

Smith, Patrick  
2019 History Thesis

Title: Banners, Lances, and Crosses: The Battle Standards of the First  
Crusade and the Idea of Crusading:

Advisor: Eric Knibbs Knibbs

Advisor is Co-author: None of the above

Second Advisor:

Released: release now

Authenticated User Access:

Contains Copyrighted Material: No

**Banners, Lances, and Crosses:  
The Battle Standards of the First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading**

by

Patrick Richard Smith

Professor Eric Knibbs, Advisor

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the  
Degree of Bachelor of Arts with Honors  
in History

WILLIAMS COLLEGE

Williamstown, Massachusetts

April 15, 2019

## Table of Contents

Acknowledgements .....	<i>iv</i>
Introduction .....	1
Chapter One: Tarsus .....	20
Chapter Two: Antioch.....	40
Chapter Three: Jerusalem .....	72
Epilogue: Ascalon.....	97
Bibliography .....	105



## Acknowledgements

---

I would not have been interested in medieval history had I not taken a class my sophomore spring with Professor Eric Knibbs. I have learned so much from him over the past two years, and I thoroughly enjoyed all the time I spent with him as his student, teaching assistant, and thesis advisee. Even though he is no longer at Williams (and he is dearly missed), he has been gracious enough to continue to advise me and my fellow medieval thesis writers, Zeke Cohen and Ross Hoch. I appreciate the effort Professor Knibbs has put into helping me with this project, but above all else, I owe him a debt for introducing me to the fascinating world of the crusaders.

If I had not taken Professor Thomas Kohut's History 301 seminar my sophomore spring, I would not have been a history major. I grew up as a lover of history, but my interest in the subject dipped at the beginning of my college career. Professor Kohut's brilliant classes renewed and deepened my love of the subject. Like Professor Knibbs, Professor Kohut has had a profound influence on my life, and I cannot thank him enough for all of the lessons he has taught me.

Professor Siniawer and Professor Kapadia were fantastic resources for me once I began writing drafts of my thesis. Their input made me realize that I had taken a pretty deep dive into the subject matter and that I had to tailor my thesis so it could be read by people not as familiar with medieval history. I would also like to thank Professors Kapadia and Bernhardsson for reading my thesis. Many thanks to Linda Grandshaw for employing me as the History Department Xerox kid and for being understanding whenever deadlines interrupted my ability to work.

Thank you to my mother, father, twin sister and dog for not hounding me while I worked on my thesis during all the school breaks of senior year. I really appreciate their patience. Thank you to my grandfather, Richard Lanaghan, for being a history teacher and for imparting the passion of the subject onto me from an early age. And finally, thank you to Harmon Pardoe, my roommate and fellow thesis writer. He has always been a close confidant and I could not have made it through without his support.

## Introduction

---

In one of the most improbable yet successful military campaigns of all time, a ragtag bunch of knights, priests, and peasants left Europe in 1096 and captured the holy city of Jerusalem by 1099.<sup>1</sup> Speaking to the Council of Clermont in 1095, Pope Urban II implored the knights of France to take up arms against “the infidels” who had recently captured the lands of their “Christian brethren in the East.”<sup>2</sup> In return for their military service, Urban promised that each person who “took the cross” and embarked on the crusade would have their sins remitted.<sup>3</sup> The movement Pope Urban II spawned was akin to a rogue wave; religious fanaticism in Europe swelled seemingly overnight and thousands of soldiers joined the cause. After marshalling themselves into geographic factions with aristocratic leaders, the crusader armies left Christendom by the summer of 1096 to begin their journey to the East.<sup>4</sup>

The army of the First Crusade was led by scions of the most powerful families in Europe. Hugh of Vermandois, the brother of the King of France, had the most esteemed lineage of the leaders of the expedition. Perhaps in recognition of Hugh’s status, Urban II

---

<sup>1</sup> For a review of the chronology of the First Crusade, see Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade: A New History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005). For a protracted timeline of events, see Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986), 159-163. Also see Thomas Asbridge, “The Holy Lance of Antioch: Power, Devotion, and Memory on the First Crusade,” *Reading Medieval Studies* 33 (2007), 3 because he uses the phrase “rough conglomeration of pilgrim groups” to describe the crusaders.

<sup>2</sup> Fulcher of Chartres, ed. and trans. by Harold S. Fink and Frances Rita Ryan, *Fulcher of Chartres: Historia Hierosolymitana, A History of the Expedition to Jerusalem* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1973), I, ch. 2, p. 64.

<sup>3</sup> Fulcher of Chartres, I, ch. 3, p. 66. In this account of Urban’s oration, all crusaders are promised to have their sins remitted. The issue of Urban’s promise that the crusader’s sins would be remitted, known as an indulgence, is of interest to a number of secondary scholars. For more information on crusader indulgences, see Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, trans. by Marshall W. Baldwin and Walter Goffart (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977), 331-332, 343-344; James A. Brundage, “Adhémar of Puy: The Bishop and His Critics,” *Speculum: A Journal of Medieval Studies* XXXIV (1959), 104-105, 119-120; Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 67; and Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusade*, 27-30.

<sup>4</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 40-41.

bestowed upon him the banner of St. Peter – the symbol of papal support for the campaign.<sup>5</sup> Although Hugh bore the official battle standard of the campaign, he was neither its official leader nor its most powerful commander. The *de facto* leader of the First Crusade at its beginning was the lord of the vast domain of Provence, Count Raymond of Toulouse. The Provençal faction was strongly associated with the ecclesiastical leadership of the expedition because the pope’s representative, Bishop Adhemar of Le Puy, hailed from Raymond’s county. Technically speaking, Adhemar was the “first crusader” – upon Urban II’s declaration at Clermont, Adhemar immediately knelt down and pledged his service to Urban’s cause.<sup>6</sup> Having met with Urban II before his declaration at the Council of Clermont, Adhemar most likely knew about Urban’s crusading intentions and contributed to Urban’s ideas.<sup>7</sup> Simply put, Adhemar embodied the idea of crusade. Although he was a priest, he led a group of Raymond of Toulouse’s troops in battle with a banner depicting the Virgin Mary as his standard.<sup>8</sup>

While the Provençal leaders were well attuned to Urban II’s vision, the bellicose Norman princes were more motivated by their desire for territory and plunder. Italian-Norman lords were particularly notorious for their warlike nature, and their chronic state of conflict with the Byzantine Empire impeded the entire campaign’s ability to ally with

---

<sup>5</sup> Anna Komnene, *The Alexiad* ed. by Peter Frankopan and trans. by E.R.A Sewter (London: Penguin Classics, 2009), X, ch. 7, p. 280. See Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, trans. by Marshall W. Baldwin and Walter Goffart (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977), 342-3. Hugh of Vermandois was the brother of the French King, but he was also the first crusader to gather his army in Italy in preparation for the embarkation to the East. Therefore, Hugh’s was the first to cross the pope’s path, but it was neither the largest nor the most important army. As Erdmann papal banners would be granted in advance of crusading expeditions for the rest of the era.

<sup>6</sup> See Fulcher of Chartres, ch. 4, p. 67; James A. Brundage, “Adhémar of Puy: The Bishop and His Critics,” *Speculum: A Journal of Medieval Studies* XXXIV (1959), 203; Jay Rubenstein, *Armies of Heaven: The First Crusade and the Quest for the Apocalypse* (New York: Basic Books, 2011), 28-29; John France, *Victory in the East: A Military History of the First Crusade* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 45-46.

<sup>7</sup> James A. Brundage, “Adhémar of Puy: The Bishop and His Critics,” 209; John France, *Victory in the East*, 5. Urban also consulted Raymond before Clermont.

<sup>8</sup> Raymond d’Aguilers, *Raymond d’Aguilers: Historia Francorum Qui Ceperunt Iherusalem*, trans. by John Hugh Hill and Laurita L. Hill (Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1968), 33-34. The capture of Adhemar’s banner is an important episode in my second chapter.

their aforementioned “Christian brethren in the East.” Upon their march to Constantinople, Bohemond of Taranto (one of the most feared Norman warriors of his time) and Tancred de Hauteville (his nephew) engaged in a skirmish with an imperial detachment.<sup>9</sup>

The first army to establish camp outside the walls of Constantinople also clashed with Byzantine forces. Led by Duke Godfrey of Bouillon and his haughty nephew Baldwin of Boulogne, the German contingent clashed with the Byzantine army because they were denied access to food stalls and markets upon their arrival.<sup>10</sup> Godfrey negotiated a peace with Emperor Alexios Komnenos and arranged an imperial audience for the other crusader princes.<sup>11</sup> Viewing the crusade merely as Western European assistance in recovering imperial lands lost to the Turks, Emperor Alexios pressed each leader to swear an oath of vassalage to him.<sup>12</sup> No crusader prince vowed to become the Emperor’s vassal, but each individually hashed out an agreement with the Emperor;

---

<sup>9</sup> Albert of Aachen, *Albert of Aachen’s History of the Journey to Jerusalem vol. 1*, trans. by Susan B. Edgington (Farnham, England: Ashgate Publishing, 2013), II, ch. 15-16, p. 54-55; Anonymous, *Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum: The Deeds of the Franks and Other Pilgrims to Jerusalem*, trans. and ed. by Rosalind Hill (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1962), 8-9.

<sup>10</sup> Albert of Aachen, II, ch. 12-13, p. 51-52. Godfrey and Baldwin from Lorraine, but I refer to his faction as the “German faction” somewhat anachronistically in the third part of my thesis. However, he was one of the most powerful lords in the German Holy Roman Empire, and I believe the term “German” best describes the soldiers who actually followed Godfrey to the Holy Land. Some historians use the term “Lotharingian” as well.

<sup>11</sup> Albert of Aachen, II, ch. 14-16, p. 53-55.

<sup>12</sup> Anna Komnene, X, ch. 8-11, p. 285-296. Anna’s account gives the best overview of the oath-making process of each leader from the Byzantine perspective. See also Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 109-113; John France, *Victory in the East*, 110-117. The oaths sworn to Alexius are of interest to many crusader historians because there are many discrepancies among the chroniclers about the details of these oaths. Some princes are said to have agreed to be subjects of the Emperor, while other princes held they merely paid him homage. Raymond of Toulouse was particularly reluctant to negotiate with the Emperor, and Tancred de Hauteville entirely evaded any audience with him. The oaths are worthy of historical examination for their bearings on medieval feudal contracts, but my examination of them is quite limited. In Chapter 3, the oaths to Alexius figure in debates about how to divvy up conquered territory among the crusaders, but that is the only mention of them I will make in my entire thesis. For an extended discussion of the oaths, please see J.H. Pryor, “The oaths of the leaders of the First Crusade to Emperor Alexios I Comnenus,” *Parergon* no. 2 (1984), 111-141.

Godfrey promised restore any lands to the Emperor and even agreed to be his adoptive son, but the Provençals and Norman princes were more reluctant.<sup>13</sup>

The first major engagements of the First Crusade in the summer of 1097 – the Siege of Nicaea and the Battle of Dorylaeum – were fought in Anatolian territories only recently captured by the Turks. These lands were subsequently returned to their rightful Byzantine owners. But in the latter half of 1098, the crusader army ventured into southeastern Anatolia, which was even farther outside the sphere of Byzantine influence. Consequently, the crusader princes squabbled over minor Armenian Christian cities, such as Tarsus.<sup>14</sup>

In the fall of 1097, the entire crusader army approached Antioch – the first major city in the Levant. The Siege of Antioch, which lasted for eight months, would prove to be the veritable climax of the First Crusade. The size of the army gradually yet severely plummeted as the soldiers endured famine and harassment from the defenders. The crusaders gained entrance into the city walls through the aid of a defector in June of 1098, but the next day, a massive Turkish relief army arrived outside the walls. The crusaders narrowly escaped certain death, but without any provisions inside Antioch nor any prospect of reinforcements, the situation seemed dire. At this juncture, the Provençal leaders of the First Crusade devised a ruse to revive the spirits of their disconsolate

---

<sup>13</sup> Anna Komnene, X, ch. 8-11, p. 285-296; Albert of Aachen, II, ch. 14-16, p. 53-54; Anonymous, *Gesta Francorum*, p. 12-13; Raymond d'Aguilers, p. 23-24; J.H. Pryor, "The oaths of the leaders of the First Crusade to Emperor Alexios I Comnenus," *Parergon* no. 2 (1984), 114. According to the *Gesta*, every crusader except Tancred reached a deal with the Emperor, for Tancred simply sailed across the Bosphorus and entirely evaded an imperial audience. According to Pryor, no crusader prince became the Emperor's vassal – this would have been inconceivable given that each crusader prince was either an outright independent lord, a vassal of the French King, or a vassal of the Holy Roman Emperor.

<sup>14</sup> This whole paragraph is based off of John France, *Victory in the East: A Military History of the First Crusade* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 189-196; Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade: A New History* (Oxford University Press, Oxford: 2005), 140-149. For the shortest synopsis of the crusader's movements in Anatolia, see Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986), 58-59.

soldiers. Discovering an object purported to be the Holy Lance that pierced Jesus' side, the Provençals lifted the hopes of all the crusaders and led the army in a successful last-ditched battle against their besiegers.<sup>15</sup>

For a brief moment, the Holy Lance of Antioch was widely celebrated and revered, but because the Provençals were its patrons, the jealous Norman crusaders worked to undermine its authenticity. The Normans goaded Peter Bartholomew, the lowly Provençal priest who “discovered” the relic, to a fatal ordeal by fire.<sup>16</sup> Afterward, the foremost Norman priest on the expedition, Arnulf of Chocques, invented a new Christian relic to serve as the army's battle standard for their march to Jerusalem.<sup>17</sup> Compared to the Siege of Antioch, the Siege of Jerusalem was relatively painless, and the crusaders entered the Holy City in July of 1099. Once inside the Holy Sepulchre of Jerusalem – the *sanctum sanctorum* of the Christian spiritual world – Arnulf “discovered” yet another Christian relic.<sup>18</sup> Known as the “True Cross,” this relic was used as the battle standard for the army of the Kingdom of Jerusalem – the political entity founded after the crusaders' conquest of the region.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> *Gesta Francorum*, 68; Raymond d'Aguilers, 58; Robert the Monk, *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade* trans. by Carol Sweetenham (Farnham, England: Ashgate Publishing, 2005), 57; Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 225; Marius Kjømo, *The Holy Lance of Antioch: A Study on the Impact of a Perceived Relic during the First Crusade*, Master's Thesis, (University of Bergen, Spring 2009), 66; Thomas Asbridge, “The Holy Lance of Antioch: Power, Devotion, and Memory on the First Crusade,” *Reading Medieval Studies* 33 (2007), 4.

<sup>16</sup> Raymond d'Aguilers, 100-103; Fulcher of Chartres, ch. 18, pp. 100-101; Ralph of Caen, *The Gesta Tancredi of Ralph of Caen: A History of the Normans on the First Crusade* trans. by Bernard S. Bachrach and David S. Bachrach, (Farnham, England: Ashgate Publishing, 2005), ch. 108, p. 126; Albert of Aachen, *Albert of Aachen's History of the Journey to Jerusalem vol. 1*, trans. by Susan B. Edgington (Farnham, England: Ashgate Publishing, 2013), V, ch. 32, p. 196-197.

<sup>17</sup> Ralph of Caen, ch. 110, p. 127.

<sup>18</sup> Albert of Aachen, VI, ch. 38, p. 233-234; Raymond d'Aguilers, 131; Fulcher of Chartres, ch. 30, pp. 124-125. The True Cross is called “the Rood of Salvation” by Albert.

<sup>19</sup> Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading*, 98.

### The Idea of Crusading

Not even fifty years before the crusaders' triumph in Jerusalem, a papally-ordained military expedition would have been an unfathomable affair. Murder was considered an irredeemable sin well into the eleventh century and the Church made concerted efforts to curb internecine violence within Christendom at this time.<sup>20</sup> To justify the idea of crusading, the Church needed to furnish a theological explanation for divinely-ordained violence. Most scholars of the First Crusade point to St. Augustine's doctrine of "just war" as the theological germ of the expedition.<sup>21</sup> Writing in the 5th century, St. Augustine made the earliest theological attempt to reconcile Christian morals with the violence endemic in post-Roman Europe. However, Augustinian "just war" only is limited to one scenario – defensive warfare – and the doctrine concerned only those with the power to declare war. Under the framework of "just war," soldiers who killed people in battle were not necessarily absolved of their sins. As a "holy war," the First Crusade was theologically divorced from the idea of "just war" because the individual participant in "holy war" was redeemed by God for fighting on behalf of the Christian cause.<sup>22</sup>

Scholars in the latter-half of the twentieth century have determined that "holy war" was given a robust theological basis only *after* the First Crusade when Christian

---

<sup>20</sup> H.E.J. Cowdrey, "The Genesis of the Crusades: The Springs of Western Ideas of Holy War," *The Holy War: The Conference on Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 5th, Ohio State University, 1974*, ed. by Thomas Patrick Murphy (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1976) 17; Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusading*, 59-60.

<sup>21</sup> Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, 8; Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 24; H.E.J. Cowdrey, "The Genesis of the Crusades," 18.

