



Swansea University
Prifysgol Abertawe



Cronfa - Swansea University Open Access Repository

This is an author produced version of a paper published in:

Rulers of the Latin East

Cronfa URL for this paper:

<http://cronfa.swan.ac.uk/Record/cronfa37662>

Book:

John, S. (2017). *Godfrey of Bouillon*. Routledge.

Full text of the "Introduction"

This item is brought to you by Swansea University. Any person downloading material is agreeing to abide by the terms of the repository licence. Copies of full text items may be used or reproduced in any format or medium, without prior permission for personal research or study, educational or non-commercial purposes only. The copyright for any work remains with the original author unless otherwise specified. The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holder.

Permission for multiple reproductions should be obtained from the original author.

Authors are personally responsible for adhering to copyright and publisher restrictions when uploading content to the repository.

<http://www.swansea.ac.uk/library/researchsupport/ris-support/>

Introduction

Standing high over the cobbles and tramlines of the Place Royale in Brussels is a gigantic bronze statue. It represents a warrior, who sits astride a muscle-bound steed captured in mid-gallop. The warrior holds aloft a war banner in his right hand, and a shield in his left. He wears at his belt a sheathed sword, and atop his head a crown. The warrior is depicted gazing ahead, downhill toward the ornate guild-houses and churches of central Brussels. The identity of the warrior is revealed in the following inscription on the front of the statue's pedestal:

GODEFROID DE BOUILLON
PREMIER ROI DE JERUSALEM
NE A BAISY EN BRABANT
MORT EN PALESTINE LE 17 JUILLET 1100
DECRETE LE 2 NOVEMBRE 1843
INAGURE LE 24 AOUT 1848
SOUS LE REGNE DE LEOPOLD I¹

The warrior whose statue dominates the Place Royale, then, is Godfrey of Bouillon. By any estimation, Godfrey was a significant historical figure. He was born around 1060, and was the second son of the count of Boulogne, an important figure in northern France and the surrounding regions. Through his maternal ancestry, Godfrey was a member of a prominent dynasty in Lotharingia, the westernmost region of the Empire. During his career, he attained the office of duke of Lower Lotharingia, in which capacity he was active in regional politics. In 1096 he set out at the head of a large army on the First Crusade, and, after its forces captured Jerusalem in July 1099, he was selected as the ruler of the incipient Latin polity centered upon the Holy City. Godfrey ruled in Jerusalem for a year, before dying after a brief illness on 18 July 1100.

¹ 'Godfrey of Bouillon, first king of Jerusalem, born in Baisy in Brabant, died in Palestine on 17 July 1100. [Statue] commissioned on 2 November 1843, inaugurated on 24 August 1848, during the reign of Leopold I.' An equivalent inscription in Flemish features on the back of the pedestal. As this book will show, Godfrey of Bouillon was not king of Jerusalem, he died on 18 July 1100 (not 17 July), and was likely born in Boulogne rather than Baisy. On the statue, see: *Rapports de MM. De Ram, Gachard et de Reiffenberg faits à la séance de la classe des lettres du 5 février 1849 concernant la statue de Godefroid de Bouillon* (1848). On nineteenth-century Belgian attitudes towards the Middle Ages, see: Jo Tollebeek, 'An Era of Grandeur: The Middle Ages in Belgian National Historiography, 1830-1914', in R. J. W. Evans and Guy P. Marchal (eds), *The Uses of the Middle Ages in Modern European States: History, Nationhood and the Search for Origins* (Basingstoke, 2011), pp. 113-35.

Godfrey came to enjoy rich fame after his death. In the Middle Ages, he was enshrined as the hero of the First Crusade, and his name became a shorthand for the entire crusading ‘movement’. He also came to be regarded as an icon of chivalry, and was often held up as an epitome of aristocratic values and martial virtues. His reputation continued to develop in the early-modern and modern periods.² Crucially, however, the various portrayals of Godfrey produced between his death and the present day are generally more revealing of the social, cultural and political contexts in which those portrayals were created than they are of Godfrey’s own career and epoch. The afore-mentioned statue of Godfrey in Brussels, for example, sheds more light on the preoccupations of mid nineteenth-century Belgium than it does on the life of the historical figure whom the statue purports to depict. The ‘historical’ Godfrey and the later traditions which surround him are enmeshed so tightly that it is not a straightforward task to unravel them. Even the most rigorous and influential modern historians have sometimes discussed Godfrey’s life in the light of his later status as a hero of the First Crusade and paragon of chivalry. As a result, many aspects of Godfrey’s life have been misconstrued in the past few generations of scholarship.

