A further discussion on the authorship of the Gesta Francorum

A further discussion on the authorship of the *Gesta Francorum*

Conor Kostick

Research Fellow for the Humanities and Social Sciences,
Trinity College Dublin

The *Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum* is the most studied and influential account of the First Crusade (1096 - 1099). It was the version of events that had the greatest impact in its day and it provided the basic materials for the even more widespread circulation of later twelfth century histories of the First Crusade. These, in turn, greatly influenced nineteenth century historians and popular twentieth century accounts: so that it is no exaggeration to say that the *Gesta Francorum* is the font from which springs the great rivers of writing on the First Crusade. A new edition of the text is in preparation, but the most recent version to date is that of Rosalind Hill (1962), which was issued with an accompanying English translation. It is Hill's edition that is used for this discussion.[1]

Soon after the completion of the *Gesta Francorum* other histories of the First Crusade by eyewitnesses began to be disseminated, but with considerably less influence. Raymond of Aguilers, a canon of the cathedral church of St. Mary of Le Puy in the Auvergne region of France, wrote his *Historia Francorum* in the aftermath of the crusade, to tell the world of the miraculous success of the expedition.[2] Fulcher of Chartres, chaplain to King Baldwin I of Jerusalem, wrote the first version of his terse but well observed *Historia Hierosolymitana* around 1105.[3] And a Poitevin priest, Peter Tudebode, took an early draft of the *Gesta Francorum* in order to amend it slightly and add a few extra passages and details, resulting in his *Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere*.[4] Perhaps because the *Gesta Francorum* was the first text to circulate in France and came to the attention of authors like Robert the Monk, whose rewriting of the story achieved great popularity in the medieval era, it shaped the understanding of the First Crusade to a much greater extent than the works of these other crusaders.[5]

Yet despite its importance in the historiography of the First Crusade, the authorship of the *Gesta Francorum* remains unknown, leading to considerable discussion over the centuries as to his background. In particular, the key question is whether the author was knight. If so, his is a particularly important voice, as the

vast majority of other crusading sources are the works of clerics. There is no doubting the regional emphasis of the author, which was slanted towards the activities of Bohemond I of Taranto, and a strong consensus has been reached that the author travelled from Italy as far as Antioch in the contingent of Bohemond.[6] There is far more colour in the description of how Bohemond's contingent was formed and its subsequent journey than for the equivalent, cursory, accounts of the armies of the expedition led by Hugh the Great, count of Vermandois, Count Raymond IV of Toulouse or Duke Godfrey IV of Bouillon.[7] As Rosalind Hill has pointed out, the author knew the names of many of the individual knights of Bohemond's following, but not even the correct titles of the other senior princes, let alone their followers.[8] The exact social status of the anonymous author, however, has proved difficult to determine.

In 1890 Heinrich Hagenmeyer produced an edition of the *Gesta Francorum*, which argued in favour of seeing the author as a literate knight, which is a view that has found favour with several subsequent historians, including Hill. Louis Bréhier, however, in his 1924 edition proposed that the author should be understood to be a cleric taking down the story from a knight. In an important contribution to *Reading Medieval Studies*, Colin Morris sounded a note of caution in regard to the characterisation of the author as a simple knight, with an analysis that went further than that of Bréhier in drawing attention to the clerical elements of the work.[9] More recently, Jay Rubenstein (following Hans Oehler) made the point that there is sufficient knowledge of scripture displayed in the *Gesta Francorum* to indicate that the author was no secular warrior. Indeed, 'the evidence for his secular character barely withstands a second glance.'[10] If the choice were between viewing the author as an unsophisticated knight or a cleric, the discussion would indeed have to conclude, without a second glance, that he was a member of the clergy. Not only does he paraphrase biblical passages but there is a strong theology at work throughout the book, most evident in the author's belief that the crusaders were *milites Christi*. But this dichotomy fails to encompass a proper consideration of the observation that there were those on the First Crusade who had once received a certain amount of clerical training but nevertheless end up pursuing a career as a knight. The amount of clerical learning displayed in the *Gesta Francorum* is not great; it is considerably less than that visible in the other sources. It is, in fact, within the bounds that would be expected from someone with a limited amount of religious training, or whose prose learning had been shaped by the Vulgate, the most influential text of the medieval period.[11] So long as the debate is not reduced to insisting the author was either an unlearned warrior or an educated cleric, then the possibility that he was a knight remains a likely one. A knight who was 'secular' in the sense of not being a practising member of the clergy, but who nevertheless held strongly to his Christian theology.