<sup>22</sup> This entire paragraph on "just war" and "holy war" is based off of Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, 8 and 31; Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 24 ; H.E.J. Cowdrey, "The Genesis of the Crusades," 18. Also see James A. Brundage, "Holy War and Medieval Lawyers," *The Holy War: The Conference on Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 5th, Ohio State University, 1974*, ed. by Thomas Patrick Murphy (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1976), 102.

theologians and canon lawyers wrote about the expedition retrospectively.<sup>23</sup> The chronicles of the First Crusade, released shortly after its completion, relay the development of the idea of crusading.<sup>24</sup> These accounts tracked the differences between Urban's concept of crusade and the actual experience of the First Crusade, which was both traumatic and euphoric for its participants.<sup>25</sup>

However, recent scholars err in prioritizing Christian theology in describing the origin of the idea of crusade.<sup>26</sup> The reform papacy of the late 11th century worked hard to articulate theology in terms that the knighthood of Christendom could comprehend, but as professional warriors, knights were wont to shed blood regardless of the Church's condemnation of violence.<sup>27</sup> Furthermore, eminent scholars such as Jonathan Riley-Smith fail to adequately recognize that the Church's acceptance of warfare, the *sine qua non* of the idea of crusade, was a process that began long before the First Crusade.<sup>28</sup> In his seminal work from the 1930s, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusading*, Carl Erdmann emphasizes reforms in the turn-of-the-first-millennium Church and pre-crusader Christian battle standards.

The first Christian war banner in history dates from the Battle of Milvian Bridge in 312. Invoking the aid of the Christian God against his rival, Emperor Constantine

---

<sup>23</sup> Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading*, 2, 154; James A. Brundage, "Holy War and Medieval Lawyers," 123-125.

<sup>24</sup> Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading*, 2.

<sup>25</sup> Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading*, 2.

<sup>26</sup> See John Gilchrist, "The Erdmann Thesis and the Canon Law," *Crusade and Settlement: Papers read at the First Conference of the Society for the Study of the Crusades and the Latin East and presented to R.C. Smail*, ed. by Peter W. Edbury (Cardiff: University College Cardiff Press, 1985), 38. Gilchrist claims that Erdmann also errs in giving emphasis on Anselm of Lucca's theological contributions to crusading.

<sup>27</sup> John Gilchrist, "The Erdmann Thesis and the Canon Law," 38. On theologians' efforts to incorporate European warrior culture with religion, see Robert W. Jones, *Bloodied Banners: Martial Display on the Medieval Battlefield* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2010), 147.

<sup>28</sup> H.E.J. Cowdrey, "The Genesis of the Crusades," 17.

“admitted a symbol understood as a monogram of Christ among the battle standards of his army.”<sup>29</sup> Constantine’s conversion before this battle serves as a turning point in early Christian history not only because it popularized Christianity, but also because it forged a connection between the religion and secular power. Shortly after his victory, Constantine legalized Christianity throughout the Roman Empire. Because the Battle of Milvian Bridge legitimized Christianity in Rome, warfare would not have necessarily been taboo to early Christians. However, Constantine's Christian standard was not a symbol of holy war. It was not until the relationship between ecclesiastical and secular power in Europe shifted during the eleventh century that battle standards came to embody holy war.<sup>30</sup>

Around the year 1000, the popes instituted a series of reforms known as the “Peace of God” and the “Truce of God,” which regulated violence among feudal lords and banned aggression toward clergymen altogether.<sup>31</sup> While these reforms were inherently peaceful, they marked the beginning of papal intervention in secular affairs. Assuming the “mediatory role of the state,” the eleventh-century Church filled the void left by the waning Carolingian Empire.<sup>32</sup> In southern and central Italy, the popes directly administered territory like any other temporal lord of the era.

Royal governments were traditionally obligated to protect Church property and clergy, but with the absence of the Carolingians in the eleventh century, there was no united royal power to perform this duty throughout Christendom.<sup>33</sup> Needing to find

---

<sup>29</sup> On Constantine’s banner at Milvian Bridge, see Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, 5-6, 35-38.

<sup>30</sup> Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, 41-42.

<sup>31</sup> Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, 59-60.

<sup>32</sup> Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, 57, 59.

<sup>33</sup> Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, 59.

immediate support, the Christian clergy turned to the lords and knights in their vicinity.<sup>34</sup> This ecclesiastical outreach gave rise to the institution of advocacy, wherein professional warriors pledged to protect monasteries and parishes, making them “advocates” of a specific diocese.<sup>35</sup> Advocates did not have to remain idle if there were no conflicts in the region. In the early eleventh century, French knights who fought against the Moors in Spain pledged their earnings to the monastery of Cluny.<sup>36</sup> Thus, the knighthood’s pledge of service to the clergy was not limited to local wars – this pledge was extended even to war against “the infidel.” The creation of the “Christian knighthood” essentially formed a social contract between feudal and ecclesiastical society.<sup>37</sup>

Surveying the relationship between Church and State in Western Europe around the year 1050, Brian Tierney posits that the medieval Church’s theological justification for meddling in secular affairs derived from the “slender basis of one piece of Scripture.”<sup>38</sup> Located in the Gospel of Luke, this passage occurs during the Last Supper as Jesus addresses his disciples:

[Jesus] said to them, “When I sent you forth without a money bag or a sack or sandals, were you in need of anything?”  
 “No, nothing,” they replied.

He said to them “But now one who has a money bag should take it, and likewise a sack, and one who does not have a sword should sell his cloak and buy one.”

“For I tell you that this scripture must be fulfilled in me, namely, ‘He was counted among the wicked;’ and indeed what is written about me is coming to fulfillment.”

---

<sup>34</sup> H.E.J. Cowdrey, “The Genesis of the Crusades,” 15; Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, 57-58.

<sup>35</sup> Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, 59.

<sup>36</sup> Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, 68.

<sup>37</sup> Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, 57-58; H.E.J. Cowdrey, “The Genesis of the Crusades,” p. 21

<sup>38</sup> Brian Tierney, *The Crisis of Church and State 1050-1300* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988), 8. Tierney’s book provides an excellent overview of the struggle between the papacy and the Holy Roman Empire before the First Crusade.

They said, “Lord, look, there are two swords here.” But he replied,  
 “It is enough!”<sup>39</sup>

During the Last Supper, Jesus knew that his betrayal by Judas Iscariot was imminent and that it was up to the remaining apostles to defend the Christian faith. Jesus called upon the apostles to purchase a sword for this task, but the apostles already possessed “two swords.” This detail seems insignificant, but the “two swords” were commonly regarded in the eleventh century as symbols for spiritual and secular power.<sup>40</sup>

Wielding the “two swords” like no other, Pope Gregory VII transformed the Church’s attitude towards warfare almost single-handedly. Gregory VII was elected in 1073, but as one of the most outspoken cardinals beforehand, he actively promoted military engagements inside and outside of Europe. The Norman Conquest of England in 1066 is perhaps the most famous example of a military affair that Gregory VII convinced the papacy to champion. William the Conqueror aimed to press his claim to the English throne, but he was hesitant to do so without papal support. Gregory VII, then known as Archdeacon Hildebrand, was instrumental in advocating on behalf of William’s venture in Rome.<sup>41</sup> Successfully convincing the pope to support the Norman cause, Gregory VII arranged for the papal banner, known as the banner of St. Peter, to be delivered to William.<sup>42</sup> Serving as the symbol of papal support, the banner of St. Peter was immortalized in the famous Bayeux Tapestry, which depicts the history of William the

---

<sup>39</sup> Luke 22:35-38, as cited by Brian Tierney, *The Crisis of Church and State 1050-1300*, 8.

<sup>40</sup> Brian Tierney, *The Crisis of Church and State 1050-1300*, 8.

<sup>41</sup> Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, 154

<sup>42</sup> Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, 154.

Conqueror's invasion.<sup>43</sup> As an ecclesiastical symbol borne by a temporal ruler, the banner of St. Peter was the ideological embodiment of the "two swords."

Once he became pope, Gregory VII brazenly instigated a row with the Holy Roman Emperor Henry IV.<sup>44</sup> Originating in the 1070s, the controversy between the papacy and the empire endured even after the First Crusade ended in 1099. Known as the "Investiture Controversy," the row pertained to the right of monarchs to nominate candidates for ecclesiastical offices in their domains. Cardinals in Rome debated the validity of this process, known as "investiture," starting in the 1050s, but Gregory VII banned lay investiture all together in 1075.<sup>45</sup> Gregory VII demanded that Henry IV respect his decision, citing the fact that all Christians, including monarchs, should submit to the will of the pope.<sup>46</sup> Henry IV responded to this letter by refusing to recognize Gregory VII as the lawful pope.<sup>47</sup> Promptly excommunicating the heretical emperor, Gregory VII asserted that "he may depose emperors" and that "he alone may use the

---

<sup>43</sup> Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, 197-199. Erdmann asserts that we cannot be sure if the banner of St. Peter was depicted in the Bayeux Tapestry, but it seems apparent that a banner bearing a cross on it appears twice in the tapestry – once is carried into the Battle of Hastings and one is flown atop the mast of William's ship. For more details on William's flag, see W.G. Perrin, *British Flags: Their Early History, and Their Development at Sea; With an Account of the Origin of the Flag as a National Device* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1922), 13-15. Perrin claims that William bore the papal banner at Hastings. As Admiralty Librarian for the British Navy, Perrin's focus is primarily on the use of the modern British flag, but he provides an excellent overview of the history of flags since antiquity. On p. 2-3, Perrin also writes that Norman flags were called *gonfanons*, which had a square body with three long tails. The Norman flags on the First Crusade would have been *gonfanons*, according to Perrin on p. 18.

<sup>44</sup> For an overview of the controversy between Gregory and Henry, see Brian Tierney, *The Crisis of Church and State 1050-1300*, 53-73.

<sup>45</sup> Brian Tierney, *The Crisis of Church and State 1050-1300*, 36, 53, 57

<sup>46</sup> Pope Gregory VII, "Letter to King Henry IV, Admonishing Him to Show More Deference to the Holy See and Its Decrees (December 8, 1075)," *The Correspondence of Pope Gregory VII* trans. by Ephraim Emerton (New York: Columbia University Press, 1932), 86-90. This letter is cited by Brian Tierney, *The Crisis of Church and State 1050-1300*, 57-59.

<sup>47</sup> Emperor Henry IV, "Henry charges Hildebrand with having stolen his hereditary privileges in Rome, striven to alienate Italy (1076)," *Imperial Lives and Letters of the Eleventh Century* trans. by T.E. Mommsen and K.F. Morrison (New York: Columbia University Press, 1962), 146-147. This letter is cited by Brian Tierney, *The Crisis of Church and State 1050-1300*, 59-60.

imperial insignia.”<sup>48</sup> Feuding with Henry IV for the next few years, Gregory VII made the habit of granting the banner of St. Peter to his partisans, who swore in their oaths to the pope that they would fight the emperor on his behalf.<sup>49</sup>

In one of his earlier letters to Henry IV, Gregory VII proposed sending troops to aid the Byzantine Empire and the Eastern Church in reclaiming its territory after the invasion of the Seljuk Turks.<sup>50</sup> Although he claimed that this expedition would culminate in the reconquest of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem, Gregory VII conceived of it as more of an effort to aid the Byzantines rather than an opportunity for individual knights to conduct a pilgrimage to the Holy Land.<sup>51</sup> Thus, Gregory VII was the first person to articulate the idea of crusade, but his plan never materialized during his lifetime.<sup>52</sup>

By asserting his sovereignty over spiritual and secular affairs, Gregory VII brought the concept of holy war to the fore during his career. The war he sponsored, the Norman Conquest, had its physical and factual expression in the banner of St. Peter. Gregory VII granted the same banner to his supporters during the Investiture Controversy, and perhaps he would have bestowed the banner to his crusaders. As previously mentioned, Pope Urban II granted the banner of St. Peter to Hugh of

---

<sup>48</sup> Pope Gregory VII, “The Dictatus Papae (March 1075),” *Church and State Through the Centuries* trans. and ed. by S.Z. Ehler and J.B. Morrall (London: Burns & Oates, 1954), p. 43-44. This letter is cited by Brian Tierney, *The Crisis of Church and State 1050-1300*, p. 49-50. Among these decrees, Gregory VII inserted a clause stating that “The Roman Church has never erred, nor ever, by the witness of the Scripture, shall err to all eternity.”

<sup>49</sup> Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, 191. Robert Guiscard was one of these men who swore an oath to fight Henry IV.

<sup>50</sup> Pope Gregory VII, “Letter to Henry IV, Setting Forth Gregory’s Plan for a Crusade (December 7, 1074),” *The Correspondence of Pope Gregory VII* trans. by Ephraim Emerton (New York: Columbia University Press, 1932), 56-58. Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, 168.

<sup>51</sup> Pope Gregory VII, “Letter to Henry IV, Setting Forth Gregory’s Plan for a Crusade (December 7, 1074),” *The Correspondence of Pope Gregory VII* trans. by Ephraim Emerton (New York: Columbia University Press, 1932), 56-58. Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, 168.

<sup>52</sup> Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusading*, 166-168.

Vermandois at the outset of the First Crusade.<sup>53</sup> Previous scholars have interpreted this banner bestowal to be a symbolic yet inert gesture.<sup>54</sup> Indeed, the papal banner represented the concepts of holy war and the “two swords,” but it played no consequential role during the campaign.

The connection between the papal banner and the idea of crusade, first established by Carl Erdmann, forms the germ of my inquiry into the use of battle standards through the First Crusade. In his conclusion to *The Origin of the Idea of Crusading*, Carl Erdmann claims, “Banners did not have a prominent role during the crusades, since they did not affect the position and fortune of those who bore them. Western chroniclers say nothing of them.”<sup>55</sup> This erroneous claim has not been thoroughly investigated nor refuted by other scholars. Unsurprisingly, banners represented an individual faction’s territorial claims throughout the medieval era. But during the First Crusade, banners also depicted universal Christian symbols, such as the Cross. A crusader contingent’s banner was uniquely identifiable, but they also bore signs of the religion that united them. As both profane and pious symbols, crusader banners were cut from the same cloth as the banner of St. Peter.

### Sources

The First Crusade is one of the most heavily documented events from the High Middle Ages. The papal banner is not mentioned by the primary chroniclers, but

---

<sup>53</sup> Anna Komnene, *The Alexiad* ed. by Peter Frankopan and trans. by E.R.A Sewter (London: Penguin Classics, 2009), X, ch. 7, p. 280; Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, 342. Anna is the only source for this detail, and she is wrong that Hugh of Vermandois was the leader of the army.

<sup>54</sup> Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, 342-3. According to Erdmann: “banners didn’t matter on the First Crusade.”

<sup>55</sup> Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, 342-343.

crusader banners played prominent, but hitherto unexamined roles in their narratives.<sup>56</sup> Some chroniclers were direct eyewitnesses who wrote from the perspective of their own crusader faction, but other chroniclers simply rewrote earlier accounts in their own words. For example, the Provençal chronicler Raymond d'Aguilers was an eyewitness to the discovery of the Holy Lance of Antioch, and he even claimed to carry the relic into battle.<sup>57</sup> The anonymous author of the *Gesta Francorum* and the French chaplain Fulcher of Chartres were also participants on the First Crusade.<sup>58</sup> Neither the Norman chronicler, Ralph of Caen, nor the German chronicler, Albert of Aachen, travelled to the Holy Land to witness the campaign, but each writer had close relationships with aristocrats and veterans who played prominent roles on the crusade.<sup>59</sup> Anna Komnene, the daughter of the Byzantine Emperor and one of the earliest female historians, was a teenager when the crusaders passed through Constantinople, and recorded her chronicle of the expedition from personal and secondhand knowledge while confined in a nunnery.<sup>60</sup>

For chronological reasons, I omit a number of chronicles of the campaign. For example, William of Tyre's *Historia Ierosolymitana* was one of the most widely read and

---

<sup>56</sup> Anna Komnene, *The Alexiad* ed. by Peter Frankopan and trans. by E.R.A Sewter (London: Penguin Classics, 2009), X, ch. 7, p. 280. Anna Komnene is the only source who says that Hugh of Vermandois carried the papal banner, but she wrongly claims that Hugh was the leader of the crusade at this juncture. The chroniclers who would have been personally seen or used banners in battle, and Anna was not among them, did not mention the papal banner.

<sup>57</sup> Raymond d'Aguilers, *Raymond d'Aguilers: Historia Francorum Qui Ceperunt Iherusalem*, trans. by John Hugh Hill and Laurita L. Hill (Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1968), 57, 63.

<sup>58</sup> Rosalind Hill, "Introduction" to *Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum* by Anonymous, trans. and ed. by Rosalind Hill (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd, 1962), pp. xi-xvi; Jay Rubenstein, "What is the *Gesta Francorum* and who was Peter Tudebode?" *Revue Mabillon* 16 (Paris 2005), 179-204; Harold S. Fink, "Introduction" to *Fulcher of Chartres: Historia Hierosolymitana, A History of the Expedition to Jerusalem* by Fulcher of Chartres, ed. and trans. by Harold S. Fink and Frances Rita Ryan, (New York, 1973), 3-24.

<sup>59</sup> Bernard S. Bachrach and David S. Bachrach, "Introduction" to *The Gesta Tancredi of Ralph of Caen: A History of the Normans on the First Crusade* by Ralph of Caen, trans. by Bernard S. Bachrach and David S. Bachrach, (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing, 2005), 1-5; Susan B. Edgington, "Introduction" to *Albert of Aachen's History of the Journey to Jerusalem*, by Albert of Aachen, trans. by Susan B. Edgington (Farnham, England: Ashgate Publishing, 2013), 1-5.