There is a vast corpus of modern scholarship on the crusades, a not insignificant proportion of which is relevant to Godfrey’s family and career.³ Existing biographical studies

² On the development of Godfrey’s reputation include, see, among others: Marcel Lobet, *Godefroid de Bouillon: Essai de Biographie Antilégitime* (Brussels, 1943); Gerhart Waeger, *Gottfried von Bouillon in Der Historiographie* (Zurich, 1969); Georges Despy, ‘Godefroid de Bouillon, myths et réalités’, *Académie royale de Belgique, bulletin de la classe des lettres et des sciences morales et politiques* 71 (1985), 249-75; David A. Trotter, ‘L’ascendance mythique de Godefroy de Bouillon et le Cycle de la Croisade’, in Laurence Harf-Lancner (ed), *Métamorphose et bestiaire fantastique au moyen âge* (Paris, 1985), pp. 107-35; Friedrich Wolfzettel, ‘Gottfried von Bouillon. Führer des Ersten Kreuzzugs und König von Jerusalem’, in Inge Milfull and Michael Neumann (eds), *Mythen Europas. Schlüsselfiguren der Imagination. Mittelalter* (Regensburg, 2004), pp. 126-42.

³ For surveys of crusade scholarship, see: Christopher Tyerman, *The Debate on the Crusades, 1099-2010* (Manchester, 2011), and Giles Constable, ‘The Historiography of the Crusades’, in Angeliki E. Laiou and Roy P. Mottahedeh (eds), *The Crusades from the Perspective of Byzantium and the Muslim World* (Washington, 2001), pp. 1-22. Modern historiography has drawn attention to the fact that the word ‘crusade’ and cognate terms were not used frequently in the twelfth century, and have only entered popular usage in the modern age. It is not the aim of this book to interrogate these terms, however, and so they are used freely in what follows. On this, see: Michael Markowski, ‘Crucesignatus: its origins and early usage’, *JMH*, 10 (1984), 157-65; Christopher Tyerman, ‘Were there any crusades in the twelfth century?’, *EHR*, 110 (1995), 553-77 (reprinted in his *The Invention of the Crusades* (Basingstoke, 1998), pp. 8-29); Walker R. Cosgrove, ‘Crucesignatus: a

of Godfrey are, however, far from satisfactory. A few examples will serve to illustrate this. Andressohn's 1947 biography is still generally cited by modern Anglophone scholars as standard. Yet in the seventy years since its publication, scholarship has advanced considerably.⁴ Moreover, Andressohn was chiefly interested in Godfrey's exploits on the First Crusade, and so paid rather less attention to his career in Lotharingia. The present book challenges some of Andressohn's findings, particularly those regarding Godfrey's career in the West. Aubé's 1985 biography offers a more comprehensive treatment of Godfrey's life.⁵ However, Aubé's study is undermined as a work of scholarship by the lack of a critical apparatus. His analysis features long quotations from primary sources and incorporates arguments formulated by other modern authorities, none of which have full citations. As a result, the uninitiated reader often must guess the origin of Aubé's information from among the works listed in his bibliography. Dorchy and Mayer have both carried out useful studies of Godfrey's career before the First Crusade.⁶ Focussing on one discrete period of Godfrey's life afforded these scholars the scope to apply sustained critical scrutiny on the pertinent sources to profitable effect. However, this approach also negated the possibility of drawing connections between the different phases of Godfrey's life and to the careers of his ancestors. The rich vein of modern writing on the First Crusade will help shed light on Godfrey's preparations for and participation in the expedition. This includes the histories of the expedition by scholars including France, Asbridge and Rubinstein, and the influential work of

refinement or one more term among many?' in Thomas F. Madden, James L. Naus and Vincent Ryan (eds), *The Crusades: Medieval Worlds in Conflict* (Farnham, 2010), pp. 95-110. Similarly, this book will render the Latin word 'miles' (pl. 'milites') as 'knight', even though historians have suggested that this may be anachronistic for the eleventh and early twelfth centuries. See: Dominique Barthélemy, *The Serf, the Knight, and the Historian*, tr. Graham R. Edwards (Ithaca, 2009), pp. 137-53.

