

instead. An easier solution was found. The Franks of Antioch were leaderless since Bohemond's captivity and Baldwin of Le Bourg's departure to govern Edessa. They suggested that Tancred should come to them as regent in his uncle's place. To Tancred the suggestion offered a fresh and wider field, where Baldwin would not overshadow him; while Baldwin was happy to be rid with so little trouble of a vassal whom he distrusted and disliked. The interview at Haifa took place early in March 1101, in an atmosphere of cordiality. Tancred handed back his fief of Galilee to Baldwin and departed with his good wishes to Antioch.¹

Already on Christmas Day, 1100, in the Church of the Nativity at Bethlehem, Baldwin had paid homage to the Patriarch Daimbert and had been crowned by him as king.²

Thus, more than four years after the princes of Western Europe had left their homes for the Crusade, the Kingdom of Jerusalem was founded. Of all the great leaders it was Baldwin, the penniless younger son of the Count of Boulogne, that had triumphed. One by one his rivals had been eliminated. Many of them had returned to the West, Robert of Normandy, Robert of Flanders, Hugh of Vermandois and Stephen of Blois. His own brother Eustace of Boulogne, who might have hoped for Godfrey's heritage, had preferred his lands by the English Channel. Of his chief competitors in the East, Bohemond lay helpless in his Turkish prison, and Raymond, landless still, was away in Constantinople as the client of the emperor. But Baldwin had bided his time and had snatched at his opportunities. Of them all he had proved himself the ablest, the most patient and the most far-sighted. He had won his reward; and the future was to show that he deserved it. His coronation was a glorious one and a hopeful ending to the story of the First Crusade.

APPENDIX I

Principal Sources for the History of the First Crusade

The story of the First Crusade is almost entirely covered by contemporary or almost contemporary sources. In the footnotes I discuss points arising from minor and secondary sources; but the chief primary sources on which we are continuously dependent and which do not always agree among themselves need a general critical appreciation in order to assess their relative value.

1. GREEK

The only Greek source of prime importance is the *Alexiad* of ANNA COMNENA, which is the life of the Emperor Alexius by his favourite daughter. Anna wrote her book some forty years after the events of the First Crusade, when she was an old woman. Her memory may at times have played her false; in particular, her chronology is occasionally somewhat muddled. Moreover, she wrote in the light of later developments. She was also a devoted daughter and wished to show that Alexius had been invariably wise, scrupulous and kindly. She therefore tended to suppress anything that might in her opinion be interpreted to his discredit, or to the discredit of his friends. She is frankly not reliable when she deals with events that occurred outside the boundaries of the empire, where she allows her prejudices full rein, as in her account of the career of Pope Gregory VII. But modern historians are too ready to belittle her. She was an intelligent and very well-educated woman; and she was a conscientious historian, who tried to verify her sources. Though she wrote in old age, she had long intended to be her father's biographer and must have collected most of her material during his lifetime, when she had full access to his official papers. Where she depends on a reliable informant, as in her account of the Crusaders' march across Anatolia, for which she clearly used Tatcius' reports, she controls her prejudices; and though she undoubtedly committed sins of omission, she cannot be proved guilty of any sins of commission in describing events that took place at Constantinople or within the empire. She enjoyed her father's confidence and herself had personal knowledge of many of the characters and incidents that she described. It is easy to make allowances for her pley and prejudices; but when that is done, her testimony on all affairs directly concerning Byzantium must be preferred to that of any other.¹

The chroniclers ZONARAS and GLYCAS² and the brief popular work
¹ The latest edition of Anna Comnena is published in the *Collection Budé* and edited by Latil, with a full introduction and notes. *Anna Comnena*, by Mrs Buckler, gives a detailed critical study of the *Alexiad*. There is an English translation of the *Alexiad*, by E.A.S. Dawes (London, 1928).
² Both edited in the Bonn *Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae*.

¹ Palcher of Chartres, II, vii, 4, pp. 390-3; Albert of Aix, VII, 44-5, pp. 537-8.