<sup>60</sup> Peter Frankopan, "Introduction" to *The Alexiad*, by Anna Komnene, ed. by Peter Frankopan and trans. by E.R.A Sewter (London: Penguin Classics, 2009), p. ix-xv. According to Frankopan, *The Alexiad* is the earliest historical work written by a female.

reproduced accounts of the crusades in the Middle Ages, but he lived in the mid-twelfth century and was not a contemporary chronicler.<sup>61</sup> Except for a passing reference here and there, I largely omit the Muslim chronicles of the First Crusade, such as Ibn al-Athir's chronicle and Ibn al-Qalanisi's "Damascus Chronicle," because they were written well into the twelfth century as well.<sup>62</sup> Moreover, the accounts of the aforementioned Muslim chronicles for the years 1095-1099 are exceedingly brief, and they omit any mention of crusader battle standards. In order to assiduously study the battle standards of the expedition between 1095 and 1099, I selected chronicles whose authors were alive in the given time period because they would have had the best (if not firsthand) knowledge of these objects.<sup>63</sup>

The primary chroniclers of the First Crusade I have selected modulated their accounts according to their factional allegiances. For example, Raymond d'Aguilers and Ralph of Caen's accounts of the discovery of the Holy Lance of Antioch are almost entirely incompatible because the relic was the touchstone of tension between their respective Provençal and Norman contingents. Raymond d'Aguilers was a close associate of the Provençal leadership, whereas Ralph of Caen was a student of the aforementioned Norman priest Arnulf of Chocques.<sup>64</sup> According to most secondary scholars, the

---

<sup>61</sup> See Peter W. Edbury and John Gordon Rowe, *William of Tyre: History of the Latin East* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 1-5. This is not a translation of William's chronicle, but rather a work of secondary scholarship examining the work's impact and contents.

<sup>62</sup> D.S. Richards, "Introduction" to *The Chronicle of Ibn al-Athir for the Crusading Period from al-Kamil fi'l-ta'rikh Part I* by Ibn al-Athir, trans. by D.S. Richards (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing, 2005), 1-7; H.A.R. Gibb, "Introduction" to *The Damascus Chronicle of the Crusades: Extracted and Translated from the Chronicle of Ibn al-Qalanisi*, trans. And ed. By H.A.R. Gibb (London: Luzac & Co, 1932), 7-14.

<sup>63</sup> Ibn al-Qalanisi was alive during the First Crusade, but he provides very, very few details on 1095-1099 – it is not even ten pages long in H.A.R. Gibb's edition! His narrative is much more useful if one is interested in the period after 1099, when the crusader states were being founded. Furthermore, al-Qalanisi was in Damascus during the campaign, so he would not have seen a crusader battle standard for himself. Moreover, he doesn't mention them.

<sup>64</sup> Bernard S. Bachrach and David S. Bachrach, "Introduction" to *The Gesta Tancredi of Ralph of Caen: A History of the Normans on the First Crusade* by Ralph of Caen, trans. by Bernard S. Bachrach and David S. Bachrach, (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing, 2005), 1.

anonymous *Gesta* author shifted his allegiances in the middle of the campaign, giving the reader a firsthand glimpse of both the Norman and Provençal blocs.<sup>65</sup>

In recording the battles of Tarsus, Antioch, and Jerusalem, the chroniclers were gripped by the factional tensions that afflicted the crusader army. My exegesis of the chroniclers' narratives is that battle standards were central elements in stirring controversy among the crusaders during these engagements. Therefore, I decided to structure my thesis around these three battles.

### Chapter Overview

In my first chapter, I survey how crusader banners became a means through which competing factions recognized their common spiritual ties. The study of crusader banners tracks the growing pains of holy war, especially at the beginning of the crusade. The first time the chroniclers' reveal this interaction occurs in their accounts of the Battle of Tarsus, which happened only one year into the expedition.

However, banners were not the only objects that embodied the duality of the “two swords” on the First Crusade. In this era, relic cults blossomed throughout Europe.<sup>66</sup> As the popes made their first interventions in secular affairs around the year 1000, Christian relics emerged as dynamic objects with temporal purposes.<sup>67</sup> In France and Northern

---

<sup>65</sup> Rosalind Hill, “Introduction” to *Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum* by Anonymous, trans. and ed. by Rosalind Hill (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd, 1962), xxxvi; Jay Rubenstein, “What is the *Gesta Francorum* and who was Peter Tudebode?” *Revue Mabillon* 16 (Paris 2005), 184-187. Rubenstein questions whether the *Gesta* author switched sides at all, and this is a valid concern. But the *Gesta* provides a firsthand, (or at least a described with secondhand knowledge that was passed off as firsthand), account of the march to Jerusalem, which his first lord Bohemond did not participate in. Perhaps this was a second author who filled in these details.

<sup>66</sup> On relic culture in eleventh-century Europe, see Jonathan Sumption, *Pilgrimage: An Image of the Mediaeval Religion* (Totowa N.J.: Rowman and Littlefield, 1975) 22-40; Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, 75. Sumption is not only a historian, but also a member of the British Supreme Court. His epic four-volume history of the Hundred Years' War is a fascinating read that was the subject of a tutorial I took with Professor Knibbs and my roommate and fellow thesis writer, Harmon Pardoe, in Fall 2018.

<sup>67</sup> Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, 43-44

Italy, members of the clergy personally led armies into battle with crosses.<sup>68</sup> Rather than being relegated to the reliquary, objects such as the Holy Lance of Vienna were carried by the Holy Roman Emperors as a standard for battle.<sup>69</sup>

In the medieval era, it was not infrequent for multiple versions of the same relic to exist simultaneously. At the beginning of the First Crusade, there were actually *two* Holy Lances in Christendom – one in the Holy Roman Empire and one in Constantinople. The Lance of Constantinople had a particularly storied lineage: St. Helena was said to have brought it from Jerusalem in the year 614.<sup>70</sup> Unsurprisingly, the discovery of another Holy Lance in the city of Antioch in the middle of the First Crusade was quite dubious to a number of contemporaries.<sup>71</sup> The Holy Lance of Antioch was *not* genuinely the lance that pierced Jesus' side, but as I argue in Chapter 2, this relic was physically fabricated by the leaders of the First Crusade to serve as an inspirational battle standard for the despondent crusader army.

However, banners and relics were not yet united iconographically in the beginning of the First Crusade.<sup>72</sup> Bearing a noble family's crest or colors, a crusader banner was an inherently elite battle standard. On the other hand, relics represented the religiosity of the masses. Indeed, the hierarchical aims of the First Crusade were territorial and political in nature, while the popular purpose of the crusade was to conduct

---

<sup>68</sup> Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, 44.

<sup>69</sup> Laura Hibbard Loomis, "The Holy Relics of Charlemagne and King Athelstan: The Lances of Longinus and St. Maurice," *Speculum* 54, no. 4 (October, 1950), pp. 437-456; Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, 44.

<sup>70</sup> Steven Runciman, "The Holy Lance Found At Antioch," *Analecta Bollandiana* 68 (1950): 200.

<sup>71</sup> On the tradition of false relics, see Jonathan Sumption, *Pilgrimage: An Image of the Mediaeval Religion* (Totowa N.J.: Rowman and Littlefield, 1975), 35-40, 43-44. On page 43, Sumption describes the Holy Lance of Antioch in particular.

<sup>72</sup> Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, 43. Erdmann says that banners and relics "were two spheres that began to be united around the year 1000," but there is a clear distinction between them on the First Crusade.

an “armed pilgrimage” to Jerusalem.<sup>73</sup> The famous German historian Leopold von Ranke was the first person to distinguish the hierarchical crusade from the popular crusade, but Carl Erdmann designated them with pithy labels: *Kriegsziel* and *Marschziel*.<sup>74</sup>

According to E.O. Blake, Urban connected the *Kriegsziel* with the *Marschziel* by granting an indulgence to the crusaders, and as the campaign progressed, the two movements became indistinguishable.<sup>75</sup> I believe the convergence between the *Kriegsziel* and the *Marschziel* is most perceptible in studying the material culture and symbols of the First Crusade. At the beginning of the First Crusade, the elites of the expedition directed the army’s zealous energy to attain the strategic objectives outlined by the papacy and the Byzantine Empire. But when the army became imperiled during the Battle of Antioch, the leaders of the First Crusade were powerless and their negotiations with the besieging Turkish army failed. The religious fervor unleashed after the discovery of the Holy Lance of Antioch saved the campaign, but this spiritual passion disrupted the *status quo* of the crusader hierarchy. The crusader elites could no longer rely upon their secular prestige in order to command authority on the campaign; rather, they deferred to the common crusader. In my third chapter, I survey how the leaders of the campaign appealed to the religious fanaticism of ordinary soldiers by bearing Christian relics alongside their family

---

<sup>73</sup> Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, xxxv; Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 20-21; Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading*, 21-24; E.O. Blake, “The Formation of the ‘Crusade Idea,’” *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* vol. 21 no. 1 (January, 1970), 11-31, as cited in Marshall W. Baldwin, “Introduction” to *The Origin of the Idea of Crusading* by Carl Erdmann, xxix-xxx. I only had access to the abstract of E.O. Blake’s article, but Marshall W. Baldwin provides a synopsis of his argument:

<sup>74</sup> Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusading*, xxxv, 269, 332. Erdmann cites Leopold von Ranke, *Weltgeschichte*, 8, p. 71. Erdmann uses the terms *Kriegsziel* and *Marschziel* on p. 332. *Kriegsziel* translates to “war aim,” while *Marschziel* translates to “march aim.”

<sup>75</sup> E.O. Blake, “The Formation of the ‘Crusade Idea,’” *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* vol. 21 no. 1 (January, 1970), 11-31, as cited in Marshall W. Baldwin, “Introduction” to *The Origin of the Idea of Crusading* by Carl Erdmann, xxix-xxx. Again, I only had access to Blake’s abstract for whatever reason, but I got more details from this introduction of Erdmann’s.

banners. In essence, the merger between the *Kriegsziel* and *Marschziel* was manifest in the crusaders' use of banner and relics as battle standards.

Banners were secular symbols adorned with spiritual imagery, while relics were religious totems used for temporal purposes. Originating in separate contexts, banners and relics combined to embody the “two swords” duality that underpinned holy war. Carl Erdmann notes that “relics and battle standards were two spheres that began to unite circa 1000 AD,” but he fails to analyze this relationship during the First Crusade.<sup>76</sup> Robert W. Jones is the another scholar who combines war banners to holy relics in discussing crusader battle standards, stating that both symbols were used before battle to improve morale because both Christian banners and relics symbolized Christ's support of their cause.<sup>77</sup>

However, the crusaders' relationship to their battle standards underwent drastic changes over the course of the First Crusade.<sup>78</sup> As battles were lost and won, banners were plundered and rewoven. Relics appealed to the common Christianity of all crusaders, but they gradually became partisan symbols just like secular banners. The crusaders' attitudes toward their battle standards mirrored the vagaries of holy war. The holistic investigation of the battle standards of the First Crusade, including banners and relics, sheds light on how the idea of crusading formed over the course of the campaign.

---

<sup>76</sup> Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusading*, 43.

<sup>77</sup> Robert W. Jones, *Bloodied Banners: Martial Display on the Medieval Battlefield* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2010), 153-154.

<sup>78</sup> In particular, Carl Erdmann and Robert W. Jones fail to treat the battle standards of the First Crusade as dynamic objects. Carl Erdmann believes that holy banners were important manifestations of the idea of crusading *before* the First Crusade, but he omits a careful study of them during the expedition. Furthermore, he fails to recognize that relics functioned like battle standards in embodying the idea of crusade.

## Chapter One

## Tarsus

---

In the latter half of 1096, the bulk of the first crusaders were marching through Europe toward Constantinople. Pope Urban II's vision for holy war was coming to fruition, and in his mind, battle standards encapsulated his mission. Writing to the King of Hungary in 1096 to win his support in his struggle against a rival claimant to the papacy, Urban II beseeched him: "Raise, O King, the glorious standard of the [Christian] faith, which ought to share the victory and glory with the secular banners of your kingdom."<sup>1</sup> Although the letter does not directly relate to the First Crusade, Urban II made a direct connection between holy war and battle standards as his armies were marching toward the Byzantine Empire. Led by Count Emicho of Leiningen, a large contingent of German crusaders interpreted Urban II's call to arms as a license to murder all non-Christians they encountered.<sup>2</sup> In what has been called the "First Holocaust," Emicho's contingent slaughtered thousands of Jews in the Rhineland cities of Mainz and Cologne.<sup>3</sup> Wantonly murdering entire families, Emicho's band committed some of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986), 25-26. Riley-Smith reproduced this letter, but his Latin source is from here: Urban II, "Epistolae et Privilegia," *Patrologiae cursus completus 151*, col. 481, compiled by J.P. Migne. This quote is slightly problematic. Urban II was asking the King of Hungary to join his fight against the anti-pope, not to join the First Crusade. However, the crusaders were either passing through or had only recently passed through the King of Hungary's lands on their way to Constantinople, so this I believe that the King of Hungary would have seen the crusaders' Christian banners in person around this time. At the very least, the King of Hungary was already aware of Urban's idea of holy war, which the pope connects to battle standards in this quote.

<sup>2</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade: A New History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 85-86.

<sup>3</sup> Albert of Aachen, *Albert of Aachen's History of the Journey to Jerusalem vol. 1*, trans. by Susan B. Edgington (Farnham, England: Ashgate Publishing, 2013), I, ch. 26-30, p. 37-42; Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 84-88; Jay Rubenstein, *Armies of Heaven: The First Crusade and the Quest for the Apocalypse* (New York: Basic Books, 2011), 49-53. Scholars such as Jay Rubenstein have argued that the "First Holocaust" was in line with the prevailing crusader ideology of the period. Thomas Asbridge says that the "First Holocaust" was not merely a "rogue incident," however, chroniclers such as Albert of Aachen expressed their shock and horror at Emicho's atrocities (Asbridge 85). Emicho's contingent did not even make it out of Europe, so contrary to Rubenstein's belief, Emicho's anti-Semitic agenda was not influential for the majority of the First Crusade.

worst atrocities of the expedition. This contingent gained a barbarous reputation and fearing the havoc they would wreak on his lands, the King of Hungary defeated Emicho's army upon their arrival at his borders in 1096.<sup>4</sup>

Christians of the medieval era were certainly not open-minded toward Jews, and Emicho's actions were not antithetical to Urban's holy war. However, contemporaries noted their shock and horror at Emicho's massacres. Albert of Aachen, one of the most significant chroniclers of the First Crusade and later events, roundly denounced Emicho for his actions and expressed sympathy for the Jews.<sup>5</sup> Aiming to separate Emicho's interpretation of holy war from that of the rest of the crusaders, Albert of Aachen sardonically claimed that Emicho's battle standard was essentially un-Christian.<sup>6</sup> Rather than following a standard bearer who carried uniquely identifiable Christian banner like the other crusaders, Emicho's contingent followed a wild goose according to Albert of Aachen.<sup>7</sup> This likely apocryphal reference to a goose is flippant and threatens to minimize the atrocities this group of soldiers committed. However, Albert's description implies that dishonorable crusaders were defined by battle standards that had nothing to do with holy war. By contrast, venerable crusaders carried battle standards that pertained to their clearly defined secular and spiritual aims.

Urban II's letter and Albert of Aachen's account reveal that battle standards were ideologically important during the first phase of the First Crusade. However, battles were few and far between in this period. The first notable engagements of the expedition, Nicaea and Dorylaeum, did not occur until the summer of 1097. There are few mentions

---

<sup>4</sup> Albert of Aachen, I, ch. 29, 40-41, Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 88.

<sup>5</sup> Albert of Aachen, I, ch. 26, p. 37-38. In describing the atrocities of Emicho's soldier, Albert became the first person to use the word "crusader" ("*crucesignantus*").

<sup>6</sup> Albert of Aachen, I, ch. 30, p. 41-42.

<sup>7</sup> Albert of Aachen, I, ch. 30, p. 41-42.

of crusader battle standards in these conflicts, and most likely, they played no strategic role. Nicaea and Dorylaeum were in close proximity to the borders of the Byzantine Empire, and these territories were promptly returned to the Emperor upon the victory of the crusaders at these battles. The ecclesiastical leaders of the campaign did not bear relics as standards to inspire common soldiers at these battles. The capture of Nicaea and Dorylaeum were primarily objectives of the *Kriegsziel*, or the hierarchical crusade, so symbols of popular religious fervor would not have been that effective. However, the more secular symbols of the First Crusade – the princes' Christian banners – were not significant at Nicaea or Dorylaeum either. Nicaea and Dorylaeum could not be claimed by the crusader princes, so they did not hoist their banners above the walls of either city. It was not until a minor conflict at the city of Tarsus that crusader battle standards made a consequential impact on the campaign. At Tarsus, the dual secular and spiritual meaning of crusader banners presented a quandary for the crusader princes, who wanted to use their banners as tools to stake their territorial claims.<sup>8</sup>

---

### The Battle of Tarsus

By the fall of 1097, the crusader army had made its way into southeastern Anatolia. This region was controlled by various Seljuk Turkish rulers, but it was largely inhabited by Armenian Christians. In most cities of this region, the local Armenians jettisoned their Turkish garrisons as the crusaders approached and they were hailed as liberators. Although the sources of the First Crusade conflict in regard to official

---

<sup>8</sup> This whole paragraph is based off of John France, *Victory in the East: A Military History of the First Crusade* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 189-196; Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade: A New History* (Oxford University Press, Oxford: 2005), 140-149. For the shortest synopsis of the crusader's movements in Anatolia, see Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986), 58-59.

crusading policy, the liberation of eastern Christians from Turkish rule was not a controversial issue for the leaders of the expedition. Ever since the Muslim Turks overran large swathes of Anatolia in the 1070s, the Byzantine Empire receded and lost strategic cities such as Antioch in the 1080s.<sup>9</sup> The “Armenian Strategy” was beneficial to the Byzantines, who wanted to reclaim the region; to the pope, who aimed to normalize relations between the eastern and western churches; and to the crusader princes, who were hungry for plunder.<sup>10</sup>

Venturing eastwards through Cappadocia, the main crusader army was led by Raymond of Toulouse, Bohemond of Taranto, and Godfrey of Bouillon. Splitting off from the main army in southern Anatolia, the two youngest crusader princes, Tancred de Hauteville and Baldwin of Boulogne, led their own forces due south towards the Holy Land. Tancred (nephew of Bohemond) and Baldwin (brother of Godfrey) had been overshadowed by their more powerful relatives through the early stages of the First Crusade, so both of them were hungry to establish their own reputations as acclaimed warriors.<sup>11</sup> Taking the road towards more gore and more glory, Tancred and Baldwin moved as two separate units in the direction of the Cilician Gates – a narrow mountain pass between Anatolia and the plains of Syria.<sup>12</sup>

Many important Armenian cities laid in their path, but the two crusader contingents coveted the ancient city of Tarsus above any other prize. Tarsus was a

---

<sup>9</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 97-98.