In resolving this issue there are inevitably great difficulties. What would be the difference in language between a knight dictating to a cleric who helped shape the material[12] and a literate knight with a 'half-conscious' memory of the phrases he had heard in church?[13] Do the rare moments when the author reveals a sophisticated grammar definitely indicate he was a cleric,[14] or someone who had once trained for the clergy but subsequently became a knight? The debate on the identity of the author of the *Gesta Francorum* has been dormant for some time, but the purpose of this article is to bring the pendulum back from Morris' view that the author was a cleric and restore it to the position that the author was, in fact, a knight.

Two general considerations on the issue of authorship have to be examined before undertaking a detailed discussion of the text, although in themselves they are inconclusive. Firstly, how likely was it that a knight c.1100 could compose such a lengthy Latin narrative? And secondly, how should the fact that at times the spirit of a *chanson de geste* seems to be influencing the text be interpreted? The question of how widespread was the ability to write Latin in the medieval era has generated a considerable literature. Although as far back as 1939 Marc Bloch's overview of feudalism acknowledged the existence of a tradition of literacy among the laity and in the same year J. W. Thompson wrote a key monograph which attempted to dispel 'the gross exaggeration still current in some quarters that in the Middle Ages only clerics could read or write Latin', their perspective was not an accepted one until the early 1980s.[15]

Aside from members of secular nobility obtaining an education in letters directly from tutors, it was not particularly rare for a younger son of a knightly family to begin clerical training, only to be brought back into secular life due to personal choice or a change in circumstance for the family, such as the death of an older son. Evidence of this exists with regard to the First Crusade. From Guibert of Nogent's *Gesta Dei Per Francos* comes an example of an otherwise unknown crusader, Alberic of Normandy, nobly born, who was sent to school early, became a cleric but out of a love for warfare defected from the clergy.[16] Guibert himself declined the offer from his mother of arms and equipment to change profession to that of a knight.[17] In his discussion of the authorship of the *Gesta Francorum*, Bernard Hamilton drew attention to the example of a very prominent crusading knight who had in his youth been clerically trained, Baldwin of Boulogne, later King Baldwin I of Jerusalem.[18] According to William of Tyre, Baldwin, the youngest of the three sons of Eustace II, count of Boulogne and Ida of Bouillon, trained for the priesthood but left the clergy to become a *miles*.[19] Albert of Aachen described him as a *vir litteris eruditus*.[20] Raymond of Aguilers gives another example of a literate knight, stating that he wrote his history along with the knight Pons of Balazuc.[21] Further, crucial, evidence that the ability to write a history of contemporary events was not confined to the clergy comes from the author of the *Gesta Francorum* himself; at one point he observed that so much had happened

that no *clericus* or *laicus* could possibly hope to write it all down.[22] In other words, general considerations of the use of Latin c. 1100 do not rule out the possibility that the author of the *Gesta Francorum* was a knight.

Both modern historians in favour of the view that the author was a knight and those in favour of the view that he was a cleric accept that, unlike the other narrative histories of the First Crusade, the *Gesta Francorum* has qualities that are reminiscent of a *chanson de geste*: that form of verse designed to be memorised and recited in the halls of the nobility.[23] Rosalind Hill made this point in her observations on the text's formulaic refrains on the capture of plunder after battles and in the doxology introduced at the end of each section of the work.[24] Colin Morris elaborated on this idea and indeed argued persuasively that, 'in a real, if limited sense, the *Gesta Francorum* is a *chanson de geste*.'[25] The clearest departure from a chronicle style is the section in which the author describes the encounter between Kerbogha, emir of Mosul, and his prophetic, pro-Christian, mother. This strange and fictional conversation would be eccentric in a chronicle style of history, but the author of the *Gesta Francorum* uses it in a very purposeful aesthetic manner. That particular scene is a device to indicate the extent of Kerbogha's pride and his confidence in the size of his army, to make all the more extraordinary the victory of the Christians in battle against him.[26] The author was familiar with such poetic devices, probably from an awareness of the structure of songs in general, but possibly he was helped in the composition of these scenes by familiarity with the particular creations of the verse makers who we know were present on the expedition.[27]

The fact that the *chanson de geste* was a familiar part of the culture of the secular nobility favours the 'knight' interpretation over the 'cleric', but not decisively. Colin Morris for one, despite offering the most sensitive appreciation of the *chanson*-like qualities of the text to date, did not draw the conclusion that the author was a participant of this secular culture. Rather, he proposed that it was possible this *chanson* style of writing may have been a deliberate attempt to appeal to an aristocratic Italian audience by an author quite capable of a very different style of writing.[28] This explanation suffers from being unnecessarily complicated. Given that there were literate knights in the era and on the crusade, if a text looks like it was shaped by the culture of the secular nobility rather than that of the clergy, then by Occam's Razor if no better criteria, it would be more logical to simply attribute it to a knight than a cleric adopting a style that would appeal to knights.