⁴ John C. Andressohn, *The Ancestry and Life of Godfrey of Bouillon* (Bloomington, 1947).

⁵ Pierre Aubé, *Godefroy de Bouillon* (Paris, 1985).

⁶ Henri Dorchy, 'Godefroid de Bouillon, duc de Basse-Lotharingie', *RBPH*, 26 (1948), 961-99; Hans E. Mayer, 'Baudouin I^{er} et Godefroy de Bouillon avant la Première Croisade', in *Mélanges sur l'histoire du Royaume Latin de Jérusalem* (Paris, 1984), pp. 10-48.

Riley-Smith, Bull and others on its ideological and devotional context.⁷ While modern historians of the First Crusade have shed light on Godfrey's involvement in the expedition, however, they have generally relied on the work of other scholars - above all Andressohn - for their assessments of his life in the West, with the result that they have come to problematic conclusions.

The present book draws from scholarship which details Godfrey's ancestry and career in the West. As regards Godfrey's dynastic origin, Parisse has produced a comprehensive genealogy of Godfrey's maternal ancestry (the house of Ardennes-Bouillon), while his paternal lineage, the history of the counts of Boulogne, has been thoroughly investigated by Tanner.⁸ Murray has produced a detailed and insightful prosopographical survey of Godfrey's ancestors, family and companions on the crusade. His work will be invaluable in what follows.⁹ The present book also incorporates work on politics and authority in the kingdom of Germany and the Western Empire in the eleventh century, including Cowdrey's biography of Pope Gregory VII, Robinson's biography of King Henry IV, Weinfurter's study of the Salian dynasty, and the range of modern scholarship on the 'Investiture Conflict'.¹⁰

As a biography of a medieval figure, the present book keys into a recent wave in biographical writing by scholars of the Middle Ages. This trend is perhaps epitomised by the appearance in 2016 of a new biography of William the Conqueror by Bates.¹¹ Bates' study,

⁷ John France, *Victory in the East: A Military History of the First Crusade* (Cambridge, 1994); Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade: A New History* (London, 2004); Jay Rubinstein, *Armies of Heaven: The First Crusade and the Quest for the Apocalypse* (New York, 2011); Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading* (London, 1986); Idem, *The First Crusaders, 1095-1131* (Cambridge, 1997); Marcus Bull, *Knightly Piety and the Lay Response to the First Crusade: The Limousin and Gascony, c.970-c.1130* (Oxford, 1993).

⁸ Michel Parisse, 'Généalogie de la Maison d'Ardenne', *PSHIGL*, 95 (1981), 9-41; Heather J. Tanner, *Families, Friends and Allies: Boulogne and Politics in Northern France and England, c. 879-1160* (Leiden, 2004).

⁹ Alan V. Murray, *The Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem: A Dynastic History, 1099-1125* (Oxford, 2000); Idem, 'The Army of Godfrey of Bouillon, 1096-1099: Structure and Dynamics of a Contingent on the First Crusade', *RBPH*, 70 (1992), 301-29.

¹⁰ H. E. J. Cowdrey, *Pope Gregory VII, 1073-1085* (Oxford, 1998); I. S. Robinson, *Henry IV of Germany, 1056-1106* (Cambridge, 1999); Stefan Weinfurter, *The Salian Century: Main Currents in an Age of Transition*, tr. Barbara M. Bowlus (Philadelphia, 1999); Uta-Renate Blumenthal, *The Investiture Controversy: Church and Monarchy from the Ninth to the Twelfth Century* (Philadelphia, 1988).

¹¹ David Bates, *William the Conqueror* (New Haven, 2016).

an instalment of the *Yale English Monarchs* series, supersedes the earlier biography in that series by Douglas, as well as Bates' own previously-published popular biography of the same figure.¹² The *Rulers of the Latin East* series, in which the present book appears, is intended to enhance biographical scholarship on figures who participated in crusading expeditions and those who played occupied prominent positions in the Latin East.