<sup>10</sup> This whole paragraph is based off of John France, *Victory in the East: A Military History of the First Crusade* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 189-196; Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade: A New History* (Oxford University Press, Oxford: 2005), 140-149. For the shortest synopsis of the crusader’s movements in Anatolia, see Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading*, 58-59.

<sup>11</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 142.

<sup>12</sup> This whole paragraph is based off of John France, *Victory in the East*, 193-195. See Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 142-147 for details Tarsus specifically.

strategically significant stronghold that the crusader army could not simply bypass, but the desire to capture the city was also driven by religious fervor. Tarsus was the birthplace of Paul the Apostle, and the pious crusader army longed to reclaim this revered city on behalf of Christianity. Alexander the Great passed through Tarsus during his successful campaign in the Levant, which Tancred and Baldwin surely desired to replicate. Perhaps the crusaders knew they were following in Alexander's footsteps as they approached the city in late September.<sup>13</sup>

Possessing a smaller force and a local Armenian guide, Tancred reached Tarsus before Baldwin.<sup>14</sup> The Turkish garrison sortied out of the city to meet Tancred, but they soon retreated back within the walls. The next day, the Turks surrendered the city to Tancred. Cementing his victory, Tancred raised his banner above the citadel of Tarsus.<sup>15</sup>

As Tancred was camped outside the walls, Baldwin's army approached. From afar, Baldwin initially believed that Tancred's camp was a Turkish military blockade. Likewise, Tancred assumed that Baldwin's army was a group of Turkish reinforcements. Tancred gathered his cavalry and boldly charged at Baldwin's company. Once Tancred's knights came close enough to Baldwin's force, both sides realized that they were crusaders.<sup>16</sup> Exactly how Tancred and Baldwin's forces recognized each other was through each other's banners. According to Albert of Aachen:

But on both sides the banners of Christianity were recognized, and friends and fellow countrymen were seen, and they dissolved into tears of joy because thus by

---

<sup>13</sup> This whole paragraph is based off of Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 143.

<sup>14</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 142; John France, *Victory in the East*, 194 for details on the Armenian guide.

<sup>15</sup> Albert of Aachen, III, ch. 6-10, p. 84-87; Ralph of Caen, *The Gesta Tancredi of Ralph of Caen: A History of the Normans on the First Crusade* trans. by Bernard S. Bachrach and David S. Bachrach, (Farnham, England: Ashgate Publishing, 2005), ch. 37-39, p. 60-62; Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 143.

<sup>16</sup> This whole paragraph is taken from Albert of Aachen, III, ch. 6-7, p. 84-85.

the grace of God combined and by common consent they pitched their tents together before the city walls.<sup>17</sup>

Paying close attention to Albert of Aachen's language, one realizes that Tancred and Baldwin's banners are not referred to individually in this passage. Rather, both are designated as "banners of Christianity."

Tancred and Baldwin's banners represented their common religious identity because they must have borne Christian symbols, such as the sign of the cross. Albert refers to the Italian Norman and French contingents as "fellow countrymen," but a simple understanding of European geography can refute this claim. Most likely, "countrymen" refers to the fact that both sides hailed from Christendom, as if Christendom were its own temporal entity. Therefore, Tancred and Baldwin's banners represented the *secular* power of the Christian religion.

Albert of Aachen's term "banners of Christianity" seems bizarre once one reads the subsequent passage in his chronicle, where he describes Tancred's standard as "very well known."<sup>18</sup> Even though Tancred and Baldwin's battle standards were similar enough to be recognized as two "banners of Christianity," their banners were unique enough to serve as individual identifiers, allowing them to use their banners for territorial claims.

The sight of Tancred's banner atop Tarsus incurred the wrath of Baldwin, who interpreted the flag as a challenge to his temporal authority.<sup>19</sup> Baldwin wanted the city for himself, and negotiations between the two crusader princes did not lead to a compromise. Appealing directly to the citizens of Tarsus, Baldwin made it clear that he had the

---

<sup>17</sup> Albert of Aachen, III, ch. 7, p. 85.

<sup>18</sup> Albert of Aachen, III, ch. 7, p. 85.

<sup>19</sup> Albert of Aachen, III, ch. 7-11, p. 85-87.

stronger army, prompting the Armenians to discard Tancred's banner and surrender the city to him instead.<sup>20</sup> Tancred peacefully acceded to Baldwin's request, but Baldwin banished Tancred's army outside of the city's walls, exposing them to a deadly assault from lingering Turkish deserters.<sup>21</sup> Rueing the injustice his army received at Tarsus, Tancred led his forces in a skirmish against Baldwin near the city of Mamistra towards the end of the Cilician Expedition.<sup>22</sup> Describing this unprecedented occasion, Thomas Asbridge writes, "the knights of Christ had, for the first time, spilled one another's blood. Greed and ambition had brought discord to the crusade."<sup>23</sup>

Albert of Aachen's description of the Battle of Tarsus is quite extensive, but few chroniclers paid much heed to the incident. The anonymous author of the *Gesta Francorum* devotes a considerable amount Tarsus, but he omits any mention of flags; Robert the Monk, who veritabily rewrote the *Gesta*, dedicates even less narrative space to the conflict.<sup>24</sup> Fulcher of Chartres dedicates only three sentences to the event even though he was probably present at the event.<sup>25</sup> Raymond d'Aguilers and Anna Komnene omit the occasion entirely. Ralph of Caen details the bloodshed between Tancred and Baldwin's factions, but not the banner dispute.<sup>26</sup> *The Chanson d'Antioche*, which is not really

---

<sup>20</sup> On Baldwin's wrath, see Albert of Aachen, III, ch. 7-11, p. 85-87; Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 143-144.

<sup>21</sup> Albert of Aachen, III, ch. 12, p. 88 and ch. 16, p. 91; Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 88 and 145.

<sup>22</sup> Albert of Aachen, III, ch. 16, p. 91; Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 146-147

<sup>23</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 147. For more on Mamistra, see Albert of Aachen, III, ch. 15-17, 90-92; John France, *Victory in the East: A Military History of the First Crusade* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 194; and Ralph of Caen, ch. 43, p. 68.

<sup>24</sup> Anonymous, *Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum* trans. and ed. by Rosalind Hill (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1962), 24-25; Robert the Monk, *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade* trans. by Carol Sweetenham (Farnham, England: Ashgate Publishing, 2005), 18 and 116.

<sup>25</sup> Fulcher of Chartres, *Fulcher of Chartres: Historia Hierosolymitana, A History of the Expedition to Jerusalem* trans. and ed. by Harold S. Fink and Frances Rita Ryan, (New York: University of Tennessee Press, 1973), ch. 14, p. 89.

<sup>26</sup> Ralph of Caen, ch. 37-39, p. 60-62 and ch. 43, p. 68.

considered a chronicle but bears striking similarities to Albert of Aachen's chronicle, also identifies the banner exchange as the root of the conflict.<sup>27</sup>

No rivalry existed between Tancred and Baldwin before Tarsus, but the seeds of their row were sown long before by European chivalric culture. The First Crusade had no prescribed rules of engagement or power-sharing agreements, so ambitious aristocrats like Tancred and Baldwin were destined to butt heads. Tancred and Baldwin both hailed from Christendom, but this did not necessarily make them allies. In the eleventh century, aristocratic violence was endemic throughout Europe, especially in the regions that most crusaders called home. The decline of the Carolingian Empire not only enabled the Church to intervene in secular affairs, but also empowered local rulers to pursue their own territorial ambitions like never before.<sup>28</sup> Tancred and Baldwin's altercation over Tarsus resembles many of the small-scale feudal contests that their soldiers would have been quite familiar with.<sup>29</sup>

However, the fact that Tancred and Baldwin both bore "banners of Christianity" did not mean that they had to cooperate. In fact, banners bearing Christian symbols were used in a number of territorial disputes before the First Crusade. In 312 AD, Emperor Constantine was the first person to use a banner with the sign of the cross in battle.<sup>30</sup> As Pope Gregory VII and Emperor Henry IV fought a proxy war in the city of Milan in the

---

<sup>27</sup> *The Chanson d'Antioche: An Old French Account of the First Crusade* (Farnham, England: Ashgate Publishing, 2005), trans. by Susan B. Edgington and Carol Sweetenham, ch. 107-110, p. 162-163. See footnote 219 on p. 162 for a comparison to Albert of Aachen's account.

<sup>28</sup> Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, trans. by Marshall W. Baldwin and Walter Goffart (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977), 57, 59; H.E.J. Cowdrey, "The Genesis of the Crusades: The Springs of Western Ideas of Holy War," *The Holy War: The Conference on Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 5th, Ohio State University, 1974*, ed. by Thomas Patrick Murphy (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1976) 13-14.

<sup>29</sup> Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading*, 10.

<sup>30</sup> On Constantine's banner at Milvian Bridge, see Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, 5-6, 35-38 (38 ft 19). Known as the Battle of Milvian Bridge, Constantine famously invoked the aid of the Christian God to attain victory. Thereafter, Constantine converted to Christianity and the Roman persecution of Christians stopped.

1070s, the papal banner of St. Peter came to embody the papacy's claim to spiritual and secular power. While the papal banners were not direct analogues to Tancred and Baldwin's "banners of Christianity," an overview of the history of the papal banner before the First Crusade will provide insight into how knights spiritually bound to the pope, and even the pope himself, balanced their religious obligations with their temporal interests.

### The History of the Papal Banner before the First Crusade

In bestowing lands to their vassals before the First Crusade, the popes used the papal banner because banners were universal symbols of feudal contracts.<sup>31</sup> Robert Guiscard, the patriarch of the future Italian Norman crusaders, was one of the first people to be enfeoffed by the papacy.<sup>32</sup> After protecting the historic monastery of Monte Cassino during the 1050s, Robert Guiscard was rewarded with a land grant by Pope Leo IX in 1059.<sup>33</sup> Swearing a feudal oath that was "limited to special ecclesiastical aims," Guiscard swore "to preserve and to acquire the *regalia* and possessions of St. Peter."<sup>34</sup> The oath of vassalage to the pope was vague in 1059 and no particular "regalia" were detailed in this account. The pope used a banner in this ceremony, but the papal banner is not specifically mentioned.<sup>35</sup> After swearing an oath of service to Pope Alexander II in 1064, a Norman

---

<sup>31</sup> Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, 189: "banners rank among the known symbols of feudal investiture, especially for 'princely' fiefs."

<sup>32</sup> H.E.J. Cowdrey, *Pope Gregory VII: 1073-1085* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 131; Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, 128. The word "enfeoffed" means to be given a fief. A fief is a territory held by a lesser lord in name of his superior. For example, the Prince of Wales holds Wales as a fief for the Queen of England.

<sup>33</sup> Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, 127. Richard of Capua was also recognized by the pope in this ceremony.

<sup>34</sup> For Robert Guiscard's oath. Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, 129 ft. 42 Erdmann cites Deusdedit III, 284f (156f), *Collectio canonum*, ed. by V. Wolf von Glanvell (Paderborn: 1905), p. 393. In the footnote, Erdmann notes that "the editor of Deusdedit mistakenly regarded the renewal of Guiscard's oath of 1080 as being 'the original.'"

<sup>35</sup> Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, 183.

named William of Montreuil was the first papal vassal to be explicitly bestowed with the banner of St. Peter.<sup>36</sup> Unlike Robert Guiscard, William of Montreuil was not given lands to hold in name of the pope. Rather, the pope recognized William as the leader of a papal army, which William marched into the Campagna region of Italy.<sup>37</sup> Robert Guiscard merely defended Monte Cassino for the pope, while William of Montreuil commanded an armed force on his behalf. By entering into a feudal contract with William, the pope aimed to expand his temporal power.

From 1064 onward, the bestowal of the papal banner was correlated with secular offensives ordained by the papacy. Upon becoming the leader of an anti-corruption movement against the Milanese clergy, a Milanese layman named Erlembald was given a papal banner in 1064.<sup>38</sup> William the Conqueror famously carried the papal banner during his invasion of England in 1066.<sup>39</sup> In 1080, Robert Guiscard's oath of vassalage was renewed, and on this occasion, Guiscard most definitely received a papal banner.<sup>40</sup> In his oath, Guiscard did not simply vow to defend the pope's lands – he pledged to fight against the Holy Roman Empire for the pope.<sup>41</sup> Upon the declaration of the First Crusade, the most significant papal offensive of the era, Pope Urban II bestowed the papal banner to the French Prince Hugh of Vermandois.<sup>42</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup> Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, 131.

<sup>37</sup> Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, 131.

<sup>38</sup> Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, 141-2, 183-184. Erdmann states that Erlembald was given the banner upon receiving command of the movement, and Erlembald became the leader in 1064.

<sup>39</sup> Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, 154; David S. Bachrach, *Religion and the Conduct of War c. 300 - c. 1215* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003), 91-92. According to Bachrach, William also bore a chain of saints' relics around his neck at the Battle of Hastings.

<sup>40</sup> Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, 191.

<sup>41</sup> Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, 174.

<sup>42</sup> Anna Komnene, *The Alexiad* ed. by Peter Frankopan and trans. by E.R.A Sewter (London: Penguin Classics, 2009), X, ch. 7, p. 280; Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, 342.

In the time between Robert Guiscard's two oaths in 1059 and 1080, Pope Alexander II died and Pope Gregory VII ascended. As the most temporally-minded pope of the medieval era, Gregory VII clashed with his foremost political rival: Emperor Henry IV. Dubbed the "Investiture Controversy," Gregory VII and Holy Roman Emperor Henry IV literally battled for the right to nominate candidates to ecclesiastical offices, most notably in the bishopric of Milan. The bestowal of the papal banner to Erlembald in 1064 directly pertained to this conflict because the movement he led, known as the *Pataria*, became the catalyst for the Investiture Controversy in the 1070s. The Investiture Controversy simmered for decades, and it was far from over even when the First Crusade was complete. However, the papal banner (and Christian battle standards in general) were important particularly at the beginning and the end of the contest. A quick survey of the *Pataria* and the Investiture Controversy reveals how the papal banner served as the symbol of spiritual and secular authority in the era of crusading, and therefore why the papal banner is the precedent for the "banners of Christianity" at Tarsus.

### The *Pataria* and the Investiture Controversy

The *Pataria* began as a grassroots movement levied against the aristocratic Milanese clergy for failing to adhere to their holy orders; the tight-knit Lombard elites who controlled the episcopate of Milan were notorious for keeping wives and for purchasing their ecclesiastical offices.<sup>43</sup> Before Erlembald took the reins over the *Pataria* for the pope, the movement was led by his brother, Landulf, and a Milanese cleric named

---

<sup>43</sup> Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, 140-144; H.E.J. Cowdrey, *Pope Gregory VII: 1073-1085* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 65 and 68.

Ariald. Even though he was a priest, Ariald was known to lead his followers into skirmishes while holding a cross in his hand.<sup>44</sup> Ariald was in clear violation of his holy orders by sanctioning and participating in violence against his own church. However, Ariald and the members of the *Pataria* believed that they were fighting on the behalf of the papacy to rectify the transgressions made by the Milanese church.<sup>45</sup> Ariald personally justified his actions by claiming that a “Christian should bear the sword for nothing other than the defense of the faith.”<sup>46</sup> The cross that Ariald bore during the *Pataria* represented Christ’s protection of true believers.<sup>47</sup>

Ariald’s cross was a defensive battle standard, but Erlembald’s papal banner was an offensive symbol. In describing Erlembald’s papal banner, the chronicler Arnulf of Milan writes that it was “fastened to a lance and was thus displayed as a symbol of homicide.”<sup>48</sup> Realizing that Erlembald’s papal banner was a symbol of warfare, Arnulf of Milan chastised the church for departing from Christian teachings regarding violence.<sup>49</sup> As a social class, knights possessed rather low standing before the 11th century; they were akin to servants of aristocrats.<sup>50</sup> Searching for allies after the decline of the Carolingian state, the clergy played a predominant role in uplifting the status of the

---

<sup>44</sup> Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, 141.

<sup>45</sup> H.E.J. Cowdrey, *Pope Gregory VII: 1073-1085*, 68.

<sup>46</sup> Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, 141, who cites Andreas of Strumi, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica Scriptorum* c. 19 p. 1063.

<sup>47</sup> This quote is from Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, 141.