It is on the internal evidence of the text itself that the argument must rest, that, and the fact that it is possible to compare the *Gesta Francorum* to a near identical copy, written by someone who clearly identified himself as a priest: the crusader, Peter Tudebode. The text of the *Gesta Francorum* appears to be a relatively bald and direct account of events, with few of the digressions that make, for example, Raymond of Aguiler's work, so much more idiosyncratic and open to

analysis with regard to his theological outlook.[29] With the *Gesta Francorum* there are no obviously decisive passages for determining the mentality of the author. If there were, the question investigated here would have been settled long ago. But there is one aspect of the author's outlook that is amenable to deeper investigation and which does offer a way forward in the discussion. In the sphere of social vocabulary and in the author's concerns with regard to social status there is evidence that the author of the *Gesta Francorum* has a quite different approach from that of the other eyewitness accounts, and indeed, all the other early crusading historians, all of whom were clerics. Even those writers such as Robert the Monk and Guibert of Nogent who were heavily dependent on the *Gesta Francorum*, wrote about social matters in a very different manner than the way that such issues appear in their *fons formalis*.

The attention of the author of the *Gesta Francorum* was almost entirely fixed on the activities of those he terms *seniores* and *milites*. While the lower social groupings were given a handful of mentions each, the *milites* have over a hundred. This simple fact is among the strongest pieces of evidence that the author was himself a member of the knightly class.[30] The social concerns of the author were rarely for the poor, although he was aware of the hardships they faced, but insofar as the author referred to an internal differentiation among the Christian forces (which was uncommon) much more attention was given to the *milites*. For example, the death of a horse and the consequent loss of status for the *miles* who owned it is made much of in the text.[31] That the issue of a *miles* becoming a *pedes* was a matter of great significance to our author is shown in his account of an offer made by Kerbogha to the Christians in Antioch. The core of the offer was that if they renounced their religion the Turkish emir would give them land, cities and castles, so that none should remain a *pedes*, but all would be *milites*.[32] Whether Kerbogha actually made such an offer or whether this was a poetic device to show how stalwart the Christian troops were in the face of temptation, the point is that from the perspective of our author the problem of there being knights who had been reduced to footsoldiers was the central one for the crusaders.

As a reporter of social issues the author of the *Gesta Francorum* was extremely limited and this, in itself, is a contrast with the other sources, all of whom had a more sophisticated social vocabulary. He was generally content to describe the expedition as a whole and not comment on the internal differentiation within it. The standard point of view he adopted is that given by the first person plural, typically he wrote of how *nos* viewed a certain event, meaning the whole movement. When the author went beyond this simple designation he still tended to use terms that embraced the entirety of the Christian forces: *populus*, *peregrini*, or *milites Christi*. In large part this is because the events that were of greatest interest to the author were the major military conflicts between the Christian army and their Muslim opponents. He seems to have been reluctant to

dwell on internal dissension within the movement, so, for example, his own move from the contingent of Bohemond to that journeying on to Jerusalem is made without any justification, or any criticism of Bohemond for not fulfilling his oath. In this regard the *Gesta Francorum* again appears to parallel a *chanson de geste*, with its focus being on a simplified conflict between two undifferentiated blocks, Christians and pagans.

Only in a few instances did the author comment on events that draw attention to the diverse social makeup of the First Crusade. Interestingly, although his vocabulary had very few terms that carried a social connotation, his phrasing concerning the poor was invariably altered by the later authors who used the *Gesta Francorum* as their *fons formalis*. The author of the *Gesta Francorum* did not, in other words, have the kind of vocabulary that a member of the medieval clergy tended to utilise for the lower social orders.

Our author used one particularly striking phrase, *gens minuta*, on two occasions. Firstly, he wrote that because of the hardship of the siege of Antioch, around February 1098, the *gens minuta et pauperrima* fled to Cyprus, Rum and the mountains.[33] Secondly, when Raymond Pilet attempted prematurely to lead an expedition against Ma'arra in July 1098, Ridwan of Aleppo threw him back, in large part because Raymond's forces had a great number of poor and local Christians unused to combat. Of this incident, the author of the *Gesta Francorum* wrote that the *gens minuta* were seized by extreme terror.[34] From the example of those who accompanied Raymond Pilet out of Antioch in July 1098 it seems that phrase was employed to describe footsoldiers, probably of the less well equipped sort, unattached to any following. But the *gens minuta et pauperrima* who abandoned the hardship of the siege of Antioch is more likely to be a reference to the entirety of the lower social orders, fighters and non-combatants. The phrase *gens minuta* is an extraordinary one, which, other than its occurrences in Peter Tudebode's direct borrowings, does not occur in any other early crusading history, nor indeed, in the entire collection of writings in the *Patrologia Latina*. The 'small people' could be seen as a deliberately derogatory term and it is very suggestive of someone looking down at them from a horse. In both the situations for which the term was employed the commoners, while suffering, were behaving in a manner the author disapproved of. Whether consciously or unconsciously negative, the appearance of the phrase *gens minuta* in the text strongly suggests that the author's vocabulary was inadequate when it came to writing about the commoners and he improvised a clumsy phrase of his own invention.