² Palcher of Chartres, II, vi, 4, pp. 384-5; Albert of Aix, VII, 43, pp. 536-7; William of Tyre, loc. cit.

known as the *Synopsis Sathas*¹ add very little to our knowledge. No official Byzantine documents concerning the Crusade have survived except for letters written by Alexius to western princes and hierarchs, which exist only in Latin translations that are certainly not accurate. The letters of THEOPHYLACT, Archbishop of Bulgaria, as yet inadequately edited, provide a little additional information.²

2. LATIN

The Latin sources are more numerous and supply us with most of our information.

RAYMOND OF AGUILERS (or Aigulthe, in the Department of Haute-Loire) joined the Crusade in the company of Adhemar of Le Puy, and soon became chaplain to Raymond of Toulouse. He began to write his chronicle, the *Historia Francorum qui ceperunt Jerusalem*, during the siege of Antioch and finished it at the end of 1099. He concentrated on the history of Count Raymond's expedition; but, though he was a loyal southern Frenchman, he was by no means uncritical of his chief, disapproving of the count's delay in marching on from Antioch and unsympathetic with his pro-Byzantine policy. Only on one occasion (see above, p. 225) does he mention the Greeks without an unfriendly comment. His part in the episode of the Holy Lance had caused critics to doubt his veracity; but within his limits he was obviously sincere and well informed. His work soon achieved a wide circulation; but though some early MSS. contain interpolations it was never re-edited.³

FULCHER OF CHARTRES attended the Council of Clermont, then went to the East in the company of his overlord, Stephen of Blois. In June, 1097, he became chaplain to Baldwin of Boulogne, in whose entourage he thenceforward remained. His *Gesta Francorum Iherusalem Peregrinantium* was written in three instalments, in 1101, 1106 and 1124-7. He was the best educated of the Latin chroniclers and the most reliable. Though devoted to Baldwin, his outlook was remarkably objective. It is only in his third instalment that any animosity against the Byzantines appears; and his general outlook towards the eastern Christians is fair and friendly. His work was much used by subsequent chroniclers.⁴ BARTHOLOMEW OF NANGIS, writing probably in Syria, published in about 1108 an edition of the earlier chapters, with a few additions, mainly topographical.⁵ A brief résumé of the later chapters is attributed to LISIARD OF TOURS.⁶ WILLIAM OF MALMESBURY, RICHARD OF POITERS and SICARD OF CREMONA all used the whole chronicle as their chief source when they wrote of the Crusade.⁷

¹ Ed. in Sathas, *Bibliotheca Graeca Mediae Aevi*, vol. VII.

² Theophylact's letters are given in M.P.G., vol. CXXXVI.

³ Ed. in the *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades*. There is room for a good critical edition.

⁴ The edition by Hagemeyer, which is fully annotated, has superseded that in the *Recueil*.

⁵ Ed. in the *Recueil*. See Cahen, *La Syrie du Nord*, p. 11 n.1.

⁶ Ed. in the *Recueil*.

⁷ See Cahen, loc. cit. Sathas's chronicle no longer exists.

The most popular of the contemporary accounts of the Crusade was the anonymous work known as the *Gesta Francorum et Aliorum Hierosolimitanorum*. This was written, probably as a diary, by one of Bohemond's followers who went on to Jerusalem with Tancred. It ends with the story of the battle of Ascalon in 1099 and was first published in 1100 or early in 1101; Ekkehard read it in Jerusalem in 1101. But the oldest extant MSS. already contain interpolations, such as a 'literary' description of Antioch, and a passage falsifying the account of Bohemond's transactions at Constantinople (see above, p. 132 n. 1), inspired by Bohemond himself about the year 1105, as well as a passage borrowed from Raymond of Aguilers. The author was a simple soldier, honest according to his lights but credulous and prejudiced and a strong admirer of Bohemond. The wide success of the *Gesta* was mainly due to Bohemond's own efforts. He regarded it as his *apologia* and himself hawked it round northern France during his visit there in 1106.¹ At an early date it was republished, almost word for word, by a Poitevin priest, himself a Crusader, called TUDEROD. His version, the *De Hierosolymitano Itinere*, contains a few additional personal reminiscences.² About 1130 there appeared a *Historia Belli Sacri*, a clumsy compilation made by a monk of Monte Cassino, based on the *Gesta* but with a few passages taken from Radulph of Caen, from some source now lost and from current legendary traditions.³ The *Gesta* was several times rewritten: in about 1109 by GUIBERT OF NOBERT, who added personal information and borrowed legendary traditions;⁴ a more critical and moral tone,⁵ in about 1110 by BAUDRI OF BOURGUEIL, Archbishop of Dol, who sought to improve its literary style;⁶ and by ROBERT THE MONK, OF REIMS, whose popular and somewhat romantic version, the *Historia Hierosolymitana*, appeared in about 1122.⁷ It also inspired a short anonymous *Expeditio Contra Turcos*, and the chapters on the Crusades in the chronicles of HUGO OF FLEURY and HENRY OF HUNTINGDON.⁸