<sup>48</sup> Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, 183. Erdmann quotes from Arnulf of Milan, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica Scriptorum*. 8.22: “Erlembald prides himself on having received from Rome itself the war-flag of St. Peter (*bellicum sancti Petri vexillum*) [to raise] against all his opponents. It is fastened to a lance and is thus displayed as a symbol of homicide. Yet it is sacrilegious to think that Peter would ever have had another banner (*vexillum*) than the one that the Lord speaks of in the Gospel: Whoever wishes to follow Me, let him deny himself and take up his cross.” For more information on Arnulf of Milan, the editors of Carl Erdmann’s book refer to H.E.J. Cowdrey, “The Papacy, the Patarians and the Church of Milan,” *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th ser., 18 (1986), 25-48.

<sup>49</sup> Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, 184.

<sup>50</sup> H.E.J. Cowdrey, “The Genesis of the Crusades,” 15.

knighthood.<sup>51</sup> To cement the pledges of advocacy from their local knights, the clergy created liturgical blessings for the banners and weapons of knights. By the 1070s, these blessings evolved into entire ceremonies of “knightly investiture,” which sanctioned knights to fight on behalf of the Church.<sup>52</sup> Blessing the paraphernalia of a knight amounted to an acceptance of the violence he would commit, and conferring a war-flag upon a military leader was deemed to be an act of war itself. By bestowing a papal banner upon Erlembald, the papacy ordained a holy war in Milan.<sup>53</sup>

Pope Alexander II and Hildebrand (later Pope Gregory VII) supported the *Pataria* and bestowed the papal banner to Erlembald because they wished to leverage the movement to consolidate their temporal power in Italy.<sup>54</sup> The corrupt Milanese clergy adhered to a different set of liturgical practices than approved by the Vatican and generally considered itself to be outside the jurisdiction of the papacy.<sup>55</sup> The Holy Roman Emperor Henry IV ruled Milan as one of his imperial territories, and the Milanese clergy generally aligned itself with the empire.<sup>56</sup> With the support of the city’s ecclesiastical leaders, Henry IV exercised his right to nominate candidates for episcopal elections. The papacy and the supporters of the *Pataria* both sought to change this procedure.

Under Erlembald’s stewardship, the movement focused on returning the right of ecclesiastical investiture to the pope. In 1070, the Archbishop of Milan resigned suddenly in order to disrupt Erlembald’s machinations, and he tasked one of Henry IV’s

---

<sup>51</sup> H.E.J. Cowdrey, “The Genesis of the Crusades,” 15.

<sup>52</sup> H.E.J. Cowdrey, “The Genesis of the Crusades,” 15-16.

<sup>53</sup> Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, 143.

<sup>54</sup> This whole paragraph is based off of Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, 141; H.E.J. Cowdrey, *Pope Gregory VII: 1073-1085*, 68.

<sup>55</sup> H.E.J. Cowdrey, *Pope Gregory VII: 1073-1085*, 68.

<sup>56</sup> H.E.J. Cowdrey, *Pope Gregory VII: 1073-1085*, 65. I say that the Milanese clergy “generally aligned itself with the empire” because they supported the imperially supported anti-pope against the officially-ordained pope.

representatives to appoint the next archbishop in secret. However, the Milanese clergy roundly rejected the imperial candidate. At the direction of Gregory VII (still serving as Archdeacon Hildebrand to Pope Alexander II), Erlembald nominated a papally-approved candidate for the office. Upon his election, the new Archbishop of Milan ascended in spite of Emperor Henry IV's wishes. Therefore, the papacy usurped the influence of the empire in Milan.<sup>57</sup>

Tensions between the papacy and the empire over the question of Milanese investiture simmered until 1075, when Erlembald died. Without a leader, the *Patavia* abruptly ended. Henry IV restored his influence in Milan and appointed his own candidate for archbishop. Henry IV also asserted ecclesiastical control over central and southern Italy. He invested bishops whose sees lay in the Roman ecclesiastical province and courted Robert Guiscard, who was still a vassal of the pope at this time. Gregory VII, who became pope in 1073, chastised Henry for his actions in Milan, but this was not the final straw that broke the bond between the two most powerful men in Christendom.<sup>58</sup>

Henry IV kept the company of political counselors who were previously excommunicated by Pope Alexander II.<sup>59</sup> These counselors influenced Henry's policy on episcopal appointments in Italy, and by refusing to dismiss these cronies, Henry brazenly rejected Gregory's demand to recognize his authority.<sup>60</sup> Collecting a critical mass of German clergy support him in 1076, Henry IV publicly chastised Gregory for trying "with the most evil arts to alienate the kingdom of Italy" from him and demanded that

---

<sup>57</sup> This whole paragraph is based off of H.E.J Cowdrey, *Pope Gregory VII: 1073-1085*, 65-69.

<sup>58</sup> This whole paragraph is based off of H.E.J Cowdrey, *Pope Gregory VII: 1073-1085*, 130-132. If you want to read conflicting scholarship regarding blame for Henry IV's excommunication, see H.E.J Cowdrey, *Pope Gregory VII: 1073-1085*, 134; Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, 255. Erdmann believes that the events at Milan contributed the most to the split between Greg and Henry.

<sup>59</sup> H.E.J Cowdrey, *Pope Gregory VII: 1073-1085*, 132.

<sup>60</sup> H.E.J Cowdrey, *Pope Gregory VII: 1073-1085*, 135.

Gregory resign from the papacy.<sup>61</sup> In turn, Gregory excommunicated Henry in a public synod in the Lateran basilica on February 22, 1076.<sup>62</sup> Invoking St. Peter directly, Gregory pronounced that Henry was unfit to serve as king and that “the government of the whole kingdom of the Germans and of Italy” should be confiscated.<sup>63</sup>

Gregory VII and Henry IV’s condemnations of each other in the 1070s set in motion the Investiture Controversy, which would last for over fifty years. The rapprochement between the papacy and the empire did not occur until 1137, when Pope Innocent II and Emperor Lothar enfeoffed a Norman named Rainulf with a land grant simultaneously. Using a banner-lance, the pope held the upper-end of the pole while the emperor held the lower-end, symbolizing the pope’s supremacy over the emperor in temporal affairs. However, this ceremony is described as a “double enfeoffment” because the pope and emperor held the banner-lance together, albeit unequally. The double enfeoffment reveals that feudal authority existed as an indivisible concept during the crusading era, which required ecclesiastical and secular powers to cooperate.<sup>64</sup> Moreover, the double enfeoffment rendered the papal banner and the imperial banner physically and figuratively indistinguishable.<sup>65</sup>

---

<sup>61</sup> Emperor Henry IV, “Henry charges Hildebrand with having stolen his hereditary privileges in Rome, striven to alienate Italy (1076),” *Imperial Lives and Letters of the Eleventh Century* trans. by T.E. Mommsen and K.F. Morrison (New York: Columbia University Press, 1962), 146-147. This letter is cited by Brian Tierney, *The Crisis of Church and State 1050-1300* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988), 59-60. Also see H.E.J Cowdrey, *Pope Gregory VII: 1073-1085*, 137-138.

<sup>62</sup> Pope Gregory VII, “Excommunication of Henry IV (Roman Lenten Synod, 1076),” *The Correspondences of Pope Gregory VII* trans. by Ephraim Emerton (New York: Columbia University Press, 1932), 90-91; Brian Tierney, *The Crisis of Church and State 1050-1300*, 60-61; H.E.J Cowdrey, *Pope Gregory VII: 1073-1085*, 140.

<sup>63</sup> Pope Gregory VII, “Excommunication of Henry IV (Roman Lenten Synod, 1076),” 91; H.E.J Cowdrey, *Pope Gregory VII: 1073-1085*, 141.

<sup>64</sup> The whole paragraph is based off of Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, 192. Erdmann’s summary of the double enfeoffment is so pithy that I have reproduced it here: “This gesture, which may seem grotesque to us, conveys the essence of medieval symbolism and is highly instructive. No other incident more clearly demonstrates that the papacy claimed imperial rights and prerogatives for itself, and that the Empire ultimately yielded to this claim.”

<sup>65</sup> Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, 199.

Originally, the papal banner was a “military-religious symbol without juridical significance,” but under the papacy of Gregory VII, the papal banner came to “represent the constitutional claims of the papacy.”<sup>66</sup> As a result of new feudal realities and the Investiture Controversy, the Church’s approach to warfare underwent dramatic changes over the course of the eleventh century. This ideological transformation was manifest in banners and battle standards conferred to professional warriors. From the top of the ecclesiastical hierarchy down to local clergymen, the Church bound martial and religious symbolism together through battle standards shortly before the First Crusade. Embodying the duality of the “two swords,” the banner of St. Peter was a model for the banners of the First Crusade.

The “banners of Christianity” flown at Tarsus were not papal banners, but they represented the same thing: secular and spiritual authority. Gregory VII, who was the first person to articulate the idea of a crusade to the East, recruited the so-called “knights of Christ” (*militia Christi*) to wage his offensive against the Holy Roman Empire.<sup>67</sup> Gregory VII cemented his contract with the “knights of Christ” by bestowing them with the papal banner of St. Peter. Pope Urban II felt that his crusaders were required to serve him like Gregory VII’s “knights of Christ,” but unlike his predecessor, Urban II did not use the papal banner to symbolize his bond with the crusaders – he let the crusaders make their own symbols.

---

<sup>66</sup> Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, 200

<sup>67</sup> For more on the *militia Christi*, see Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, 201-206. Erdmann makes a distinction between “Knights of Christ” and “Knights of St. Peter.”

### The Meaning of Banners on the First Crusade

Upon hearing about Urban's proclamation of the First Crusade, Bohemond immediately ripped his cloak into a sign of the cross, sewed it onto his uniform, and declared his intention of capturing the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem.<sup>68</sup> This is the earliest mention in the chronicles of a crusader battle standard. Bohemond reinterpreted the sign of the cross – a peaceful symbol of Christ's sacrifice – as a symbol that encouraged and justified violence. With his makeshift cross, Bohemond inverted Christian symbolism – a quality shared by Erlembald's papal banner, the "banners of Christianity" at Tarsus, and the other battle standards of the First Crusade.

However, Bohemond's cloak was a part of his military uniform, so he also inverted a symbol of warrior culture by cutting it into the shape of a cross. Likewise, Tancred and Baldwin had augmented their familial standards by affixing crosses to them. Therefore, the "banners of Christianity" at Tarsus represented the compromise between spiritual and secular authority, figuratively and aesthetically. The formation of the idea of crusade and the dual meaning of battle standards were inextricable developments.<sup>69</sup>

However, Tancred and Baldwin's conflict at Tarsus flouted Urban's desire to have the knights of Christ cooperate in reclaiming the Holy Land. In his speech at the Council of Clermont, Urban decried the abundance of internal conflicts within Christendom.<sup>70</sup> Urban II's crusade was in part an attempt to export violence to the East in order to secure domestic peace, but Urban did not prescribe a remedy to internecine

---

<sup>68</sup> Anonymous, trans. and ed. by Rosalind Hill, *Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum: The Deeds of the Franks and Other Pilgrims to Jerusalem*, (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1962), 7; Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 66.

<sup>69</sup> Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, 56. I must refer you to Erdmann's pithy conclusion at the end of his chapter on Holy Banners: "If the history of symbols is a valid indicator, the emergence of these new [holy banners] should reflect a general evolution in the history of ideas."

<sup>70</sup> Fulcher of Chartres, ch. 1, p. 61

Christian warfare that occurred outside of Europe.<sup>71</sup> Tancred and Baldwin's "banners of Christianity" did not represent a harmonious relationship between religion and warfare; above all else, Tancred and Baldwin used their "banners of Christianity" to press their territorial claims to Tarsus. Likewise, the papal banner under Pope Gregory VII's reign was used to symbolize his territorial ambitions. By sanctioning Erlembald to make war in Milan, the papacy aimed to bring the city under its spiritual influence through bellicose means. Therefore, Erlembald's papal banner represented the papacy's claim to Milan, just as either Tancred or Baldwin's "banners of Christianity" represented their claims to Tarsus.

What happened at Tarsus is also significant because it was the first time that battle standards incited violence within the crusading ranks. Controversies over battle standards would come to define crusader internal relations later in the First Crusade. During the Battle of Antioch, the Provençals "discovered" the Holy Lance (the spear used to pierce Jesus' side while he was on the cross) underneath the Antiochene Basilica of St. Peter.<sup>72</sup> The entire crusader army rallied underneath the Holy Lance and used it as their standard in an all-out assault against a larger Turkish army. As the victorious crusaders marched away from Antioch, the other contingents scorned the Provençals for laying exclusive claim to the relic. Peter Bartholomew, the Provençal priest who declared that an apparition of St. Andrew revealed the location of the Holy Lance of Antioch to him, was subjected to a trial by fire by his skeptics in 1099.<sup>73</sup>

---

<sup>71</sup> H.E.J. Cowdrey, "The Genesis of the Crusades," 16-17.

<sup>72</sup> For a review of the Holy Lance of Antioch see Thomas Asbridge, "The Holy Lance of Antioch: Power, Devotion, and Memory on the First Crusade," *Reading Medieval Studies* 33 (2007), 3-36. Also read my next chapter!

<sup>73</sup> Raymond d'Aguilers, 51-52, 100-103; Fulcher of Chartres, ch. 18, pp. 100-101; Ralph of Caen ch. 108, p. 126; Albert of Aachen, V, ch. 32, p. 196-197.

However, Peter Bartholomew was neither the first nor the only crusader to die over a dispute about the battle standards used at Antioch. Tancred and Baldwin's flag feud at Tarsus was a precedent for disputes between other crusader princes at Antioch. After the city was finally secured from the Turks in the summer of 1098, the two most powerful crusader princes, Bohemond of Taranto and Raymond of Toulouse, squabbled over its possession. Raymond initially placed his flag at the top of the citadel of Antioch, but Bohemond convinced the surrendering Turkish garrison to replace Raymond's flag with his infamous blood-red banner.<sup>74</sup> Bohemond and Raymond's troops came to blows, and after a few months of intermittent conflict, Bohemond won out over his opponent. However, Bohemond remained in Antioch for the rest of the First Crusade, just as Baldwin departed from the campaign after his conflict with Tancred. However, Bohemond's banner was *not* a "banner of Christianity" because it did not bear a sign of the cross. The flag feud at Antioch is not a direct parallel to Tarsus because the flags used at Antioch did not represent the metaphorical conflict between the profane and pious aspects of the First Crusade.

The crusaders were united by their religion, but they failed to refrain from territorial disputes over the course of the campaign. The use of papal banners in feudal ceremonies turned Christian symbology into a politically provocative tool by the mid-eleventh century. The alliances and tensions between the leaders of the First Crusade were manifest in the objects they used to identify themselves in battle, and the nuanced meaning of crusader battle standards is first displayed in the chronicler's descriptions of the Battle of Tarsus. The ecclesiastical and secular objectives of the First Crusade were

---

<sup>74</sup> On Bohemond's blood red banner, see Albert of Aachen, *History of the Journey to Jerusalem*, IV, 17, p. 149; Fulcher of Chartres I, 17, p. 99.

not yet intertwined by Tarsus, but sometime between this battle in 1097 and Rainulf's double enfeoffment in 1137, the secular and spiritual significance of Christian battle standards became equal and indivisible. This development did not happen gradually over this forty-year period – it was complete by the end of the First Crusade.

## Chapter 2

### Antioch

---

In the fall of 1097, the crusader army marched in unison upon the city of Antioch. As the site of St. Peter's first diocese, Antioch was one of the most august cities in the Christian world, but it was no longer ruled by Christians.<sup>1</sup> In 1085, only a decade before the First Crusade, the Seljuk Turks captured Antioch from the Byzantines. Because of Antioch's strategic and spiritual significance, the reclamation of the city was one of Emperor Alexios Komnenos' primary objectives. Ostensibly, the Siege of Antioch was the culmination of the Emperor Alexios' "Armenian Strategy," in which the crusaders recovered swathes of territory in southeastern Anatolia on his behalf.<sup>2</sup> The "Armenian Strategy" was supported not only by Emperor Alexios, but also by Pope Urban II. Urban's original idea for the crusade, the *Kriegsziel*, pertained to the reclamation of Byzantine lands as a means to reconcile with the Eastern Christian Church.

However, the Siege of Antioch proved to be so arduous that the recapture of the city seemed unattainable. The crusaders languished outside the city walls for nearly eight months, enduring famine and constant sorties from the defenders. Believing that the siege was doomed to fail, the Byzantine envoys to the expedition deserted, which tarnished Emperor Alexios' relations with the crusaders for the rest of the campaign.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> I refrain from using the term "Christendom" here, although it would be quite a fitting term. As a concept, "Christendom" describes the lands in which Christians lived, but not necessarily the region in which Christian European monarchies ruled. For more on "Christendom," see David Luscombe and Jonathan Riley-Smith, "Introduction", *The New Cambridge Medieval History IV c.1024-1198* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 8.

<sup>2</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade: A New History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 98; John France, *Victory in the East: A Military History of the First Crusade* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 189-196. Refer to Chapter 1 of my thesis for details on the Armenian Strategy.