Minores, as a broad term for the lower social orders, appears in the *Gesta Francorum* on three occasions. In each case, however, *minores* was used in juxtaposition to *maiores* to form a couplet indicating a totality of people divided into a crude bipartite structure. In this regard there is a possible biblical reminiscence, although the phrase *maiores et minores* was something of a commonplace among contemporary narrative historians.[35] There are a few

instances of our author using the term *pauperes*, an important Vulgate term for the poor and, as Karl Lyser has observed, a term that for early eleventh century writers also meant 'defenceless'.[36] The author of the *Gesta Francorum* was inclined to use the term *pauperes* with both with regard to the poor in general, but also he was willing to talk about footsoldiers with the term, again suggesting a distinctive approach to social vocabulary and furthermore that he was looking down at the footsoldier from the perspective of a knight.

The issue of supplying the crusading army as it gathered, first at Constantinople and then at the siege of Nicea (April 1097 to its surrender 19 June 1097), prompted the author of the *Gesta Francorum* to make one of his few observations about the poor. He recorded the promise of Alexius I Comnenus, the Byzantine emperor, to give alms to the *pauperes* in the contingent of Duke Godfrey to keep them alive after they had departed Constantinople (4 April 1097).[37] In summing up the siege of Nicea and the sense of frustration that the sacrifices of the expedition had not been properly rewarded, the anonymous author pointed out that many of the *pauperrima gens* had in fact starved to death.[38] Immediately afterwards he nevertheless acknowledged that, exceedingly pleased with the fall of the city, Alexius ordered alms to be distributed bountifully to *nostri pauperes*.[39]

After this cluster of usages in writing about the siege of Nicea and its aftermath, the term *pauper* appears only three times more in the entire work. Two of these instances were cases where the term *pauperes* was used as an adjective that seems to have been used to describe poor combatants rather than 'the poor'. The author described a scene where Kerbogha's complacency grew from having been brought a rusty sword, a bad bow and a useless spear, recently stolen from the *pauperes peregrini*.[40] This incident was not intended to identify a social group but to show Kerbogha, gloating hubristically and prematurely over the superiority of his forces to those of the Christians. When the castellan Achard of Montmerle left the siege of Jerusalem to contact six Christian vessels that had arrived at Jaffa on 17 June 1099, he was intercepted by some Arab soldiers and killed. According to the report of the *Gesta Francorum* Achard died along with the *pauperes homines pedites*.[41] In this case, the only such formulation, the most likely meaning is that these were footsoldiers who were distinguished, perhaps, by poverty relative to the condition of better off footsoldiers in the main body of the Christian forces for whom the author consistently used the term *pedites* without qualification.[42] The point here is that the author of the *Gesta Francorum* even when employing terms that make it seem as though he is attentive to the lower social grouping, was as often making a distinction between rich and poor warriors as that between those who fought and the non-combatant poor. In this regard his vocabulary is significantly different from that of the clerical authors.

The final use of *pauperes* by the author of the *Gesta Francorum* is the most critical and important one. This was the epitaph of Bishop Adhémar of Le Puy,

papal legate and one of the prominent leaders of the crusade, on his death at Antioch (1 August 1098): 'Quia ille erat sustentamentum pauperum, consilium divitum, ipseque ordinabat clericos, predicabat et summonebat milites, dicens quia: "Nemo ex vobis saluari potest nisi honorificet pauperes et reficiat, vosque non potestis saluari sine illis, ipsique vivere nequent sine vobis."' (Because [Adhémar] was the helper of the *pauperes*, the counsel of the rich and he ordered the clergy; he preached to and summoned the *milites*, saying this: None of you can be saved unless he does honour to the *pauperes* and assists them; you cannot be saved without them, and they cannot live without you').[43]

Karl Leyser has noted that Adhémar's speech reflected the contemporary orthodoxy of the tripartite division of society.[44] This is a valuable observation, but it applies with even greater force to the preceding description of the legate as: 'sustentamentum pauperum, consilium divitum, ipseque ordinabat clericos'. The division of rich and poor here is hierarchical rather than functional (working, fighting, praying) but nevertheless this passage provides evidence that the author of the *Gesta Francorum* did indeed see the expedition in tripartite terms and, by loose analogy with the orthodox understanding of the three orders, it seems that here at least *pauperes* is being used for non-combatants. For Colin Morris this passage is a decisive one in indicating that the author was a cleric, since it shows an outlook that would be unlikely for a knight, particularly in its concern for the poor.[45]

But a careful look at the phrasing of the sentence shows that, in fact, the concern for the poor reported here was Adhémar's and, indeed, the reportage is given from the perspective of a *miles* who was remembering the bishop as someone who recalled them to their duties to the poor, which they might otherwise have neglected. At the core of the passage is this message from Adhémar: 'You knights should help the poor.' The conclusion that this passage reveals how a knight, rather than a cleric, remembered the words of Adhémar is strengthened by consideration of the work of Peter Tudebode.