Three important chroniclers of the First Crusade did not themselves take part in it. EKKENHARD, Abbot of Aura, came to Palestine with the German Crusaders of 1101. On his return to Germany, in about the year 1115, he composed a work called the *Hierosolymina*, intended to be part of a world chronicle that he contemplated. It is made up of a few personal reminiscences and of stories told to him or to his friend, Frutholf of St Michaelsberg, by actual members of the Crusade, supplemented by information taken from already published chronicles. He often gives his sources, but was a credulous man.⁹

¹ The latest edition is Béthier's, under the title of *Histoire Anonyme de la Première Croisade*. The notes in Hagemeyer's edition, *Anonymi Gesta Francorum* (Heidelberg, 1890) are still useful.

² Ed. in the *Recueil*. See Cahen, op. cit., pp. 8-9.

³ Ed. in the *Recueil*. See Cahen, loc. cit.

⁴ Ed. in the *Recueil*. See Cahen, loc. cit.

⁵ Ed. in the *Recueil*. See Cahen, loc. cit.

⁶ Ed. in the *Recueil*. See Cahen, loc. cit.

⁷ Extracts of Hugu and Henry are published in the fifth volume of the *Recueil*. The *Expeditio Contra Turcos* is published with Trudobin in the third volume.

⁸ The edition in the fifth volume of the *Recueil* is far better than that of Hagemeyer (*Ekkehard von Aura*, Leipzig, 1883).

RADULPH OF CAEN came to Syria in 1108. He had already served with Bohemond in the Epirot campaign of 1107 and then attached himself to Tancred. After Tancred's death, in about 1113, he wrote the *Gesta Tancredi Siciliae Regis in Expeditione Hierosolymitana*. The book, which only exists in one MS., was never finished. Its style is that of an ignorant but very pretentious man. It contains a few exclusive scraps of information about its hero, but otherwise follows already published work; however, the author does not seem to have read the *Gesta Francorum*.¹

The fullest contemporary account of the First Crusade is given in the *Liber Christianae Expeditionis pro Erebione, Emundatione et Restitutione Sanctae Hierosolymitanae Ecclesiae* of ALBERT OF AIX (Aachen), written sometime about the year 1130. We know nothing of Albert except that he never visited the East. Till the middle of the last century he was regarded as the most authoritative source for the history of the Crusade, and historians such as Gibbon trusted him absolutely. But since von Sybel's destructive criticism it has been the fashion to discredit him rather more than is fair. His work is a compilation of legends and eyewitness accounts, put together with very little critical sense and without citing the sources. His account of Peter the Hermit's earlier life is obviously unreliable; but the narrative of Peter's expedition was certainly supplied by someone who took part in it. Details such as the time taken to traverse stages in the march are wholly convincing. For the story of Godfrey's journey to Constantinople and the march across Anatholia he certainly relied on an account given him by a soldier in Godfrey's army. He had probably been in the habit of noting down information given him by returning soldiers and pilgrims long before he began to compile his book. It is fairly easy to identify the legendary material; but his narrative of the events of the Crusade itself should be treated with respect.²

WILLIAM OF TYRE, the greatest of the Crusader historians, wrote some seventy years after the Crusade. For his narrative up to the establishment of the Crusaders in Palestine he used Albert of Aix almost exclusively; but after the capture of Jerusalem his story is also based on records and traditions surviving in the Crusader kingdom. But his tremendous *Historia Rerum in Partibus Transmarinis Gestarum* only becomes an important source after the accession of Baldwin. I hope to discuss it more fully in a later volume.³

