on the crusaders began to treat the bishoprics of the Holy Land as their property. No important post was given to a Greek cleric. The patriarch of Jerusalem died at Cyprus, and was not to be replaced by one of his countrymen. The patriarch of Antioch, whose demise was not so conveniently timed, found after two years that he could not get along with the Latin churchmen, and left of his own accord. By and large the field was clear for the Latin clergy. If anything, they had more bishoprics than they could either fill or maintain.

---

108 v. 4, loc. cit., p. 435E. 109 ' ... ipseque ordinabat clericos ... ' (Brehier, op. cit., p. 166).
110 Raymond, ch. 15, loc. cit., p. 276A.
111 For these sects in their relations with the crusaders, see M. Spinka, 'The Effect of the Crusades upon Eastern Christianity,' Environmental Factors in Christian History, ed. J. T. McNeill et al., (Chicago, 1939), pp. 252–272.
112 William of Tyre, vi, 23, RHO, v, 274.
113 Spinka, loc. cit., p. 254.
114 Ibid., pp. 255–256.
115 See his two letters, written together with Adhemar and other bishops from the crusaders' camp (HEp, pp. 141–142, 147–148).
116 Albert, v, 1, loc. cit., p. 438B.
117 Supra, p. 5, n. 19.
118 Supra, n. 112.
120 Fruitz concludes that the crusaders were not wealthy enough to maintain the church organizations of Palestine and Syria with their 102 bishoprics (Kulturgeschichte der Kreuzzüge [Berlin, 1888], p. 97).
Our information is far from complete, but some details may be given concerning the more important sees. When Baldwin and Bohemund made their belated pilgrimage to Jerusalem in 1099, they brought four priests with them — Benedict, Roger, Bartholomew, and Bernard of Valence, the former chaplain of the bishop of Puy. The first was consecrated archbishop of Edessa; the others, bishops of Tarsus, Mamistra, and Artasium respectively. At Antioch, when the Greek patriarch John had withdrawn, the same Bernard took his place. In September, 1098, Raymond of Toulouse presided over the election of Peter of Narbonne as bishop of Albara; Peter later became archbishop of Apamea. In June, 1098, the leaders chose Robert, a priest of Rouen, as bishop of Ramlah, a see rendered especially valuable by the precious remains of St George. They provided for the collection of tithes, and endowed their candidate with gold, silver, and livestock. 'He remained there with joy.' At Jerusalem, canons were assigned to the Holy Sepulchre and the Temple, while Gerhard, abbot of Allerheiligen in Schaffhausen, who had undertaken the long journey for the love of God, was chosen Guardian of the Sepulchre. Even the abbot whom we have noted as burning a false stigma on his brow was able to obtain a post, first as abbot of St Mary's in Jephoshaphat, and then as archbishop of Caesarea.

These elections reflected the investiture strife raging in Europe, and would not have met the approval of a Cluniac reformer. Raymond, describing the election of the bishop of Albara, says that the count of Toulouse consulted his chaplains and the other leaders, and then proceeded to choose a bishop. One of the chaplains (perhaps Raymond himself) announced the forthcoming election and inquired if any candidate would present himself. As no one ventured to do so, the clergy and leaders chose Peter of Narbonne, the people assented by acclamation, and the count then invested the bishop with his temporalities. It is clear that the count of Toulouse directed the choice. Similarly, the bishop of Ramlah (Robert of Rouen) seems to have been chosen by the maiores.

The richest prize was the patriarchate of Jerusalem. The clergy knew its importance, and wished to elect the spiritual head first, perhaps conceiving that this priority would enable the patriarch to overshadow his secular colleague. One senses a sharp change in their attitude. With peaceful conditions partially restored, they were beginning to shake off their subservience and rise up as at home to challenge the lay power. If Adhemar had lived, their efforts might have succeeded. But they were weakened by the loss of their best leaders, Adhemar and William, bishop of Orange. Save for the bishop of Albara, the right-hand man of

Where he obtained his estimate of 108 bishoprics, I cannot say. The patriarchates of Antioch and Jerusalem should each have included at least that many. For Antioch, see William of Tyre, iv, 9, RHO, i, 166; xiv, 15, p. 623; for Jerusalem, ibid., pp. 1135–1137.

121 Raoul of Caen, Gesta Tancredis, ch. 140, RHO, iii, 704.

122 Bréhier, op. cit., p. 192.

123 Fulcher, op. cit., 1, 30, 2 (Hagenmeyer, p. 308).

124 Supra, p. 6, and appendix, sv. Baldwin.

125 Source references for both elections will be found in the appendix, nos. 32, 35.

126 Raymond, ch. 20, loc. cit., p. 301A–D.
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the count of Toulouse, they still found it necessary to step softly. Angered by their protests, the leaders proceeded all the more quickly to elect a secular head.\textsuperscript{127}

The patriarchate fell to Arnulf of Chocques, chaplain of Robert Curthose. There was some lively electioneering, with the Provengals opposing his election bitterly; but by Raymond's own admission,\textsuperscript{128} Arnulf had the majority of the people as well as of the clergy on his side. Arnulf had come up in the world. His rise is an epitome of the extraordinary opportunities the crusade offered to the clergy.