There has been a centuries-long controversy over the status of the *Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere* of Peter Tudebode. The work is very similar indeed to the anonymous *Gesta Francorum* and the debate has been conducted about the relationship between the two. Which preceded the other? Or are they both variants of an earlier text? In 1641 Jean Besly produced an edition of the *Historia De Hierosolymitano Itinere* that challenged the version of the *Gesta Francorum* in Jacques Bongars's famous 1611 collection of crusading sources.[46] From the internal evidence presented in the manuscript from which he was working (now Paris, B. N. MS latin 4892), Besly argued for the primacy of the version in which the author gave his name as *Petrus Tudebodus* a *sacerdos* of Civray, approximately 50 km from Poitiers.[47] Henri Wallon and Adolphe Régnier adopted this perspective for the *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades* version edited in 1866.[48] With the appearance of Heinrich Hagenmeyer's scholarly edition

of the *Gesta Francorum* in 1880 the argument was made that the relationship of the two works should be reversed and that the *Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere* should be considered the derivative work.[49]

The consensus of historians since 1880 has been to follow Hagenmeyer, with the important exception of John and Laurita Hill, the most recent editors of Peter Tudebode's text. The Hills performed valuable work in examining the key manuscripts and, largely on stylistic grounds, separating the two traditions. This allowed them to publish a modern edition of *Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere*, which is used here. On the issue of the relationship between the *Gesta Francorum* and the *Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere*, they argued that the *Gesta Francorum*, *Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere* and the *Historia Francorum* of Raymond of Aguilers shared a now lost common source.[50] The difficulty with this position is that while there is some evidence that the *Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere* of Peter Tudebode is based on a slightly fuller version of the *Gesta Francorum* than we have today,[51] his text can be fully explained by seeing it as an adaptation of an earlier version of the *Gesta Francorum* by someone who also had access to the work of Raymond of Aguilers. It does not seem necessary to posit a 'missing source.' The strongest evidence that Peter was adapting the *Gesta Francorum* (or a very similar earlier version) and not the other way around has been pointed to by John France. The fact that Peter identifies himself as a French priest does not fit with a text that consistently uses *nos* for events that are describing the viewpoint of the Italian contingent.[52] Coming from Poitiers it does not make sense for the original author to write that 'we' set out from Amalfi, went from one city to another, crossed the river Vardar etc.[53]

For the purposes of this discussion the priority of the texts is not crucial, what is important is that where there are differences, albeit relatively small ones, between Peter Tudebode's work and that of the anonymous author, these differences are all consistent with the view that one text was the work of a knight, the other that of a cleric. This is particularly true for the key passage on the death of Adhémar. The version of Adhémar's words in the *Historia De Hierosolymitano Itinere* has the notable difference that the legate was reported as saying 'none of you can be saved unless he honours and assists the *pauperes clerici*; you cannot be saved without them, and they cannot live without you,'[54] This significantly changes the meaning of the passage. The theological message from Adhémar is no longer that by the meritorious deeds of the knights towards the *pauperes* they assist their own salvation, as a result of Peter's amendment, it is through the prayers of the clergy that the souls of the knights are saved. It is a change that shifts the psychological standpoint of salvation from that of a knight to that of a cleric. For those interested in establishing the priority of the texts, it should also be noted that Peter's version looks like a clumsy and unconvincing insertion of the term *clerici*, which as well as changing the message of the passage, changes *pauperes* from a noun to an adjective. The new sentence no longer

follows consistently with the start of the eulogy in which Adhémar is described as the helper of the *pauperes*. It seems that the priest was prepared to weaken the coherence of the text to promote the importance of his vocation.

Elsewhere Peter Tudebode's changes are less critical but nevertheless consistent in revealing a greater sensitivity to the situation of the non-combatant poor than does the *Gesta Francorum*. It is, of course, possible that a knight would be more attentive to the situation of the poor than a priest, but if our expectation is that in general a member of the lower clergy would have a greater awareness of the outlook of the poor than a knight, then such an expectation is fulfilled in this case. The author of the *Gesta Francorum* used *minores* as a loose term for the lower social order on three occasions. Peter Tudebode added two more examples. Peter Tudebode had Peter the Hermit use the term in his embassy to Kerbogha. Where the *Gesta Francorum* reported Peter as saying: 'Our *maiores* say that you should quickly withdraw'[55] Peter Tudebode's version read: '*Nostri maiores sive minores* say that you should quickly withdraw.'[56] Then, in Kerbogha's reply, Peter Tudebode replaced the *Gesta Francorum*'s phrase *seniores et maiores* with *seniores et maiores sive minores*.[57] These additions, although relatively unimportant, begin to demonstrate a greater awareness of the presence of the lower social orders in Peter Tudebode's work than in the *Gesta Francorum*. This distinction between the two texts is more clearly evident in their respective use of the term *pauperes*.