The approaches deployed in other modern biographies of medieval figures will provide methodological models for this book. Much has been written on the exigencies of biography.¹³ As those discussions have shown, this is rarely a straightforward endeavour. A scarcity of relevant source material often hampers such ventures. Moreover, while the actions of a particular individual from the Middle Ages can sometimes be established, the thoughts, motivations and feelings upon which those actions were contingent are often very difficult to fathom. The contemporary material which describes Godfrey's life - and especially his involvement in the First Crusade - is such that it will be possible at points to discuss his thinking and worldview in relation to certain key events and issues. However, for the most part it is not the overarching aim of this book to recover the 'inner' Godfrey of Bouillon. Rather, it is conceived as a cultural biography, that is, a study which uses Godfrey as a prism for interrogating the dynamics which shaped the course of his life, the events in which he participated, and the cultures to which he belonged. To emulate Gillingham's approach to the composition of his seminal biography of Richard I, this book is 'less a question of what I think he was 'really' like, but rather of the many ways in which contemporaries portrayed him.'¹⁴ A key aim of the book, then, will be to establish how the perceptions that Godfrey's contemporaries had of him can illuminate, *inter alia*, the nature of Lotharingian politics in the

¹² David C. Douglas, *William the Conqueror: The Norman Impact on England*, new edn (New Haven, 1999); David Bates, *William the Conqueror*, new edn (Stroud, 2004).

¹³ For general comments, see: Michael Prestwich, 'Medieval Biography', *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 40 (2010), 325-46, and the essays collected in David Bates, Julia Crick and Sarah Hamilton (eds), *Writing Medieval Biography, 750-1250: Essays in Honour of Professor Frank Barlow* (Woodbridge, 2006).

¹⁴ John Gillingham, *Richard I* (New Haven, 1999), p. ix.

age of the 'Investiture Conflict', the recruitment drive for the First Crusade in the kingdom of Germany, the subsequent course of the expedition, and the early phases of Latin settlement in the Holy Land. This book follows a number of recent biographies of individuals who occupied prominent offices in the West before - and in some cases after - embarking on crusade. Gillingham's afore-mentioned study of Richard I constitutes a particularly instructive example, as a key argument of his book is that Richard's formative experiences in the West shaped how he acted whilst on the Third Crusade. Other recent scholarship in this vein include Freed's work on Frederick Barbarossa, Evergates' study of Henry the Liberal, count of Champagne, and Perry's appraisal of John of Brienne.¹⁵

This book explores Godfrey's dynastic origins and his career in the West, before turning to his experiences on the First Crusade and in Jerusalem in the expedition's aftermath. It suggests that Godfrey's involvement in the crusade can perhaps best be understood in the light of his experiences in Lotharingia and the familial traditions which helped shape his worldview. In short, Godfrey the duke of Lower Lotharingia is just as important to this book as Godfrey the ruler of Latin Jerusalem.

The first chapter surveys the nature of power in the kingdom of Germany and the Western Empire in the eleventh century, before examining the place of Godfrey of Bouillon's maternal ancestors in Lotharingian and imperial politics. Particular attention is paid to the careers of Godfrey the Bearded (his grandfather) and Godfrey the Hunchback (his uncle), both of whom preceded him as duke of Lower Lotharingia. The chapter pinpoints evidence which suggests that from the mid-1050s until the early 1070s, Godfrey's maternal ancestors had close dealings with the reform papacy. The chapter also explores how Godfrey's predecessors interacted with ecclesiastical authorities in Lotharingia, above all, the bishop of Liège and the monastery of St Hubert. Finally, the chapter examines the lives of Godfrey's

¹⁵ John B. Freed, *Frederick Barbarossa: The Prince and the Myth* (New Haven, 2016); Theodore Evergates, *Henry the Liberal: Count of Champagne, 1127-1181* (Philadelphia, 2016); Guy Perry, *John of Brienne: King of Jerusalem, Emperor of Constantinople, c.1175-1237* (Cambridge, 2013).

parents, Eustace II and Ida of Boulogne, in order to establish the circumstances in which Godfrey and his brothers Eustace (III) and Baldwin were born. The second chapter investigates Godfrey's career between his birth in about 1060 and the coming of the First Crusade in 1095. It assesses the fragmentary evidence for his earliest years before his emergence in Lotharingian politics in 1076, and then charts his struggles to attain the office of duke of Lower Lotharingia, and his appointment to it in 1087. It is suggested that Godfrey was not firmly aligned with Henry IV of Germany in this period, and that he did not participate in Henry's grand military campaigns in Saxony and Italy in the 1070s and 80s. It is also contended that, like his uncle and grandfather before him, Godfrey maintained links with the bishop of Liège (who instituted the Peace of God in his diocese at an assembly in which Godfrey participated) and the monks of St Hubert (from whom Godfrey received instruction about sin and penitence).