The bishop of Martirano, Arnulf's supporter, obtained the church of Bethlehem, but never lived to rule over the see of Christ's nativity. He was snatched away to an unknown fate by the Turks; and Raymond, who charges that he received the church in return for aiding the election of Arnulf, regards his untimely end as a divine punishment. If we may believe that Arnulf turned out some clergy who held benefices in the Holy Sepulchre, it is quite likely that he undertook to reward his partisans by providing them with places.\textsuperscript{129}

Connecticut College.

APPENDIX

A List of Clergy on the First Crusade

Note. — This list is limited to clerics who went on crusade with the main armies in 1096, and even within these limits does not pretend to exhaust the extant sources. All references have been checked. Question marks have been placed after doubtful entries in the list.


2. Adhemar of Monteil, bishop of Puy. For a summary of his career, see Ch. Kohler in \textit{La Grande Encyclopédie}, i, 555. There is also a monograph to which I have not had access: G. J. d'Adhémar Labaume, \textit{Adhémar de Monteil, évêque de Puy — létal d'Urbain II, 1079–1098} (Le Puy, 1910).

3. 'Adrianus episcopus.' 'Charta Boemundi,' \textit{HEp.}, p. 156. He may be the 'episcopus de Apulia' (Fulcher, \textit{op. cit.}, ed. Hagenmeyer, p. 327, n. 24), who may in turn be the bishop of Russignolo (Ronciglione, Roscignolo, Rossano?) noted by Hagenmeyer, \textit{Anonymi Gesta Francorum} (Heidelberg, 1918), p. 155, n. 28.


6. Apulia, bishop from. See above, no. 3.

7. Arnulf of Chocques. The best biographical and bibliographical note on Arnulf is in David, \textit{Robert Curthose}, Appendix C, pp. 217–220, where it is demonstrated that he came not from 'Rohes' but from Chocques, in the diocese of Thérouanne.

\textsuperscript{127} \textit{Ibid.}

\textsuperscript{128} \textit{Ibid.}, ch. 21, p. 302C. Space is lacking here for a discussion of the disputed question as to whether Arnulf was elected patriarch regularly or irregularly, or whether he was merely elected vice-patriarch \textit{pro tempore}. For a defense of the view that Arnulf was elected regularly, see \textit{HEp.}, pp. 409–411; for an opposing view see Emil Hampel, \textit{Untersuchungen über das lateinische Patriarchat von Jerusalem} (1099–1118) (Breslau, 1899), pp. 8–14. For additional bibliography see above, appendix, no. 7.

\textsuperscript{129} Raymond, cited \textit{supra}, n. 128.
8. Arnulf, bishop of Martirano. He aided the election of Arnulf of Chocques as patriarch (Raymond, ch. 21, loc. cit., p. 582A–C); was carried off by Saracens (Bréhier, op. cit., p. 210); cf. Italia Sacra, Vol. ix, col. 272.

9. Atta, bishop of. See above, no. 4.

10. Baldwin, an abbot. He burned a cross on his forehead to obtain funds for the journey (Guibert of Nogent, RHO, iv, 182–183), but as he confessed this sin and led an exemplary life thereafter, he was chosen first abbot of St Mary’s in Jehoshaphat, and then in 1101, archbishop of Caesarea (ibid.). Guibert does not name him; but Hagenmeyer (Fulcher, op. cit., p. 405, n. 4) identifies him as Baldwin (died 1107), who came out with Godfrey; cf. William of Tyre, ix, 9, ed. Babcock and Krey, i, 393, and n. 24, and R. Röhrich, Geschichte des ersten Kreuzzuges (Innsbruck, 1901), p. 117, n. 2.


12. Benedict, a priest. Consecrated archbishop of Edessa, 1099 (Raoul, cited supra, no. 11). Hagenmeyer identifies him with an unknown bishop who came with Baldwin on his pilgrimage to Jerusalem in 1099 (Fulcher, op. cit., i, 38, viii, p. 393, and n. 25) but this contradicts Raoul’s statement that Roger, Bartholomew, Bernard, and Benedict were all ‘in presbyteratus officio positi’ when they came.


15. Bonfilius, bishop of Poligno. Vita B. Bonfili, episcopi Fulginatis, AASS, 27 Sept., vii, 489–490 (written with some critical insight by one Sylvester, ca 1255). Bonfilius was an ardent reformer, took only pious clerics and laymen with him, and is alleged to have lived for ten years as a hermit in the Holy Land before returning home. Cf. Leib, Rome, Kiew, et Byzance, p. 256.