In reporting Stephen of Valence's vision of Christ at Antioch (10 June 1098), Peter Tudebode added an extra line of *oratio recta*, stating that Christ ordered everyone to make penance, undertake a procession with bare feet through the churches and 'give alms to the *pauperes*.'[58] This is useful additional information that the visions of Stephen were giving expression to the needs of the poor. Peter Tudebode made it clear that this advice was acted upon, when he altered the *Gesta Francorum*'s report that just before battle with Kerbogha (28 June 1098) 'and they gave alms' to read 'and they gave alms to the *pauperes*.'[59] In the month after the fall of Ma'arra (11 December 1098) the *pauperes* engaged in a form of behaviour that, in the version of events reported by Peter Tudebode, brought forth a response from the *seniores*. The *pauperes peregrini* cut open the bodies of the dead to look for coins hidden in the stomachs. They then cooked and ate scraps of flesh from the bodies. As a result, reported Peter, the *seniores* dragged the bodies outside the gates of the city, where they formed large piles that were burnt.[60] The version in the *Gesta Francorum* was blander, neither distinguishing the *pauperes* as those responsible for cannibalism, nor reporting the response of the *seniores*.[61]

Peter Tudebode wrote a description of an appearance of St Andrew to the lowly Provençal visionary Peter Bartholomew that is not in the *Gesta Francorum*. The phrasing was drawn from the account of Raymond of Aguilers although Peter Tudebode placed it in his account of the storming of Ma'arra (11 December

1098), while Raymond was referring to the events of March 1099. It is clear, however, from his other comments concerning the siege of Ma'arra, that Peter Tudebode was an eyewitness to events there. Nor does the manner of his borrowing from Raymond contradict the basic message reported by both historians.[62] According to Peter Tudebode, St Andrew announced to Peter Bartholomew that the city would fall soon to the Christians if they repented of their having been evil and followed the Lord's instructions to *love your brothers as yourself* [Lev 19:34]. They were to take a tithe, which was to be divided into four parts: 'One should be given to the bishop, another to the priests, another to the churches and the other to the *pauperes*.'[63] From this and the other passages that mention the lower social order it is evident that Peter Tudebode had a greater awareness of the activities and needs of the *pauperes* than did the author of the *Gesta Francorum*.

The question of the authorship of the *Gesta Francorum* is a crucial one for our understanding of the crusades, indeed for our insight into wider aspects of western European society c.1100. So much of the source material of the era available to us is the work of clerics that any relatively long text written by a knight has to be embraced as a very precious document. Historians have been divided over this question, with the more recent scholarship favouring the view that the author was a cleric, particularly in the light of Colin Morris's persuasive article for *Reading Medieval Studies*. But a careful reading of the passage on which the main weight of his argument rests, that of the epitaph of Bishop Adhémar of Le Puy, suggests otherwise. The impression that the viewpoint of the epitaph to the papal legate was that of a knight is strengthened by consideration of the fact that someone we know to be a priest, Peter Tudebode, felt it necessary to alter its perspective. Furthermore, an analysis of the social vocabulary of the author of the *Gesta Francorum* indicates that he was someone who was far more interested in the *milites* than any other social grouping and that he was a writer who was untypical and rather clumsy in his language when it came to commentating on the lower social orders. It is the conclusion of this article then that some confidence can be given to assertion that the *Gesta Francorum* was indeed, as earlier historians conjectured, written by a knight.

Notes

[1] Editions of the *Gesta Francorum*: J. Bongars, *Gesta Dei per Francos*, 2 vols, Hanover, Typis Wechelianis, apud heredes Ioan. Aubrii, 1611; *Recueil des historiens des croisades, Historiens occidentaux* (hereafter *RHC Oc.*) 5 vols, Paris, Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres, 1841 - 95, Book iii. 121 - 63; *Anonymi Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum*, ed. H. Hagenmeyer, Heidelberg, Carl Winter, 1890; *Anonymi Gesta Francorum*, ed. B. A. Lees,

Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1924; *Histoire Anonyme de la première Croisade* ed. L. Bréhier, Paris, Champion, 1924; *Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum* ed. R. Hill, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1962, hereafter GF. Marcus Bull is preparing a revised edition of the *Gesta Francorum* for Oxford Medieval Texts.