The third chapter considers how Urban II's appeal for the First Crusade might have reached Godfrey, and his response to that appeal. It suggests that in 1095-6 Godfrey had access to a number of channels of communication, both ecclesiastical and aristocratic, and that any one of them could have been the conduit along which the official papal message concerning the crusade reached him. It also identifies the dynastic ties which bound Godfrey to the aristocracy of northern France, emphasising the permeable nature of the frontier between the region and Lotharingia. This chapter makes the case that Godfrey's positive response to Urban's appeal for the First Crusade might be best understood in the light of his maternal ancestors' efforts to support the reform papacy, his own participation in the episcopal Peace assembly in Liège, and the influence of the monks of St Hubert on his ideas about religion. The third chapter also examines how Godfrey prepared in 1095-6 for the First Crusade, and discusses the composition of the army at whose head he departed Lotharingia in August 1096.

The fourth chapter, the longest of the book, is devoted to Godfrey's career on the First Crusade. It charts his exploits from his departure on the expedition through to the capture of Jerusalem by the crusader armies on 15 July 1099. It examines Godfrey's influence on the crusade relative to that of the other leading participants, suggesting that while Godfrey proved himself to be a brave and effective warrior in his own right, he was one of a number of prominent figures who shaped the course of the First Crusade. The chapter suggests that up until the final few months of the expedition, Godfrey remained largely in the shadow of Bohemond, a redoubtable general who possessed a wealth of military experience, and who was the single most dominant participant in the crusade, and Raymond of Toulouse, who was the richest and most distinguished of the leaders. The argument is drawn that it was only in the early months of 1099, at the very end of the expedition, that Godfrey came to the fore and began to surpass the other leaders in influence and authority.

The fifth chapter explores Godfrey's tenure as ruler of Latin Jerusalem. It begins by considering the circumstances of his appointment as ruler of Jerusalem in July 1099. It asserts that he did not take the title of king, and then examines a range of possible explanations for why he did not do so. The chapter then charts his year-long tenure as ruler of the Holy City and traces his efforts to establish the institutions of government in the new Latin polity. The chapter concludes by examining the circumstances of his death on 18 July 1100, and the developments which culminated in him being succeeded by his younger brother, Baldwin, who was inaugurated king of Jerusalem in Bethlehem on Christmas Day 1100.

There follows at the end of the book an epilogue which examines how perceptions of Godfrey developed over the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. It is contended that depictions of Godfrey in that period were shaped by an interconnected series of historical, socio-cultural, political and literary impulses, the most important of which was the course of crusading history between 1100 and 1300. The fortunes of crusading expeditions and the condition of

the Latin states established by the First Crusaders in the Holy Land had a principal influence upon how he was regarded during this time. The epilogue casts the development of Godfrey's reputation as one reflex of the wider process through which the momentous events of the First Crusade were assimilated into the cultural consciousness of Latin Christendom.¹⁶ The success of the First Crusade captured the imagination of the Latin Christian world, and this helped to stimulate interest in Godfrey and his career.

The five core chapters of the book rest on sources which date to the eleventh century or within five or so years of Godfrey's death in 1100. The majority of this evidence consists of texts which this book will, for convenience's sake, refer to as chronicles and charters.¹⁷ Charters yield important information on the careers of Godfrey and his ancestors. Members of the family issued their own charters, and they are also named in documents issued by other parties.¹⁸ The diplomas issued by the kings of Germany/emperors are of particular use, for they contain witness lists which illuminate the crown's political connections at a given moment. The most informative texts for Godfrey's ancestry and early life, however, are chronicles, above all, those which originated in Lotharingia. The most important of these is the chronicle known as the *Cantatorium*, which was written in stages at the monastery of St Hubert down to 1106.¹⁹ The events described in the latter part of the *Cantatorium* took place at the time of the great dispute between Gregory VII and Henry IV. In describing those

¹⁶ For an overview, see: James M. Powell, 'Myth, Legend, Propaganda, History: The First Crusade, 1140-ca.1300', in Michel Balard (ed.), *Autour de la Première Croisade* (Paris, 1996), pp. 127-41. On the circulation of information concerning the First Crusade, see: Carol Sweetenham, 'What Really Happened to Eurvin De Créel's Donkey? Anecdotes in Sources for the First Crusade', in *WEC*, pp. 75-88, and Simon John, 'Historical truth and the miraculous past: the use of oral evidence in twelfth-century historical writing on the First Crusade', *EHR*, 130 (2015), 263-301. A methodological model for this study is Benjamin Z. Kedar, 'The Jerusalem Massacre of July 1099 in the Western Historiography of the Crusades', *Crusades*, 3 (2004), 15-75, which examines accounts of the First Crusaders' capture of Jerusalem in 1099 in chronological sequence, demonstrating how perceptions of that event transformed over time.