<sup>3</sup> Anonymous, *Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum* trans. and ed. by Rosalind Hill (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1962), 34-35; Raymond d'Aguilers, *Raymond d'Aguilers: Historia Francorum Qui Ceperunt*

In June of 1098, Bohemond of Taranto convinced a commander of one of the city's gates to defect to the side of the crusaders, which allowed for the army to stage a surprise escalade. The crusaders infiltrated Antioch on 3 June 1098, but the next day a Turkish relief force arrived outside the walls. The crusaders' elation over the capture of Antioch was short-lived, and they relapsed into despondency. Common soldiers were dismayed not only by the lack of plunder, but also the lack of basic supplies. With their days inside Antioch numbered, the leaders of the First Crusade realized that their only hope for survival lay in an all-out offensive against the enemy.<sup>4</sup>

In order to motivate the army for a final stand, Bishop Adhemar of Le Puy and the leaders of the Provençal faction conspired to create a battle standard provocative enough to incite such an attack. Gathering in the Basilica of St. Peter in Antioch, Adhemar and his conspirators physically assembled a lance using a piece of metal they excavated on the premises and proclaimed the weapon to be the Holy Lance that pierced Jesus' side on the cross. The Holy Lance has been a Christian symbol related to warfare since its legendary origin. A Roman soldier named Longinus pierced the side of Jesus with his spear while he was on the cross.<sup>5</sup> All of the objects associated with the crucifixion (Longinus' lance, three nails, pieces of wood, and vials of Jesus' blood) were widely

---

*Iherusalem*, trans. by John Hugh Hill and Laurita L. Hill (Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1968), 37; Albert of Aachen, *Albert of Aachen's History of the Journey to Jerusalem vol. 1*, trans. by Susan B. Edgington (Farnham, England: Ashgate Publishing, 2013), IV, ch. 40, p. 163. Albert claims that the Byzantines deserted in June of 1098, but in fact they deserted in January. Also see Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade 178-179*; John France, *Victory in the East*, 243. France attempts to exonerate the Byzantines for deserting, claiming that they were actually on a resupplying mission, but nevertheless, they never returned to the expedition.

<sup>4</sup> *Gesta Francorum*, 44-48; *Raymond d'Aguilers*, 46-48; Albert of Aachen, IV, ch. 15-23, p. 144-149, ch. 29, p. 153; Fulcher of Chartres, *Fulcher of Chartres: Historia Hierosolymitana, A History of the Expedition to Jerusalem* trans. and ed. by Harold S. Fink and Frances Rita Ryan, (New York: University of Tennessee Press, 1973), ch. 17, p. 98-99; Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 200-202, 205-211; John France, *Victory in the East*, 257-259. The betrayal of the city of Antioch is a fascinating episode of guile, and without this deceit, the crusader army would have been slaughtered outside the walls of Antioch.

<sup>5</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 222.

revered as holy relics throughout the Middle Ages.<sup>6</sup> Any monastery or church that was worth its salt had Christian relics, and especially prestigious ecclesiastical institutions held relics of the crucifixion. In fact, multiple reliquaries claimed to house the Holy Lance at the time of the First Crusade.<sup>7</sup> The most notable of these locations was one that Adhemar probably visited earlier in the campaign: the Chapel of the Virgin at the Pharos of Constantinople.<sup>8</sup>

Adhemar was reportedly skeptical of the zeal with which the crusaders venerated the Holy Lance of Antioch after the battle.<sup>9</sup> In spite of his doubts, Adhemar found utility in the Holy Lance because he deployed it as a motivational tool in the Battle of Antioch. First and foremost, relics made for excellent battle standards in the crusading era. Devotional practices surrounding relics “reached extraordinary heights” in eleventh-century Europe, encompassing all social strata.<sup>10</sup> Furthermore, relics were considered “tangible foci of sanctity” through which divine power emanated.<sup>11</sup> Possessing the Holy Lance of Antioch, the crusaders likely believed that they were invincible and that the

---

<sup>6</sup> Thomas Asbridge, “The Holy Lance of Antioch: Power, Devotion, and Memory on the First Crusade,” *Reading Medieval Studies* 33 (2007), 6. For a discussion of relics in relation to the proliferation of saints cults in this era, see Rosamond McKitterick, “The Church,” *The New Cambridge Medieval History III c.900-c.1024* ed. by Timothy Reuter (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 159-160.

<sup>7</sup> For an extended discussion of the Holy Lances in Europe before the Crusade, see Laura Hibbard Loomis, “The Holy Relics of Charlemagne and King Athelstan: The Lances of Longinus and St. Mauricius,” *Speculum* 54, no. 4 (October, 1950), pp. 437-456.

<sup>8</sup> Stephen Runciman, “The Holy Lance Found At Antioch,” *Analecta Bollandiana* 68 (1950), 199-200, 202; Thomas Asbridge, “The Holy Lance of Antioch: Power, Devotion, and Memory on the First Crusade,” *Reading Medieval Studies* 33 (2007), 5-6; David S. Bachrach, *Religion and the Conduct of War c. 300 - c. 1215* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003), 112.

<sup>9</sup> Raymond d’Aguilers, 66; Fulcher of Chartres, ch.18, p. 100. Even the most overtly pro-Provençal chronicler mentions Adhemar’s skepticism towards the relic’s holiness and authenticity, but Adhemar’s well-documented doubts clearly did not prevent him from carrying the relic into battle either. Adhemar could have still used the lance as a motivational tool regardless of his personal beliefs. This point will be developed further over the course of this chapter.

<sup>10</sup> John France, *Victory in the East*, 6; Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade: A New History*, 222-223. On the growth of relic cults related to saints, see Benedicta Ward, *Miracles and the Medieval Mind: Theory, Record, and Event 1000-1215* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1982), 33-66.

<sup>11</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade: A New History*, 222-223

success of their campaign was inevitable, motivating them to attack Kerbogha's army despite being outnumbered in the fateful Battle of Antioch in June of 1098.<sup>12</sup>

Adhemar must have been a primary agent in arranging the fabrication of the relic because of his supreme status as the pope's representative on the First Crusade. After all he was the "first crusader" – upon Urban II's declaration at Clermont in 1095, Adhemar immediately pledged to lead the expedition in lieu of the pope.<sup>13</sup> In order to announce the Council of Clermont to the French clergy, Urban wrote a letter in August of 1095 from Le Puy while visiting Adhemar at his diocese.<sup>14</sup> At this juncture, Adhemar had chance to give Urban his own input and shape the idea of crusade.<sup>15</sup> As Urban's representative, Adhemar was not only one of the primary recruiters for the expedition, but also the steward of the whole army.<sup>16</sup> Adhemar had completed the pilgrimage to Jerusalem in the 1080's, so he knew how to conduct the physical and spiritual journey.<sup>17</sup> As the leader of thousands of people who trekked into the Holy Land, Adhemar has been (unsurprisingly) likened to the biblical Moses by many chroniclers of the First Crusade and modern-day

---

<sup>12</sup> Raymond d'Aguilers, 56; Albert of Aachen, IV, ch. 52-53, p. 172-173. Raymond claims that the lance made them invincible while Albert claims that "God and the Lord Jesus were at work" because of the use of the lance in battle.

<sup>13</sup> See Fulcher of Chartres, ch. 4, p. 67; James A. Brundage, "Adhémar of Puy: The Bishop and His Critics," *Speculum: A Journal of Medieval Studies* XXXIV (1959), 203; Jay Rubenstein, *Armies of Heaven: The First Crusade and the Quest for the Apocalypse* (New York: Basic Books, 2011), 49-53, 28-29; John France, *Victory in the East*, 45-46.

<sup>14</sup> James A. Brundage, "Adhémar of Puy: The Bishop and His Critics," 209.

<sup>15</sup> James A. Brundage, "Adhémar of Puy: The Bishop and His Critics," 209; John France, *Victory in the East*, 5. Urban also consulted Raymond before Clermont.

<sup>16</sup> James A. Brundage, "Adhémar of Puy: The Bishop and His Critics," 201.

<sup>17</sup> James A. Brundage, "Adhémar of Puy: The Bishop and His Critics," 208, ft. 48; Jay Rubenstein, *Armies of Heaven*, 28-29; John France, *Victory in the East*, 45-46.

historians.<sup>18</sup> If Adhemar had vocalized his doubts about the lance's authenticity, the crusaders would have heeded his word because he was such a venerable figure.<sup>19</sup>

Adhemar was not only instrumental in the formation of the First Crusade, but he also embodied the idea of holy war itself. In an ostensibly flagrant violation of Christian canon law, Adhemar commanded Provençal troops in multiple engagements over the course of the Siege of Antioch.<sup>20</sup> The role of priests in “maintaining the fighting spirit of soldiers” by bearing Christian banners and relics in battle was well-established by Adhemar's time.<sup>21</sup> But by conspiring in the creation of the Holy Lance of Antioch and by personally fighting in battle, Adhemar was more intimately involved in the conduct of holy war than any of his ecclesiastical predecessors. At the Battle of Antioch, Adhemar led his cohort with not one, but two battle standards – his personal banner of the Virgin Mary and the Holy Lance of Antioch he helped to invent.<sup>22</sup> By physically carrying two standards at Antioch, Adhemar figuratively wielded the “two swords” of secular and spiritual power.

The idea of a “holy warrior” was well-formed by the eve of the First Crusade, but the reciprocal concept of a “warrior priest” was more dubious.<sup>23</sup> In Chapter One, I laid out the spiritual predicament that afflicted knights before the First Crusade. Before 1095,

---

<sup>18</sup> Anne Derbes, “A Crusading Fresco Cycle at the Cathedral of Le Puy,” *The Art Bulletin*, vol. 73, no. 4 (Dec., 1991), 571-575. Derbes compares Adhemar to the portrayals of Moses in the cathedral. See also James A. Brundage, “Adhémar of Puy: The Bishop and His Critics,” 212; Raymond d'Aguilers, 129.

<sup>19</sup> On Adhemar's private skepticism, see Steven Runciman, “The Holy Lance Found At Antioch,” *Analecta Bollandiana* 68 (1950), 199-200; David S. Bachrach, *Religion and the Conduct of War*, 112, ft. 118.

<sup>20</sup> Raymond d'Aguilers, 26. Adhemar's troops were involved in the Siege of Nicaea as well, but his actions at Antioch were more significant.

<sup>21</sup> David S. Bachrach, *Religion and the Conduct of War*, 92-94.

<sup>22</sup> On Adhemar's use of the lance at the battle, see *Gesta Francorum*, 68; Robert the Monk trans. by Carol Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade* (Farnham, England: Ashgate Publishing, 2005), 173. Raymond d'Aguilers, the Provençal chronicler, claims that he, not Adhemar, bore the Holy Lance on that day: Raymond d'Aguilers, 63; Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986), 76.

<sup>23</sup> See Rosalind Hill, “Introduction” to *Gesta Francorum*, xxviii. As a clergyman, Adhemar was barred from fighting, but he ignored this.

knights had no opportunity to remit their sins while remaining professional warriors, but the First Crusade afforded them salvation through their own vocation.<sup>24</sup> By contrast, the church made an effort to preserve the non-combatant status of the clergy before the First Crusade. As discussed in Chapter One, the French clergy made use of the institution of advocacy to protect their parishes in the absence of the Carolingian.<sup>25</sup> A movement related to the idea of ecclesiastical protection was the “Peace of God,” which began around the turn of the 11th century as a grassroots attempt to shelter unarmed priests from attacks by lay people.<sup>26</sup> The Peace of God was not achieved overnight; rapprochements between the clergy and the laity needed to be arranged so that the movement’s precepts could be followed and understood. One of the oldest Peace of God assemblies was actually held in Le Puy by Adhemar’s predecessor in 990.<sup>27</sup> To seal their non-aggression pact, priests and knights would gather at their local reliquaries and swear upon the relics of their diocese’ patron saint.<sup>28</sup>

Around the year 1000, relics were being used in Europe to promote peace among the laity, but in 1098, Adhemar reversed the symbolism of relics by bearing the Holy Lance of Antioch in battle. Before we can examine the nuances of Adhemar’s relationship towards the battle standards he brandished at Antioch, we must cover the

---

<sup>24</sup> H.E.J. Cowdrey, “The Genesis of the Crusades: The Springs of Western Ideas of Holy War,” *The Holy War: The Conference on Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 5th, Ohio State University, 1974*, edited by Thomas Patrick Murphy, (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1976): 23. Also see Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 38-39; Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, translated by Marshall W. Baldwin and Walter Goffart. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977), 57-58.

<sup>25</sup> Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, 59.

<sup>26</sup> For details on the Peace of God movement, see a brief description in Robert Fossier, “Rural economy and country life,” *The New Cambridge Medieval History III c.900-c.1024* ed. by Timothy Reuter (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 52. I cited this article not because of its expansive detail on the Peace of God, but rather because I know it comes from the *Cambridge Medieval History* and conveys the details necessary for our purposes here. Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, 59-63.

<sup>27</sup> Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, 63.

<sup>28</sup> Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading*, 4.

events leading up to the siege. Later, we must assiduously examine the details of the Holy Lance of Antioch's discovery to verify the intended purpose of the relic.

### The Siege of Antioch

As the northernmost city in the Levant, the capture of Antioch was of the utmost strategic significance for the campaign. The city guarded the road to the port of St. Simeon on the Mediterranean, which came to be instrumental in supplying the crusaders for the rest of the crusade. With the Orontes River bordering the eastern walls and a citadel nestled in the mountains of the western portion of the city, Antioch's fortifications proved to be a formidable test of the army's aptitude for siege warfare. As Raymond d'Aguilers described the city's defenses, Antioch "is so protected with walls, towers, and breastworks that it may dread neither the attack of machine nor the assault of man even if all mankind gathered to besiege it."<sup>29</sup> Moreover, the Turkish garrison was well prepared for the arrival of the crusaders and they were in contact with other regional Muslim rulers for support.<sup>30</sup> Armies from Damascus, Aleppo, and Mosul appeared at different periods during the siege and put immense pressure on the crusaders.<sup>31</sup> While Baldwin and his small detachment of knights secured his personal domain around the eastern Armenian city of Edessa, the main bulk of the crusader army arrived Antioch in late October of 1097.<sup>32</sup> In the words of Albert of Aachen, the crusader army approached "the very walls of dreadful Antioch, splendid with their shields of gold color, green, red and every shade,

---

<sup>29</sup> Raymond d'Aguilers, 31.

<sup>30</sup> John France, *Victory in the East*, 199-200.

<sup>31</sup> John France, *Victory in the East*, 203, 224.

<sup>32</sup> Albert of Aachen, IV, ch. 9-12, pp. 139-142; John France, *Victory in the East*, 194-195. Baldwin's venture in Edessa enabled him to pursue his territorial lust while securing the eastern flank for the other crusaders.

and with their banners held high, picked out in gold and visibly ornamented with all kinds of workmanship in royal purple...”<sup>33</sup>

Arriving at Antioch with pomp and ceremony, the crusaders were almost immediately thrown into conflict with the Turkish garrison. The army camped across the Orontes to the north of the city, leaving those who dared to cross it defenseless. Sorties from the Turks tormented peasants and soldiers foraging for food and grazing their livestock. To reach the crusaders, the Turks made use of multiple bridges over the Orontes, especially the “Bridge Gate,” which ran right up to the walls of the city. The crusaders also constructed a pontoon bridge over the Orontes that led to their camp.<sup>34</sup> Every bridge became a tactical flashpoint, but the main bridge across the Orontes lay to the east of the city on the road to Aleppo.<sup>35</sup> The “Iron Bridge” was a centuries-old Byzantine structure that was heavily defended by the Turks. The earliest skirmish of the battle occurred in its vicinity on 20 October 1097 – one day before the crusaders even reached the walls of Antioch. Recognizing the bridge’s vital location, Adhemar himself beseeched the crusaders to storm the bridge.<sup>36</sup> Ordering his troops to form a shield wall (“*testudo*”), Adhemar personally led his troops into the engagement and successfully seized the bridge.<sup>37</sup> Although it was not his first time commanding troops in battle, Adhemar won credit for the first engagement at Antioch. This initial victory augured the central role that Adhemar would come to play in the army’s eventual success. Minor

---

<sup>33</sup> Albert of Aachen, III, ch. 37, p. 108.

<sup>34</sup> Albert of Aachen, III, ch. 42, pp. 111-112. Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 165.

<sup>35</sup> Raymond d’Aguilers, 31; John France, *Victory in the East*, 206.

<sup>36</sup> Albert of Aachen, III, ch. 35, p. 106; John France, *Victory in the East*, 206.

<sup>37</sup> Albert of Aachen, III, ch. 35, p. 106; John France, *Victory in the East*, 206. “*Testudo*” is the term France uses to describe Adhemar’s shield wall.

victories like this, however, would be few and far between for the crusaders because the siege would last for another seven months.<sup>38</sup>

By Christmas of 1097, the nearby countryside had been completely plundered and starvation loomed for the entire army.<sup>39</sup> Knowing that individual soldiers were too exposed to venture far from the camp in search of food, Bohemond and Robert of Flanders led a foraging expedition to the southeast on 28 December.<sup>40</sup> As this force was gathering rations, a massive Turkish relief army heading for Antioch passed through the area.<sup>41</sup> The small crusader force beat back the Turks, but they left their newly acquired foodstuffs and rations behind enemy lines. Bohemond managed to save some of his loot from being plundered, but not enough to satiate the rest of the army. Battle-hardened yet hungry, Bohemond and Robert of Flanders slinked back to the siege with little to show for their efforts.<sup>42</sup>

Meanwhile on 29 December 1097, the Turks led a sortie from the “Bridge Gate” against the crusader camp. According to Raymond d’Aguilers, the Provençals were the primary victims of these routine raids because of their position at the vanguard of the camp.<sup>43</sup> Defending their pontoon bridge, Adhemar and Raymond of Toulouse’s troops rushed across the Orontes to counterattack the Turks. However, they were lured too close

---

<sup>38</sup> John France, *Victory in the East*, 206.

<sup>39</sup> John France, *Victory in the East*, 209, 235.

<sup>40</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 170-172; *Gesta Francorum*, 30-31; Albert of Aachen, III, ch. 49-51, pp. 116-118; Fulcher of Chartres, ch. 15, pp. 94-95; Jay Rubenstein, *Armies of Heaven*, 154.