[2] Raymond of Aguilers, *Historia Francorum qui ceperunt Iherusalem*, ed. J. France, unpublished PhD. thesis: University of Nottingham, 1967, hereafter RA. I am grateful to Prof. France for permission to quote from his thesis, which I consider a superior edition to those of the *RHC Oc.* Book iii. 235 - 309 and *Le 'Liber' de Raymond d'Aguilers*, ed. J. H. Hill and L. L. Hill, Paris, Paul Geuthner, 1969. Because it is not easily accessible, references to the *RHC* edition are given in brackets.

[3] Fulcher of Chartres, *Historia Hierosolymitana (1095 - 1127)*, ed. H. Hagenmeyer, Heidelberg, Carl Winter, 1913, hereafter FC.

[4] Peter Tudebode, *Historia de Hierosolymitana,* ed. J. H. Hill and L. L. Hill, Paris, Paul Geuthner, 1977, hereafter PT. On the complex relationship between the *Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere* and the *Gesta Francorum* see J. Rubenstein, 'What is the *Gesta Francorum*, and who was Peter Tudebode?', *Revue Mabillon*, 16 (2005), 179 - 204.

[5] On the circulation of the *Gesta Francorum* see A. C. Krey, 'A neglected passage in the Gesta and its bearing on the literature of the First Crusade', in *The Crusades and other historical essays presented to Dana C. Munro*, ed. L. J. Paetow, New York, F. S. Crofts, 1928, pp. 57 -76. Robert the Monk, *Historia Iherosolimitana*, *RHC Oc.* Book iii. 717 - 882.

[6] For Bohemond I of Taranto see R. B. Yewdale, *Bohemond I, Prince of Antioch*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1924.

[7] For these princes see M. Bull, 'The Capetian monarchy and the early crusade movement: Hugh of Vermandois and Louis VII', *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, 50 (1996), 25-46; J. Hill and L. Hill, *Raymond IV, Count of Toulouse*, Syracuse, Syracuse University Press, 1962; J. C. Andressohn, *The Ancestry and Life of Godfrey of Bouillon*, Bloomington, University of Indiana Press, 1947.

[8] GF xi - xii. Although titles at this time had considerable fluidity, see I. S. Robinson, 'Eine unbekannte Streitschrift über die Sakramente von Exkommunizierten im Münchener Kodex lat. 618', *Studi Gregoriani*, 11 (1978), 297 - 395 (p.311 n. 30).

[9] First in a footnote, C. Morris, 'Policy and Visions - The case of the Holy Lance at Antioch', in *War and Government in the Middle Ages*, ed. J. Gillingham and J. C. Holt, Woodbridge, Boydell, 1984, pp.33 - 45 (p. 36, n. 12), then expanded in C. Morris, 'The *Gesta Francorum* as narrative history', *Reading Medieval Studies*, 19 (1993), 55 - 71.

[10] Rubenstein, p.187. Hans Oehler, 'Studien zu den *Gesta Francorum*', *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch* 6 (1970), 58 - 97.

[11] See also J. G. Gavigan, 'The Syntax of the *Gesta Francorum*', *Language*, 19 (1943), 10 - 102 (p.12).

[12] Bréhier, pp.v - viii.

[13] GF, p.xiv.

[14] Morris, *Gesta*, p.66, referring to GF, pp.59 - 60.

[15] Marc Bloch, *Feudal Society*, 2 vols. (London, Routledge and K. Paul, 1961 [1939]), I, pp.79 - 81; J. W. Thompson, *The Literacy of the Laity in the Middle Ages,* New York, Franklin, 1963 [1939], p. 180. See also M. T. Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record: England 1066 - 1307,* London, Edward Arnold, 1979; B. Stock, *The Implications of Literacy: Written Language and Models of Interpretation in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries,* Princeton, Princeton University Press 1983; R. McKitterick, *The Carolingians and the Written Word,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1989; *The Uses of Literacy in Early Mediaeval*

Europe, ed. R. McKitterick, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1990; R. V. Turner, 'The *Miles Literatus* in Twelfth- and Thirteenth- Century England: How Rare a Phenomenon?' *The American Historical Review*, 83 (1978), 928-945; I.S. Robinson, 'The Institutions of the Church', in *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, ed. D. Luscombe and J. Riley-Smith, vol.4.1, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2004, pp.368-461.

[16] Guibert of Nogent, *Gesta Dei per Francos*, ed. R. B. C. Huygens, Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis, 127A, Turnhout, Brepols 1996, hereafter GN, 5.xv: *Et postmodum a clero apostatice ac turpiter, militiae amore, desciverat.*

[17] Guibert of Nogent, *Monodiae*, ed. E. - R. Labande, Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 1981, I.6.

[18] B. Hamilton, *Religion in the Medieval West*, London, Edward Arnold, 1986, p.108.