¹⁷ For introductory comments, see: Elisabeth van Houts, *Local and Regional Chronicles* (Turnhout, 1995), pp. 13-16; David Dumville, 'What is a Chronicle?', in Erik Kooper (ed), *The Medieval Chronicle II* (Amsterdam, 2002), pp. 1-27; Olivier Guyotjeannin, Jacques Pycke and Benoît-Michel Tock, *Diplomatique Médiévale*, 3rd Edn (Turnhout, 2006).

¹⁸ On the charters issued by Godfrey and his ancestors in their capacity as duke of Lower Lotharingia, see: Georges Despy, 'Les actes des ducs de Basse-Lotharingie du XI^e siècle', *PSHIGL*, 95 (1981), 65-132.

¹⁹ *Cantatorium*; Karl Hanquet, *Étude critique sur la chronique de St Hubert dite Cantatorium* (Brussels, 1900).

events, the St Hubert chronicler sided firmly with the papacy. St Hubert was situated close to Bouillon in the diocese of Liège, and its monks had close dealings with members of Godfrey's family. This text therefore contains a wealth of information about their careers. Godfrey and his predecessors acted as advocates for the abbey, and this undoubtedly had a bearing on how they were portrayed in the *Cantatorium*. It should be noted that it was not the principal purpose of this text to record information about members of the house of Ardennes-Bouillon. Its chief aim was to provide a written record of the various lands and properties that St Hubert acquired during the eleventh and early twelfth centuries, and information about Godfrey and his forebears was included only when doing so assisted that function. Other useful sources from Lotharingia include Anselm of Liège's mid eleventh-century account of ecclesiastical affairs in the diocese, a set of annals compiled at the monastery of St James in Liège, and the account of Sigebert of Gembloux which terminates in 1111, but which was written in stages down to that point, and contains very little about the period after 1099.²⁰

The book also draws from eleventh-century sources which originated further afield in the kingdom of Germany. Among these is the set of annals written at the Bavarian abbey of Niederaltaich (the *Annales Altahenses Miores* or *Annals of Niederaltaich*), which details events in the kingdom in the earlier part of the eleventh century.²¹ Lambert of Hersfeld's monumental account of events in the Empire in the late eleventh century offers a range of important insights on the exploits of Godfrey's ancestors and relatives.²² Lampert focussed his account on the struggles between the Salian kings of Germany (of whom he was a fierce critic), and those who rebelled against them, especially the Saxons (for whom he expressed support). Like Lampert, Bruno of Merseburg wrote an important account of the German

²⁰ Anselm of Liège, *Gesta Episcoporum Tungrensium, Trajectensium, et Leodiensium*, MGH SS, vol. 7, pp. 161-234; *Annales S. Iacobi Leodiensis*, MGH SS, vol. 16, pp. 635-45; Sigebert.

²¹ AAM.

²² Lampert. On Lampert's account, see the introduction to Robinson's translation.

crown's wars in Saxony.²³ This book also draws from the work of Berthold of Reichenau and Bernold of St Blasien, who wrote in the duchy of Swabia. Both these authors were staunch supporters of Gregory VII.²⁴ Also of use is the chronicle of Frutolf of Michelsberg.²⁵ Of particular use is the work of an author who wrote a continuation of Frutolf's account in about 1106. This continuation is a valuable source, providing a German perspective on the First Crusade and early phases of Latin settlement in the Holy Land.²⁶ To these will be added sources from Italy which shed light on the conflict between Henry IV and Gregory VII. The pope's own register is a particularly valuable repository of evidence.²⁷ Also of use are the writings of Gregory's partisan Bonizo of Sutri, the pro-Henry Benzo of Alba, and the account written at the abbey of Monte Cassino by Leo Marsicanus and his continuator.²⁸