<sup>41</sup> *Gesta Francorum*, 30; Albert of Aachen, III, ch. 49-51, pp. 116-118; Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 170-172. This Turkish force was led by Duqaq of Damascus.

<sup>42</sup> Details on plundered food can be found in Albert of Aachen, III, ch. 51-52, pp. 117-118; Jay Rubenstein, *Armies of Heaven*, 154.

<sup>43</sup> This whole paragraph is based off of Raymond d’Aguilers, 32-33; Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 172-174; Jay Rubenstein, *Armies of Heaven*, 155-156. December 29 is my birthday, and this happened exactly 899 years before I was born.

to the walls of Antioch, so they had to retreat.<sup>44</sup> Running for their lives, the Provençal infantry dropped their standards and “ran pell mell for the [pontoon] bridge.”<sup>45</sup> The most notable casualty of the day was Adhemar’s anonymous standard bearer.<sup>46</sup> Perhaps this soldier held onto Adhemar’s standard and was killed with it in his possession, but in any case, the Turks captured the standard.

Depicting the Virgin Mary, the Provençals venerated this standard, and they were extremely ashamed of its loss.<sup>47</sup> Taking their prize atop the city walls, the Turks flew the banner in the face of their defeated enemy and then stuck the point of the banner in the ground.<sup>48</sup> Raymond d’Aguilers felt that this gesture was an insult to the Virgin Mary, and later he justified the act of impaling Turkish heads on the ground with pikes as “God’s command because the Turks had formerly disgraced” the Virgin Mary.<sup>49</sup> This incident foreshadowed how battle standards would play a central role in the most vicious slaughters of the final days of the First Crusade, but the maltreatment of a battle standard was a provocative action throughout the expedition. Tancred and Baldwin’s row at Tarsus is an early example of how a banner could be used to incite conflict between feudally-minded soldiers.

---

<sup>44</sup> Raymond d’Aguilers, 33-34; Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 173.

<sup>45</sup> Raymond d’Aguilers, 33.

<sup>46</sup> Raymond d’Aguilers, 33; *Gesta Francorum*, 32. Based on the language in Raymond’s chronicle, I cannot infer whether or not Raymond is referring to the standard bearer of Adhemar and “a noble young man, Bernard of Bezières” as the same person. Unfortunately, this detail may have been lost in translation.

<sup>47</sup> Raymond d’Aguilers, 33-34, 40.

<sup>48</sup> Raymond d’Aguilers, 40; Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 174; Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading*, 76.

<sup>49</sup> Raymond d’Aguilers, 40.

The Turks who stole Adhemar's banner not only "disgraced" him, but also threatened his legitimacy as the secular and spiritual leader of the First Crusade.<sup>50</sup> Adhemar's banner was a testament to his piety, but it also represented his familial pride. Adhemar was born into a military family, which supported him in his early days as Bishop of Le Puy by forcibly suppressing a rival family's challenge to his election.<sup>51</sup> With previous experience in working across the aisle with knights, Adhemar likely understood the feudal significance of chivalric banners. At this point in the expedition, Adhemar's banner of the Virgin Mary must have been the foremost symbol of holy war, outshining the significance of Tancred and Baldwin's "banners of Christianity."<sup>52</sup> Because Adhemar embodied the idea of crusading, the capture of his banner was an affront to the conceptual core of the campaign.

The seizure of Adhemar's standard on 29 December elevated the bridge skirmish from a minor defeat to a major blow to crusader morale. In the medieval era, losing one's battle standard to an enemy represented a humiliating defeat.<sup>53</sup> Raymond d'Aguilers even feared that the incident would incur God's wrath, speculating that the loss was *quid pro quo* for crusaders' pillaging.<sup>54</sup> On 30 December, multiple chronicles recorded an earthquake near the city of Antioch. The concept of divine intervention was alive and well in the minds of the crusaders, and the hand of God is very prevalent in the

---

<sup>50</sup> Raymond d'Aguilers, 40. He uses the term "disgrace," which I quoted here. In describing December 29, Asbridge treats only the temporal symbolism of Adhemar's banner and overlooks the dynamic aspects of Adhemar's character: Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 173-4

<sup>51</sup> John France, *Victory in the East*, 45.

<sup>52</sup> Albert of Aachen, III, ch. 8-9, pp. 85-6; Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 174.

<sup>53</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 173-4; Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading*, 76.

<sup>54</sup> Raymond d'Aguilers, 34.

chronicles.<sup>55</sup> Without their holiest symbol, how would the crusaders attain victory on behalf of Christendom? Hoping to reignite fervor among the troops, Adhemar himself ordered the crusaders to give alms, fast, and join a procession around the camp as penance.<sup>56</sup> The beginning of 1098 was a newfound nadir for the crusaders, but Adhemar hoped the procession would turn their fortunes around.

The crusading ranks thinned enormously as a result of winter and famine, but a few acts of valor lifted the army's spirits. Upon hearing of the impending arrival of a relief force from Aleppo, Bohemond personally orchestrated an ambush against the siege breakers. Facing an army an order of magnitude larger than his own, Bohemond led his troops under his infamous blood-red banner and staged an all-out cavalry charge. Surprisingly, the army from Aleppo turned tail and fled. Bohemond was reputed to be one of the strongest, most ruthless warriors of his day, but this was not enough to deter the relief army's confidence in their superior numbers. Ingeniously, Bohemond divided his army into six divisions, giving the optical illusion that it was much larger than in reality. Bohemond saved the crusader army from near-catastrophe through cunning and guile, and these skills enabled him to maneuver his way within the walls of Antioch to end the siege.<sup>57</sup>

---

<sup>55</sup> Jay Rubenstein, *Armies of Heaven*, 154-6. Jay Rubenstein highlights instances natural phenomena in the chronicles, claiming that the authors' apocalyptic mentality explains their obsession with the fortunes of the crusaders and divine activity. However, Rubenstein inadequately investigates Adhemar's banner and fails to connect the significance of its loss to the wrath of God evoked by the chronicles. Rubenstein's overall thesis is that collective mindset of the First Crusade was shaped by apocalyptic thought. The evidence is quite circumstantial.

<sup>56</sup> Raymond d'Aguilers, 36; James A. Brundage, "Adhémar of Puy: The Bishop and His Critics," 205.

<sup>57</sup> *Gesta Francorum* 35-8; Raymond d'Aguilers, 32; Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 180-186; John France, *Victory in the East*, 245-251. On Bohemond's blood red banner, see Albert of Aachen, IV, 17, p. 149; Fulcher of Chartres I, 17, p. 99.

## The Capture of Antioch and the Second Siege

---

Sometime in the spring of 1098, Bohemond established contact with the commander of the tower above the St. George Gate of Antioch, an Armenian named Firuz, and convinced him to defect to the crusaders' side.<sup>58</sup> Firuz's motives for betraying Antioch are only mentioned by two contemporary chroniclers, who claim that Firuz had visions of Christ and wanted to convert to the crusaders' religion.<sup>59</sup> However, the most plausible explanation for Firuz's defection is provided by a twelfth-century Muslim chronicler, who claims that Bohemond offered him "money and land grants" if he decided to cooperate with the crusaders.<sup>60</sup> Whatever his incentives truly were, Firuz agreed to turn over his tower to Bohemond's troops on the night of 2 June 1098. According to the author of the *Gesta* (who may have scaled the walls himself that night), about sixty of Bohemond's troops gained entry into Antioch without being noticed. After opening the gate for the rest of the army, Bohemond led his troops on a rampage through the city, erecting his blood-red banner across from the citadel for the rest of the army to see. After eight arduous months, the crusaders had finally captured Antioch, but the siege was far from over. The very next day, a Muslim army from Mosul, led by a general named Kerbogha, arrived outside the city. His arrival had been rumored for months, but

---

<sup>58</sup> *Gesta Francorum*, 44-48; Raymond d'Aguilers, 46-48; Albert of Aachen, IV, ch. 15-21, pp. 144-149; Fulcher of Chartres, ch. 17, pp. 98-99; Ralph of Caen, trans. by Bernard S. Bachrach and David S. Bachrach, *The Gesta Tancredi of Ralph of Caen: A History of the Normans on the First Crusade* (Aldershot, 2005), ch. 63-66, pp. 88-91; Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 200-202, 205-211; John France, *Victory in the East*, 257-259. I omitted Bohemond's plot to gain lordship over the city, which was quite manipulative and has its own banner backstory to it. This is provided by the *Gesta Francorum*, 60-62.

<sup>59</sup> Fulcher of Chartres, ch. 17, pp. 98-99. Albert of Aachen, III, ch. 61, p. 125 Fulcher specifically mentions Firuz's visions. Albert mentions that Firuz "perceived the truth which is Christ."

<sup>60</sup> Ibn al-Athir, *The Chronicle of Ibn al-Athir for the Crusading Period from al-Kamil fi'l-ta'rikh Part I* trans. by D.S. Richards (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing, 2005), p. 14-15. This is one of the few times I cite a Muslim chronicle for the First Crusade. Refer to my introduction for my explanation of why I largely omit Muslim chronicles of the First Crusade. In brief, al-Athir's chronicle is one-hundred years after the campaign, quite short, and does not mention battle standards.

his appearance outside Antioch at precisely this moment was serendipitous. The crusaders just barely averted sure defeat by infiltrating the city the night before Kerbogha came, but with few provisions inside the city walls, the expedition looked doomed upon the start of the second siege.

The mood of the expedition in the winter of 1097 was joyous in comparison to their despair in June of 1098.<sup>61</sup> Crusader princes such as Roger of Barneville and Godfrey led sorties outside the city walls against Kerbogha, but both were beaten back. Godfrey barely escaped with his life, but Roger was not so lucky. In a morbid act of mimicry, Kerbogha's soldiers stuck Roger's head on a pike and exhibited it as if it were a battle standard.<sup>62</sup> This scare tactic paid off. The crusaders knew that their likeliest outcomes were either starvation or death in battle, so it is no surprise that many common soldiers attempted to flee. Knowing that their only opportunity for survival lay in retaining their numbers, Bohemond and Adhemar locked the gates of the city to discourage deserters.<sup>63</sup> As the profane and pious leader of the crusade, Adhemar was widely sought after for guidance during times of such difficulty. After the earthquake on 30 December, Adhemar managed to salvage the army's morale through a liturgical procession, but the crisis of the second siege required a more creative remedy for the army's malaise.

### The Holy Lance of Antioch

---

Barely a week after the "Second Siege of Antioch" began, an otherwise unknown Provençal priest named Peter Bartholomew regaled Adhemar and Raymond of Toulouse

---

<sup>61</sup> On famine and suffering during the second siege of Antioch, see Robert the Monk, trans. by Carol Sweetenham, trans. *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade* (Aldershot, 2005), 157; *Gesta Francorum*, 62.

<sup>62</sup> Albert of Aachen, IV, ch.27, p.152.

<sup>63</sup> Raymond d'Aguilers, 56-57; James A. Brundage, "Adhémar of Puy: The Bishop and His Critics," 205.

with a miraculous tale. Claiming that he had several mystical encounters with St. Andrew beginning the day after Adhemar's standard was lost, Peter asserted that the ghostly apostle revealed the location of the Holy Lance to him.<sup>64</sup> According to this tale, the lance that pierced Jesus' side while he was upon the cross was hidden underneath the Basilica of St. Peter in Antioch.<sup>65</sup> The traditional, epic narrative of the Holy Lance of Antioch suggests that its discovery lifted the spirits of the downtrodden and starving crusaders, prompting the army to break out of the city to valiantly face their besiegers head on with the lance as their battle standard.<sup>66</sup> The crusaders believed that the possession of the Holy Lance enabled God to intercede for them in battle, instilling in them such unshakeable confidence that the crusader army beat the odds and defeated Kerbogha's massive army.<sup>67</sup> Less than two months later, the man who bore the lance in the battle, Adhemar, died from an epidemic spreading through Antioch.<sup>68</sup>

In a letter to the Pope Urban II on 11 September 1098, all of the crusader princes lamented Adhemar's death, but they also expressed their joy at the discovery of the lance.<sup>69</sup> However, Adhemar's death left a vacuum in both the secular and spiritual

---

<sup>64</sup> Raymond d'Aguilers, 51-54; Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 221-223.

<sup>65</sup> Raymond d'Aguilers, 5.

<sup>66</sup> *Gesta Francorum*, 68; Raymond d'Aguilers, 58; Robert the Monk, 57; Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 225; Marius Kjørmo, *The Holy Lance of Antioch: A Study on the Impact of a Perceived Relic during the First Crusade*, Master's Thesis, (University of Bergen, Spring 2009), 66; Thomas Asbridge, "The Holy Lance of Antioch: Power, Devotion, and Memory on the First Crusade," *Reading Medieval Studies* 33 (2007), 4.

<sup>67</sup> Raymond d'Aguilers, 56; Albert of Aachen, IV, ch. 52-53, p. 172-173. Raymond claims that the lance made them invincible while Albert claims that "God and the Lord Jesus were at work" because of the use of the lance in battle.

<sup>68</sup> Albert of Aachen, V, ch. 4, p. 179-180; Raymond d'Aguilers, 66; *Gesta Francorum*, 74; Fulcher of Chartres, ch. 23, p. 107; Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 249-250; James A. Brundage, "Adhémar of Puy: The Bishop and His Critics," 201-202. Adhemar received unanimous praise posthumously in the chronicles.

<sup>69</sup> Fulcher of Chartres, ch. 24, 107-112; Thomas Asbridge, "The Holy Lance of Antioch: Power, Devotion, and Memory on the First Crusade," *Reading Medieval Studies* 33 (2007), 12; David S. Bachrach, *Religion and the Conduct of War c. 300 - c. 1215*, 116.

leadership of the First Crusade.<sup>70</sup> While Bohemond and Raymond of Toulouse competed for temporal control of Antioch in Adhemar's absence, Peter Bartholomew and the Norman chaplain Arnulf of Chocques vied to be the next spiritual leader of the campaign.<sup>71</sup> Arnulf called Peter Bartholomew's credibility into question by impugning the lance's authenticity.<sup>72</sup> Peter was subsequently subjected to an ordeal – a trial by fire – to prove his truthfulness.<sup>73</sup> Raymond d'Aguilers claimed that Peter Bartholomew was unburnt by the flames, contending that Peter was mortally wounded by the mob who rushed to greet him as he emerged from the fire intact.<sup>74</sup> With this interpretation of the story, Raymond d'Aguilers could maintain the lance's authenticity even despite the apparent outcome of the ordeal: Peter's death. Fulcher of Chartres and Ralph of Caen have a more plausible version of Peter's ordeal, in which he simply died because of his burns.<sup>75</sup> No matter the cause of Peter's death, the trial by fire was an ignominious blow to the reputation of the Holy Lance of Antioch.

Among the primary and secondary scholarship of the First Crusade, the discovery of the Holy Lance is one of the most contentious events of the expedition. With nearly a millennium of hindsight, modern readers readily doubt the authenticity of the relic. As Peter's trial reveals, many contemporaries had their doubts as well. Despite being a

---

<sup>70</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 251. Asbridge focuses on Adhemar's death and the military leaders who succeeded him. See also John France, *Victory in the East*, 18. France focuses on the ecclesiastical leaders who succeeded him.

<sup>71</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 251, 290; John France, *Victory in the East*, 18. Raymond d'Aguilers, 96. Raymond refers to Arnulf as the "chief of the unbelievers" of the lance. Also see Benedicta Ward, *Miracles and the Medieval Mind: Theory, Record, and Event 1000-1215* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1982), 203-204.

<sup>72</sup> Ralph of Caen, ch. 108, p. 126.

<sup>73</sup> Raymond d'Aguilers, 100-103; Fulcher of Chartres, ch. 18, pp. 100-101; Ralph of Caen ch. 108, p. 126; Albert of Aachen, V, ch. 32, p. 196-197. Ordeals were gradually being phased out in this period in favor of legal procedure. See David Luscombe and Jonathan Riley-Smith, "Introduction", *The New Cambridge Medieval History IV c.1024-1198* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 3. A detailed look at the trial will come in Chapter 3.

<sup>74</sup> Raymond d'Aguilers, 101-2; Albert of Aachen, V, ch. 32, p. 196-197. AA notes the Provençals' dubious claim about Peter's survival.

<sup>75</sup> Fulcher of Chartres, ch. 18, p. 100; Ralph of Caen, ch. 108, p. 126.

Provençal himself, Adhemar harbored his own suspicions. Adhemar was one of the best educated men on the crusade and he likely viewed Peter Bartholomew as an illiterate, unreliable fanatic.<sup>76</sup> As previously mentioned, Adhemar's skepticism was reported by two chroniclers, notably Raymond d'Aguilers, who was a firm believer in the relic.<sup>77</sup> Yet a number of chroniclers describe how Adhemar carried the Holy Lance of Antioch in battle against Kerbogha.<sup>78</sup> Historians cannot determine how Adhemar would have dealt with the animosity between Peter Bartholomew and Arnulf of Chocques; Adhemar was dead soon after the Battle of Antioch and could not influence the crusaders' discourse regarding the lance.<sup>79</sup>

Adhemar's ultimate opinion of the lance may never be known, but as the foremost ecclesiastical-military leader of the First Crusade, he was charged with deciding the lance's fate upon its discovery. Whether or not Adhemar believed in the relic's validity, he and his leaders were desperate to rally the army for a final stand against Kerbogha. The motivational power of a holy relic was exactly what Adhemar needed to accomplish this objective. Throughout the expedition, the crusaders sought Adhemar to revive their morale and he could not forfeit this opportunity to save the army from annihilation within the walls of Antioch.<sup>80</sup> Despite his skepticism, Adhemar likely collaborated in the production of the myth of the Holy Lance of Antioch to precipitate the most daring battle

---

<sup>76</sup> Stephen Runciman, "The Holy Lance Found At Antioch," *Analecta Bollandiana* 68 (1950), 199. Runciman's paper is the most important piece of scholarship to my thesis. Thomas Asbridge, "The Holy Lance of Antioch: Power, Devotion, and Memory on the First Crusade," *Reading Medieval Studies* 33 (2007), 5-6.