A slightly different point of view is given by the Genoese CAFFARO, the author of the *Annals of Genoa*, covering the years between 1100 and 1163, and of a *De Liberatione Civitatum Orientis*, written in 1155, but discovered among some old papers a century later and possibly altered slightly before it was published. Caffaro belonged to a Genoese family that came to Palestine in 1100. His account is patriotic, but sober and reliable.⁴

¹ Ed. in the *Recueil*. There is a large literature about Albert, of which the most important works are those of Krebs, Kügel, Kühne and Beunmont (see Bibliography). See also von Sybel, *Geschichte des ersten Kreuzzugs*, 2nd ed. (preface), and Hagemmeyer, *Le Vrai et le Faux sur Pierre l'Hermitte*, especially pp. 9ff.

² Ed. in the *Recueil*. See Fritz, *Willelmus von Tyrus*, and Cahen, op. cit., pp. 17-18.

³ Ed. in the fifth volume of the *Recueil*.

The contemporary chroniclers of Western Europe all mention the Crusade, but depend entirely on one or other of the sources that we have mentioned, with the exception of the *Chronicle* of ZIMMERN, which provides information about the German Crusaders.¹

The Crusade produced its epics, both in Latin and in the *langue d'oïl* and the *langue d'oc*. They are, however, more important for their literary interest than for their historical worth. The Latin poets, GREGORY THE LOMBARDO, JOSEPH OF EXETER and GUNTHER OF BASLE, are historically valueless. The Provençal *Chanson d'Antioche*, attributed to GREGORY BERNARD, is more interesting and deserves further study. In the *langue d'oïl* there exists, besides a version in verse of Baudri, a *Chanson d'Antioche* by GRANDOROF DOVAI, which is based partly on Robert the Monk and partly on an earlier *Chanson* composed by RICHARD THE PILGRIM, who apparently took part in the Crusade in Robert of Flanders' army. He was a simple, rather ignorant man, but with his own point of view. For instance, though he wishes that the Crusaders had taken Constantinople, he is friendly towards Taiticus. There is also a poem in French by GILON with interpolations by a certain FULCHER, based on the same material, and a Spanish *Gran Conquista d'Ultramár*, late in date, which uses Bechada and Grandor and William of Tyre. The cycle with Godfrey of Lorraine as its hero, such as the *Chevalier au Cygne*, contains only legendary history.²

Very little contemporary correspondence has survived, but what remains is of great importance. There are a few letters to and from the Popes Urban II and Paschal II; two appeals from ecclesiastics in the East; two interesting, though not entirely disingenuous, despatches from the Crusading leaders; and, most valuable, two letters each from two prominent Crusaders, STEPHEN OF BLOIS, and ANSELM, Bishop of Ribemont. Stephen wrote three letters home to his wife. The first, written on his arrival at Constantinople, has been lost. The second was sent from the camp at Nicaea and the third from the camp at Antioch. Stephen, though a weak man, was honest and enthusiastic; and his letters are the most human of the documents regarding the Crusade. Anselm's letters were both written from Antioch and were addressed to his superior, Manasses, Archbishop of Reims. They provide useful information but lack the personal quality of Stephen's.³

The few papal decrees regulating the Crusade and the charters concerned with the establishment of the Crusading Kingdom are inevitably important. The archives of Genoa and Venice contain material of increasing value as the Italian towns took an increasing interest in the affairs of the Crusaders.

¹ Extracts are published by Hagemmeyer in vol. 11 of the *Archives de l'Orient Latin*.

² For the epics, see Hagenmeyer, *Les Poèmes épiques des Croisades*, defending a Syrian origin for the poems, and the summary in Cahen, op. cit., pp. 22-26.

³ The best edition of these letters is in Hagemmeyer, *Die Kreuzzugsbriefe*. A fuller collection is to be found in Riant, *Inventaire critique des Lettres historiques*.

3. ARABIC

Arabic sources, though numerous and highly important for the later Crusades, give us very little assistance over the first. No official charters or documents of the period have survived. The great encyclopaedias and geographies, so popular with the Arabs, are barely concerned with these years, with one exception. The works of the chroniclers known to have lived at the time have only come down to us in sparse, short quotations in later writers. There are only three works of real value.