Godfrey's career on the First Crusade is served in a wide array of evidence. Anna Komnene's account of her father Alexios Komnenos' reign as emperor of Byzantium provides important information.²⁹ Though Anna wrote later in the twelfth century, her work stands outside Latin Christian historiographical traditions, and so will be used here to illuminate the Byzantine perspective on the expedition. The present book rests above all on a range of Latin sources for the First Crusade. The letters written by the leaders of the crusade during the course of the expedition are particularly revealing, for they shed important light into their ideas at particular junctures while the expedition was in progress.³⁰ This book

²³ Bruno; David S. Bachrach and Bernard S. Bachrach, 'Bruno of Merseburg and his historical method, c.1085', *JMH*, 40 (2014), 381-98.

²⁴ Berthold I; Berthold II; Bernold.

²⁵ Frutolf.

²⁶ Frutolf 1106. This account has long been attributed to Ekkehard of Aura, but McCarthy in his recent translation of these texts convincingly refutes that attribution.

²⁷ Gregory VII, *Register*.

²⁸ Bonizo; Benzo; *CMC*.

²⁹ Anna. For Anna's writings, see: Penelope Buckley, *The Alexiad of Anna Komnene: Artistic Strategy in the Making of a Myth* (Cambridge, 2014), and on her treatment of the First Crusade, see: John France, 'Anna Comnena, the Alexiad and the First Crusade', *Reading Medieval Studies*, 10 (1983), 20-32.

³⁰ Several of these letters are edited in *DK* and translated in *LE*.

makes considerable use of the various Latin chronicles of the crusade.³¹ The most influential of these is the *Gesta Francorum*, which was probably written soon after the First Crusade ended in August 1099 by an individual who had been associated with Bohemond and his contingent of Normans from southern Italy.³² Although historians have sometimes regarded the *Gesta Francorum* as a narrative record of events witnessed by the author, studies have shown that it is more sophisticated than it might at first seem. It has been argued, for example, that the author of this account artificially skewed its narrative towards Bohemond, and that he deployed a number of techniques to denigrate Alexios and the Byzantines, from whom Bohemond had become estranged by the end of the crusade.³³

In the first years of the twelfth century three veterans of the First Crusade used the *Gesta Francorum* as a basis for their own chronicles of the expedition. As a result, there emerged an influential tradition of historical writing on the crusade centered upon this text. The Poiteven priest Peter Tudebode copied the *Gesta Francorum* almost verbatim, but altered certain passages and added a few snippets of information based on his own experiences.³⁴ Probably before about 1102, Raymond of Aguilers used the *Gesta Francorum* to write a substantially new account of the First Crusade.³⁵ He had been a canon of the cathedral church of St Mary in Le Puy, and became a chaplain of Raymond of Toulouse during the course of the crusade. This author provides a great deal of original information, particularly on relations between Raymond of Toulouse and the other leading figures of the crusade.

³¹ On these, see: Rudolf Hiestand, 'Il cronista medievale e il suo pubblico: alcune osservazioni in margine alla storiografia della crociate', *Annali della Facoltà di lettere e filosofia dell'Università di Napoli*, 27 (1984-5), 207-27; Susan B. Edgington, 'The First Crusade: Reviewing the Evidence', in *FCOI*, pp. 55-77; Jean Flori, *Chroniqueurs et propagandistes: introduction critique aux sources de la première croisade* (Geneva, 2010).

³² *GF*. On its provenance and influence, see, among others: Jay Rubenstein, 'What is the *Gesta Francorum* and who is Peter Tudebode?', *Revue Mabillon*, 16 (2005), 179-204, and John France, 'The Use of the Anonymous *Gesta Francorum* in the Early Twelfth-Century Sources for the First Crusade', in *FCTJ*, pp. 29-42.

³³ Relevant studies include Colin Morris, 'The *Gesta Francorum* as Narrative History', *Reading Medieval Studies*, 19 (1993), 55-71, and Kenneth B. Wolf, 'Crusade and Narrative: Bohemond and the *Gesta Francorum*', *JMH*, 17 (1991), 207-16.

³⁴ PT. The most recent examination of Tudebode's use of the *Gesta Francorum* is Marcus Bull, 'The relationship between the *Gesta Francorum* and Peter Tudebode's *Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere*: the evidence of a hitherto unexamined manuscript (St. Catharine's College, Cambridge, 3)', *Crusades*, 11 (2012), 1-17.