[19] William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, ed. R. B. C. Huygens, Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis 63, Turnhout, Brepols, 1986, hereafter WT, p.453.

[20] Albert of Aachen, *Historia Iherosolimitana*, ed. S. B. Edgington, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2007, hereafter AA, p. 572. For the early career of Baldwin of Boulogne see A. V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem*, Oxford, Unit for Prosopographical Research, 2000, pp.30- 36.

[21] RA, p.201 (276). For Pons of Balazuc see RA, pp.iv - vi.

[22] GF, p.44.

[23] On the evolution of the *chanson de geste* at this time see R. R. Bezzola, *Les origines et la formation de la littérature courtoise en Occident (500-1200)* 3 vols., Paris, Champion, 1958 - 63.

[24] GF, p.xv.

[25] Morris, *Gesta*, p.61.

[26] See also N. Hodgson, 'The Role of Kerbogha's Mother in the *Gesta Francorum* and Selected Chronicles of the First Crusade', in *Gendering the Crusades*, eds. S. B. Edgington and S. Lambert, Cardiff, University of Wales Press, 2001, pp.163- 176.

[27] RA, p. 358 (302).

[28] Morris, *Gesta*, p. 63.

[29] For a discussion on the intellectual perspectives of Raymond of Aguilers see C. Kostick, *The Social Structure of the First Crusade*, Leiden, Brill, 2008, pp.27 - 39.

[30] For the question of whether *milites* were a knightly class at this time, see C. Kostick, 'The terms *milites*, *equites* and *equestres* in the early crusading histories', *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, 50 (2006), 1 -21.

[31] GF, p.23.

[32] GF, p.67.

[33] GF, p.35.

[34] GF, p.74.

[35] I Chronicles 24:31: *tam maiores quam minores*. See for example, FC, I, V, 11 (152); I, XVI, 1 (225); I, XXV, 3 (267), also AA 168, 216, 856, also Baldric of Dol, *Historia Hierosolymitana, RHC Oc.* Vol. iv. 1-111, hereafter BD, (p.42).

[36] K. Leyser, *Communications and Power in Medieval Europe: the Gregorian Revolution and beyond*, trans. T. Reuter, London, Hambledon, 1994, p.82 n. 26.

[37] GF, p.7.

[38] GF, p.17.

[39] GF, p.18.

[40] GF, p.51.

[41] GF, p.89. For Achard of Montmerle see J. Riley-Smith, *The First Crusaders, 1095 - 1131*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1997, p.197.

[42] GF, pp.18-19, 21, 23, 30, 32, 35, 40, 73, 79.
[43] GF, p. 74. For Bishop Adhémar of Le Puy see J. A. Brundage, 'Adhémar of Puy: The Bishop and his Critics', *Speculum*, 34 (1959), 201 - 212.
[44] Leyser, p.82 n. 25. For the tripartite division of society the best discussion still remains, G. Duby, *The Three Orders: Feudal Society Imagined,* Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1978.
[45] Morris, *Gesta*, p. 66.
[46] Peter Tudebode, *Historia de Hierosolymitano itinere*, ed. J. Besly, Paris, Sebastian Cramoisy, 1641.
[47] PT, p.138 n. b.
[48] *RHC Oc.* Vol. iii. 3 - 117.
[49] Hagenmeyer, *Gesta.*
[50] PT, pp.21 - 24; *Peter Tudebode,* trans. J. H. Hill and L. L. Hill, Philadelphia, The American Philosophical Society, 1974, pp.10 - 13.
[51] Rubenstein, *passim.*
[52] J. France, 'The Use of the Anonymous *Gesta Francorum* in the Early Twelfth-Century Sources for the First Crusade', in *From Clermont to Jerusalem. The Crusades and Crusader Societies 1095 - 1500*, ed. A. V. Murray, Turnhout, Brepols, 1998, pp. 29 - 42.
[53] GF, pp.7 - 8.
[54] PT, p.117: 'Quoniam nemo ex vobis salvus fieri potest, nisi honorificet et reficiat pauperes clericos...'
[55] GF, p.66: 'Nostri maiores ... velociter recedatis.'
[56] PT, p.108: 'Nostri maiores sive minores ... velociter exeatis..'
[57] PT, p.109, referring to GF 67.
[58] PT, p.100: '... pauperibus dent eleemosinas'.
[59] PT, p.110: 'Et dederunt eleemosynam pauperibus.' Referring to GF 67-8.
[60] PT, pp.124 - 5.
[61] GF, p.80.
[62] For the same passage in Raymond of Aguilers see RA, 214 - 5 (278).
[63] PT, 122: '... una quarum detur episcopo, alia sacerdotibus, alia ecclesiis, alia pauperibus.' For Peter of Narbonne, Bishop of Albara, see Riley-Smith, *First Crusaders*, p. 217.