IBN AL-QALANISI of Damascus wrote, in the years 1140-60, a history of his native city from the time of the Turkish invasions to his own day. The title of the work, the *Muhtajjal Tarikh Dimashq* (the *Continuation of the Chronicle of Damascus*) shows that it was intended as a sequel to the chronicle of the historian HILAL. But whereas HILAL aimed at giving the history of the world, Ibn al-Qalanisi was only interested in Damascus and its rulers. He spent his life in the chancery of the Damascene court, rising to be its chief official. He was therefore well informed; and except when the reputations of his masters were at stake he seems to have been accurate and objective.¹

IBN AL-ATRIK of Mosul wrote his *Kamil al-Tawarikh* (*Sum of World History*) at the beginning of the thirteenth century. But his careful and critical use of earlier sources makes him an authority of primary importance, though his entries are usually very brief.²

KEMAL AD-DIN of Aleppo wrote his unfinished chronicle of Aleppo and his Encyclopaedia half a century later still. But he too made full use of earlier sources, and in his Encyclopaedia he cites them by name. Of these lost sources the most to be regretted is the history of the Frankish invasion by HAMDAN IBN ABD AR-RAHIM of Maaraba, of which even in Kemal ad-Din's time only a few pages survived. IBN ZURAIQ of Maarat an-Numan, who was born in 1051 and played a part in the events of the Crusade, left a history of his times also only known from a few extracts; and AL-AZIMI of Aleppo, born in 1090, left an account of northern Syrian history at the time of the Crusade, of which a slightly larger number of extracts still exist.³

4. ARMENIAN

There is one invaluable Armenian source covering the period of the First Crusade, the *Chronicle of MATTHEW OF EDESSA*. The work deals with the history of Syria from 952 to 1136 and must have been written before 1140. Matthew was a native man with a hatred for the Greeks and no great love for those of his compatriots who were Orthodox in religion. Much of his information about the Crusade must have been derived from some ignorant

Frankish soldier; but about events in his native city and its neighbourhood he was very fully informed.¹

Later Armenian chroniclers, such as SAMUEL OF ANI and MEKHITAR OF AIRAVANQ, writing at the end of the twelfth century, and KIRAKOS OF GANTZAG and VARTAN THE GREAT, in the thirteenth century, treat only briefly of the First Crusade. They seem to have made use of Matthew and of a lost history written by a certain JOHN THE DEACON, whom Samuel praises highly and who showed special animosity not only against the Emperor Alexius but also against his mother, Anna Dalassena.²

5. SYRIAC

The only surviving Syriac work to treat of the First Crusade is the *Chronicle* of MICHAEL THE SYRIAN, Jacobite Patriarch of Antioch from 1166 to 1199, who passes very briefly over the period before 1107. He made use of earlier Syriac chronicles that are now lost as well as of Arabic sources. His information is of little value till he reaches his own lifetime.³

Though some of the primary histories of the Crusade have been individually edited, the only collection of sources is the great *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades*, published in Paris from 1844 onwards. This includes Latin and Old French, Arabic, Greek and Armenian texts, with translations into French of the Greek and eastern writers. Unfortunately except for the last (fifth) volume of the Latin texts, published some years after the rest of the *Recueil*, the editing of the manuscripts has been careless. There are also many arbitrary lacunae; and the translations are not always accurate. Nevertheless the collection remains indispensable for the student of the Crusades.

¹ For Ibn al-Qalanisi, see the preface to Gibb's translation of the passages of the *Damascus Chronicle* that refer to the Crusades (see Bibliography). The full text in Arabic is published by Amador (*Leyden*, 1908).

² The full text of Ibn al-Atirik's works is published in Arabic in 14 volumes by Tornberg (*Leyden*, 1851-79). Relevant passages are published in R.H.C.O.C.

³ There is no good edition of Kemal ad-Din. Passages relative to the Crusades, from 1097 to 1146, are fully given in the *Recueil*.

¹ A French translation was published from the MSS. by Duhauteur in 1858 and extracts of the Armenian text with French translation in R.H.C.O.C. The full Armenian text was published in Jerusalem in 1868. I have not been able to obtain it, and have therefore used the translation by Duhauteur, checking it where possible with the extracts in Armenian in the *Recueil*.

² Extracts of these historians are published in the *Recueil*.

³ Trans. and publ. by Chaboc.