³⁵ RA.

Fulcher of Chartres was another author who used the *Gesta Francorum* early in the twelfth century to write his own account of the First Crusade.³⁶ Fulcher set out on the expedition in the company of Robert of Normandy and Stephen of Blois, but during the course of it he joined the contingent of Baldwin (Godfrey's younger brother) and became his chaplain. Fulcher remained in the Holy Land after the end of the crusade, and it was while he was resident in the Latin East that he began to write. He finished the first version of his account of the crusade in 1106, and it soon began to circulate in that form. This first version was used by an author who probably worked soon after in the West to compose a separate account of this expedition. This account, the *Gesta Francorum Iherusalem Expugnantium*, was attributed in the seventeenth century to an otherwise unknown author named Bartolf of Nangis. Though there is no evidence for that attribution, it will be convenient to refer to this source as the 'Bartolf' text as a shorthand.³⁷ Significantly, Fulcher later extended his account to cover the history of the Latin East down to 1127. He added to his account of the First Crusade (book I) treatments of the reigns of Baldwin I (book II) and Baldwin II (book III). The extant versions of Fulcher's account of the First Crusade likely reflect his later reworking, meaning his work poses difficulties to the diachronic approach being adopted in this book. It is important, then, to consider how Fulcher originally treated the First Crusade by yielded by cross-referencing his work with the 'Bartolf' text as far as possible.

By far the most crucial source for charting Godfrey's activities on the First Crusade and thereafter in Jerusalem is the voluminous account written by Albert of Aachen.³⁸ Working in Lower Lotharingia - not far from Godfrey's homelands - Albert wrote about the crusade from an imperial perspective. Significantly, then, Albert's account stands entirely apart from the tradition of near-contemporary historiography on the First Crusade centered

³⁶ FC.

³⁷ Bartolf. On the origin of this text and its relationship to Fulcher's account, see Susan B. Edgington, 'The *Gesta Francorum Iherusalem expugnantium* of "Bartolf of Nangis"', *Crusades*, 13 (2014), 21-35.

³⁸ AA; Susan B. Edgington, 'Albert of Aachen Reappraised', in *FCTJ*, pp. 55-68.

upon the *Gesta Francorum*. A reading of his account shows that he treated many aspects of the expedition in a way that differs to the viewpoint advanced in the sources of the *Gesta Francorum* tradition.³⁹ Moreover, Albert's account is considerably longer and more detailed than any sources of that tradition. It consists of twelve books, the first six of which cover the First Crusade. Edgington has argued that Albert completed these books soon after the events they describe.⁴⁰ To these books he added a further six (books 7 to 12) which cover the history of the Latin East down to 1119. Albert did not participate in the First Crusade or go to the Holy Land, and he seems to have drawn his information from oral reports provided by crusaders who had returned to Lotharingia. He was able to accumulate a wealth of unique material on Godfrey's exploits on the expedition and in Jerusalem.

The *Gesta Francorum* and the writings of Peter Tudebode and Raymond of Aguilers all cease immediately after the closing act of the First Crusade (the battle of Ascalon in August 1099). It is thus a smaller corpus of sources that detail Godfrey's tenure as ruler of Jerusalem. In terms of the chronicle accounts, relevant information is contained in the 'Bartolf' text, in the account of Fulcher of Chartres, and most fully, the work of Albert of Aachen. Also of use for Godfrey's tenure are a few contemporary and near-contemporary letters concerning events in the Holy Land, and a number of charters which describe actions undertaken by or involving Godfrey.⁴¹

³⁹ Colin Morris, 'The Aims and Spirituality of the First Crusade as seen through the eyes of Albert of Aachen', *Reading Medieval Studies*, 16 (1990), 99-117.

⁴⁰ AA, pp. xxiv-xxv.

⁴¹ *DULKJ*; Hans E. Mayer, *Die Kanzlei der lateinischen Königen von Jerusalem*, 2 vols in 4 (Hanover, 1996). As Mayer's monumental studies show, some of Godfrey's acts are known only from later reissues, while the authenticity of others is debatable. The present book draws only from the documents deemed authentic by Mayer. Also of use is RRR, an online calendar of documents produced in the Latin East, compiled under the direction of Jonathan Riley-Smith.