18. Frumold, canon of Cologne. (?) Transferred his property to the abbey of Brauweiler in return for money for the journey, Dec. 31, 1095; but this does not prove that he actually went (Hagenmeyer, Chronologie, no. 16, p. 12).


20. Gerbault of Lille, a priest. Translatio reliquiarum S. Georgii Martyri, AASS, 23 April, iii, 136–137.

21. Gerhard, abbot of Allerheiligen in Schaffhausen. Gave up his post ‘pro humilitate’ after being abbot only a few months, to go on crusade. As ‘prior sancti sepulcri’ he was one of the chief men of the new kingdom. See F. L. Baumann, ‘Das Klöster Allerheiligen in Schaffhausen,’ in Die ältesten Urkunden von Allerheiligen in Schaffhausen, Rheinau und Muri (Vol. iii of Quellen zur Schweizer Geschichte, Basel, 1883), p. 83, and n. 4, p. 165; cf. Bernold, MGH SS, v, 467.

22. Gervais, abbot of St Savin sur la Guartampe. (?) According to the Vita B. Bernardi Tiromiensis, AASS, 14 April, ii, 226C–D, he went on crusade and was devoured by a lion; but there is also a tradition that he died in Judaea in 1079 (Gallia Christiana, Vol. ii, col. 1287).

23. Gilbert, bishop of Evreux. He buried Odo, bishop of Bayeux, at Palermo, en route to the Holy Land (Ordericus Vitalis, viii, 1, ed. Le Prevost, iii, 266); but as he was home by Nov. 13, 1099, it is possible that he did not finish the crusade (ibid., x, 10 [iv, 65]; cf. David, op. cit., p. 228).

24. Gislebert, canon of St Mary’s in Aachen. (?) R. Röhrich, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Kreuzzüge (2 vols, Berlin, 1874), ii, 302; but the source cited (Albert, vi, 36) does not prove that Gislebert was necessarily on the crusade.
27. Odo, bishop of Bayeux. See above, no. 23.
29. Peter, bishop of Anagni. (?) The Vita B. Petri, episcopi Anagnini, AASS, 3 Aug., i, 288, alleges that Peter went ‘apostolica licentia’ with Bohemund to avoid persecution arising from unjust charges that he had misused funds collected to build a church. But the Vita is late and faulty, exhibiting startling chronological inconsistencies; and W. Holtzmann questions its claim to rest upon a contemporary life of Peter (‘Studien zur Orientpolitik des Reformapsttums,’ Historische Vierteljahrschrift, xxii [1924–1925], 171, and nn. 3, 4). Cf. Leib, op. cit., p. 84, n. 6, and R. B. Yewdale, Bohemund I, Prince of Antioch (Princeton, 1924), p. 38.
32. Peter of Narbonne, a priest. Consecrated bishop of Albara, 1098 (Bréhier, op. cit., p. 168; Raymond, ch. 14, loc. cit., p. 266D–G); the first Latin bishop chosen by the crusaders. After election he went to Antioch to be consecrated by the Greek patriarch John IV. When Bernard became patriarch of Antioch, Peter transferred the allegiance of his see to that church, and was made an archbishop (William of Tyre, vi, 8, RHO, i, 289), apparently of Apamea (ibid., xi, 10), sometime between 1112–1119 (RHO, v, introd., lxv). As archbishop of Apamea he is said to have despoiled the tombs of the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob at Hebron (Canonici Hebrömensis tractatus de inventione sanc torum patriarcharum, RHO, v, 390E). He was still alive in 1119.
33. Peter Tudebode, priest of Civray. See his Historia de Hierosolimitana itinere, RHO, iii; for commentary, Krey, op. cit., p. 11.
34. Raymond of Agiles. Author of the eye-witness account, Historia Francorum qui ceperunt Jerusalem, RHO, iii, 235–309.
35. Robert of Rouen, a priest. Consecrated bishop of Ramlah (Lydda, St George), June, 1099 (Bréhier, op. cit., p. 192, Raymond, loc. cit., p. 292A; Albert, v, 42, loc. cit., p. 461B; William of Tyre, vii, 22, loc. cit., p. 313). He was the first Latin bishop on the patriarchate of Jerusalem.
36. Roger, a priest. Consecrated bishop of Tarsus, 1099 (Raoul, cited supra, no. 11).
38. Russignolo, bishop of. See no. 3.
39. Sannardus, chaplain of Robert of Flanders. It was to him that Robert entrusted the arm of St George which Gerbault of Lille had stolen (supra, no. 20).
40. Simon, a chaplain. Raymond, ch. 15, loc. cit., p. 263B.
41. William, bishop of Orange. There is an excellent biographical note on William in HEp., p. 411, n. 27.