<sup>77</sup> Raymond d'Aguilers, 54, 96-97; Fulcher of Chartres, ch. 18, 100.

<sup>78</sup> Robert the Monk, 167; *Gesta Francorum*, 68 claims that Adhemar himself bore the lance in battle. Raymond d'Aguilers, 63 claims he bore it himself.

<sup>79</sup> Runciman, "The Holy Lance Found At Antioch," 200-201; James A. Brundage, "Adhemar of Puy: The Bishop and His Critics," 206. Brundage also wonders what Adhemar would have done if he were alive to mediate Peter Bartholomew's trial by fire.

<sup>80</sup> For Adhemar's pre-battle sermon before Nicaea, see Albert of Aachen, II, ch. 27, pp. 63-64. At Antioch, the crusaders "hungered for a miracle to console them" and the discovery of the lance was it. Also see, Runciman, "The Holy Lance Found At Antioch," 197; Bachrach 112-113.

of the First Crusade. Upon its excavation, the Holy Lance of Antioch was physically and figuratively constructed as a battle standard.

### The Fabrication of the Holy Lance of Antioch

The chroniclers agree upon very little in regard to the excavation of the Holy Lance of Antioch, but one of the few uncontroversial facts is that the Provençals unearthed a metal object beneath the Basilica of St. Peter in Antioch sometime in the middle of June in 1098.<sup>81</sup> The Holy Lance's discovery in the Antiochene Basilica of St. Peter was significant, especially for those who believed that the relic was revealed to the crusaders in their hour of need. Because the pope resided in the Roman Basilica of St. Peter, the Antiochene Basilica would have felt like a spiritual home away from home.<sup>82</sup> Before the discovery of the lance, the crusaders used the church in special ceremonies, such as the funeral of Roger of Barneville, whose body was recovered after being mutilated by Kerbogha's army.<sup>83</sup> As the holiest church between Constantinople and Jerusalem, the Antiochene St. Peter's was the most logical venue for any efforts to rally the beleaguered crusader army. Arranging for the dig to occur in the basilica, the Provençal conspirators knew that they could pass off the discovery of the Holy Lance in this location as an act of divine providence.<sup>84</sup>

---

<sup>81</sup> Raymond d'Aguilers, 57; *Gesta Francorum*, 65; Robert the Monk, 163; Albert of Aachen, IV, ch. 43, pp. 165-166; Ralph of Caen ch. 100-101, pp. 118-120; Anna Komnene, XI, ch. 7, pp. 314-315; Fulcher of Chartres ch. 18, pp. 99-101. The date for the discovery given by Raymond is June 14th, 1098 and is widely accepted by primary and secondary scholars. However, Raymond is the only source for this date, and we cannot actually be sure when the excavation precisely occurred.

<sup>82</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 222.

<sup>83</sup> Albert of Aachen, IV, ch. 28, p. 153; Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading*, 76

<sup>84</sup> Ralph of Caen, ch. 102, p. 120. However, Ralph of Caen wisely notes that Longinus never visited the Antioch and therefore never brought the lance to the city.

The chroniclers hotly debated the authenticity of the Holy Lance of Antioch and their respective opinions can be gleaned from their divergent views on the relic's physical form.<sup>85</sup> Chroniclers who believed that the relic was authentic claimed that it was discovered intact as a complete weapon.<sup>86</sup> The skeptical chroniclers claimed that the diggers merely found an iron shard that they attached to a pole, meaning that the lance had no divine history.<sup>87</sup> Below, I aim to approximate the physical form of the Holy Lance of Antioch by comparing the chroniclers' testimonies, historical precedents, and secondary scholarship.<sup>88</sup> With this approach, the factual aspects of the excavation can be identified and the true legacy of the relic can be understood.

The most plausible theory about the lance's physical form is that it was not discovered as a complete lance, but rather as one of the "Holy Nails" used to crucify Jesus.<sup>89</sup> According to this theory, this "Holy Nail" was "beaten by the crusaders into the form of a lance" underneath the Basilica of St. Peter.<sup>90</sup> The "Holy Nails" were impaled in Jesus' extremities during the crucifixion, so their spiritual significance as Christian relics

---

<sup>85</sup> See Thomas Asbridge, "The Holy Lance of Antioch: Power, Devotion and Memory on the First Crusade," 11-14; Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 226; Marius Kjørmø, *The Holy Lance of Antioch: A Study on the Impact of a Perceived Relic during the First Crusade*, Master's Thesis, (University of Bergen, Spring 2009), 70, 95; David S. Bachrach, *Religion and the Conduct of War c. 300 - c. 1215*, 112-117. Asbridge and Kjørmø emphasize that the chronological gap between the discovery of the lance and the Battle of Antioch. I refute will refute this claim later.

<sup>86</sup> *Gesta Francorum*, 65; Robert the Monk, 163; Raymond d'Aguilers, 57; Albert of Aachen, IV, ch. 43, pp. 165-166. Raymond claims that he "kissed the point of the lance as it barely protruded from the ground." Raymond implies in this passage that the lance was discovered intact, but he omits whether or not the entire pole was excavated along with the spear tip he kissed. This distinction is crucial for my later discussion about the physical form of the lance.

<sup>87</sup> Ralph of Caen ch. 100-101, pp. 118-120; Anna Komnene XI, ch. 7, pp. 314-315; Fulcher of Chartres, ch. 18, pp. 99-101. Ralph claims that Peter Bartholomew planted an Arab spear tip in the ground and fooled the other diggers, while Anna Komnene describes the relic as genuine but calls it the "Holy Nail" instead of the Holy Lance. Fulcher of Chartres was skeptical but describes it as an intact lance.

<sup>88</sup> Stephen Runciman, "The Holy Lance Found At Antioch," *Analecta Bollandiana* 68 (1950), 202-203. Here, Runciman proposes the "Holy Nail" fashioning theory that underpins my historical interpretation of the Lance of Antioch.

<sup>89</sup> Stephen Runciman, "The Holy Lance Found At Antioch," 202-203

<sup>90</sup> Stephen Runciman, "The Holy Lance Found At Antioch," 202-203

was not substantially different than that of the Holy Lance.<sup>91</sup> The most salient difference between a Holy Lance and a spear assembled using a Holy Nail is numerical. Only one lance was used to stab Jesus on the cross, but multiple spears could be assembled from the several Holy Nails used in the crucifixion.<sup>92</sup> If the Holy Lance of Antioch were actually a spear fashioned from a Holy Nail, it would have been a legitimate relic of the crucifixion that did not conflict with the other, more authoritative Holy Lance in Constantinople.<sup>93</sup>

This theory about the Holy Lance of Antioch's physical composition is dubbed the "Byzantine view" because the evidence for it is derived from the primary Byzantine chronicle of the First Crusade.<sup>94</sup> Anna Komnene, the daughter of the Byzantine Emperor Alexios Komnenos, chronicled her father's deeds in the one of the first histories to be written by a woman, titled *The Alexiad*.<sup>95</sup> Writing nearly fifty years after the event, Anna Komnene claims that the twelve excavators dug up "a Holy Nail" underneath the basilica.<sup>96</sup> Anna Komnene is not the most reliable chronicler; in the same paragraph in which she describes the discovery, she conflates Peter Bartholomew with Peter the Hermit and Adhemar.<sup>97</sup> It is possible that Anna Komnene simply confused the Holy

---

<sup>91</sup> Stephen Runciman, "The Holy Lance Found At Antioch," 202

<sup>92</sup> Stephen Runciman, "The Holy Lance Found At Antioch," 202. "There could only be one Holy Lance, but there could be several Holy Nails."

<sup>93</sup> Stephen Runciman, "The Holy Lance Found At Antioch," 202.

<sup>94</sup> Stephen Runciman, "The Holy Lance Found At Antioch," 202-203. Runciman uses the words "Byzantine view" when describing this theory, so I have used it as a term.

<sup>95</sup> Peter Frankopan, "Introduction" to *The Alexiad*, by Anna Komnene, ed. by Peter Frankopan and trans. by E.R.A Sewter (London: Penguin Classics, 2009), p. ix, According to Frankopan, *The Alexiad* is the earliest historical work written by a female.

<sup>96</sup> Anna Komnene, *The Alexiad* ed. by Peter Frankopan and trans. by E.R.A Sewter (London, 2009), 314.

<sup>97</sup> Anna Komnene, 314, footnote 16. Also see Stephen Runciman, "The Holy Lance Found At Antioch," 202 ft. 2

Lance with one of the Holy Nails.<sup>98</sup> However, Anna had an incentive to impugn the Holy Lance of Antioch because her father possessed the Holy Lance of Constantinople.<sup>99</sup> At the very least, the physical form of the Holy Lance of Antioch was ambiguous and disputed.

The “Byzantine view” is further supported by a historical precedent: the lance held by the Holy Roman Emperors. According to Bishop Liutprand of Cremona, who represented the Holy Roman Empire at the Byzantine court in the tenth century, several Holy Nails were attached a spear acquired by King Henry the Fowler. This spear, which reportedly belonged to Emperor Constantine, had a very unique composition: the Holy Nails were attached to the spear blade in the shape of a cross, but the nails were not used as the sharpened tip of the weapon. At some point, this relic became associated with the patron saint of the Holy Roman Empire, St. Maurice, so it was given the name of the Holy Lance of St. Maurice. The Holy Roman Emperors used this lance for ceremonial purposes long before the First Crusade, and its symbolic power derived from the fact that the Holy Nails made it a holy weapon.<sup>100</sup> Therefore, the Provençal diggers at Antioch could have made an average spear a divine relic by attached a Holy Nail to it.

The “Byzantine view” is further supported by the fact that it explains away discrepancies in chronicles regarding the Holy Lance of Antioch’s discovery. Raymond d’Aguilers, the only eyewitness to the excavation of the lance, notes that he “kissed the

---

<sup>98</sup> Other scholars have interpreted Komnene’s description of a “Holy Nail” to be a criticism of the crusaders’ religious fervor. Thomas Asbridge, “The Holy Lance of Antioch: Power, Devotion, and Memory on the First Crusade,” *Reading Medieval Studies* 33 (2007), 8 ft. 20 mentions Anna Komnene.

<sup>99</sup> Stephen Runciman, “The Holy Lance Found At Antioch,” 202-203.

<sup>100</sup> Liutprand of Cremona, *Antapodosis* (Tit for Tat), trans. by F.A. Wright (New York: E.P. Dutton & Company, 1930), IV ch. 24-25, pp. 159-160; Laura Hibbard Loomis, “The Holy Relics of Charlemagne and King Athelstan: The Lances of Longinus and St. Mauricius,” 440-446; Stephen Runciman, “The Holy Lance Found At Antioch,” *Analecta Bollandiana* 68 (1950), 203. I initially thought I independently made a fantastic connection between the Holy Nails on German spear and the Holy Lance of Antioch, but then I realized Runciman had made this point fifty years before me. Loomis specifically says that the presence of the Nails of the Passion in the spear gave it its holiness.

point of the Lance as it barely protruded from the ground.”<sup>101</sup> Raymond was the most vocal proponent of the lance’s authenticity, claiming that he personally carried it into the fray against Kerbogha.<sup>102</sup> Raymond does not explicitly state that the lance was fashioned from a Holy Nail, but from the evidence he presents, we can only verify that he excavated an iron tip. Therefore, Raymond’s narrative leaves open the possibility that the diggers attached the iron tip to a pole in order to make a lance. Delicately avoiding the fact that the lance was not found intact, Raymond omits any other physical description of the object. If Raymond intentionally misled his readers to believe that an entire lance was excavated underneath the Basilica, then he did so without telling any explicit lies.

Ralph of Caen, the most virulent critic of the lance’s authenticity, claims that Peter Bartholomew intentionally planted “the iron tip from an Arab spear” at the site of the excavation while no one was watching.<sup>103</sup> By claiming that Peter was the mastermind behind the ruse, Ralph leaves open the possibility that the other conspirators believed the iron tip to be a Holy Nail. However, the excavators would have still had to fashion a lance using the Holy Nail in order to delude the crusaders into believing it was the Holy Lance. Therefore, Ralph’s account of the lance aligns with the “Byzantine view.” Raymond d’Aguilers and Ralph of Caen stand on opposite ends of the spectrum of belief pertaining to the Lance of Antioch, but the “Byzantine view” reveals the common ground between these two chroniclers.

---

<sup>101</sup> Raymond d’Aguilers, 57.

<sup>102</sup> Raymond d’Aguilers, 63

<sup>103</sup> Ralph of Caen, ch. 100, p. 119; Marius Kjørmo, *The Holy Lance of Antioch: A Study on the Impact of a Perceived Relic during the First Crusade*, Master’s Thesis, (University of Bergen, Spring 2009), 35, 42. Kjørmo also sees this definition of the lance to be a sign of Ralph’s bias. Kjørmo notes how it is likely that Peter Bartholomew fabricated evidence to support the lance, but he does not mention Runciman’s theory. Ralph also points out that Longinus never came to Antioch, so the lance would not have been brought there: Ralph of Caen, ch. 102, p. 120.

Given the strong textual and historical evidence for the “Byzantine view,” the Provençal excavators fabricated the precise physical form and the ideological interpretation of the Holy Lance of Antioch. One should not go so far as to say the lance was a “fraudulent” relic because, after all, the excavators may have believed that they truly discovered a Holy Nail. Instead of outrightly lying about the divine power of the relic, they may have simply misled the crusaders into thinking that a Holy Nail was a Holy Lance.

In any case, the Provençals *had* to claim that they discovered the Holy Lance because they could not contradict Peter Bartholomew’s narrative.<sup>104</sup> In searching for an opportunity to spiritually motivate the crusaders, the Provençals could have picked from a number of visionaries. But because they decided upon Peter Bartholomew, they had to uphold his story.

A Holy Nail would not have been the appropriate battle standard for an army lacking enthusiasm; nails were used for torture and crucifixion, but lances were used for warfare.

Seizing the opportunity to spur the crusaders into a last-ditch effort against Kerbogha, Adhemar downplayed his skepticism of Peter Bartholomew and bore the Holy Lance of Antioch beside him in battle.<sup>105</sup> The “discovery” of the lance can be called a “pious fraud” because the Provençal conspirators may not have thought they were forging an entirely apocryphal relic.<sup>106</sup> By transforming a Holy Nail into the Holy Lance, however,

---

<sup>104</sup> Raymond d’Aguilers, 53-54; *Gesta Francorum*, 59-60.

<sup>105</sup> James A. Brundage, “Adhémar of Puy: The Bishop and His Critics,” 206. Brundage emphasizes Adhemar’s skepticism, but he could not have been that skeptical if the lance were carried at least beside him, if not beside him.

<sup>106</sup> The term “pious fraud” comes from Stephen Runciman, “The Holy Lance Found At Antioch,” *Analecta Bollandiana* 68 (1950), 206.

the Provençal diggers knew that they were designing a relic that was meant to be used in battle.

### The Discovery of the Lance as the Impetus for Battle

Narratively speaking, many chroniclers place their accounts of the discovery of the lance in different places, which jeopardizes the connection between the relic and the Battle of Antioch. For example, Raymond d'Aguilers and the anonymous *Gesta* author share the same, plausible chronology. According to them, Peter Bartholomew had a series of visions spanning much of the Siege of Antioch, and he only approached Adhemar and Raymond of Toulouse on 10 June during the nadir of the battle.<sup>107</sup> After their initial liaison, the Provençal diggers are not mentioned for a few pages in either chronicle. It is only after shaming notable deserters from the army that both chroniclers resume their discussion of the Holy Lance and describe its excavation.<sup>108</sup> The most skeptical chroniclers do not disjoint their narratives to examine the relic. In particular, Fulcher of Chartres and Ralph of Caen compress their accounts of the lance discovery and immediately assert its fraudulence.<sup>109</sup> Fulcher sequentially lumps together the discovery of the lance with Peter Bartholomew's trial by fire in order to emphasize its invalidity.<sup>110</sup> Furthermore, his account of the discovery is placed before the arrival Kerbogha's force, thus removing any causal relationship between the lance discovery and the Battle of

---

<sup>107</sup> Raymond d'Aguilers, 53-54; *Gesta Francorum*, 59-60.

<sup>108</sup> Raymond d'Aguilers, 57; *Gesta Francorum*, 65.

<sup>109</sup> Fulcher of Chartres, ch. 18, p. 100; Ralph of Caen, *The Gesta Tancredi of Ralph of Caen: A History of the Normans on the First Crusade* trans. by Bernard S. Bachrach and David S. Bachrach, (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing, 2005), ch. 100-102, pp. 118-121.

<sup>110</sup> Fulcher of Chartres, ch. 18, pp. 100-101.

Antioch.<sup>111</sup> In a similar vein, Ralph of Caen places his account of the lance *after* the battle.<sup>112</sup>

Historians have traditionally considered the Holy Lance of Antioch to be the tangible source of spiritual motivation for the crusaders to face Kerbogha's army, but recent scholars have seized upon the chroniclers' divergent chronologies in order to assert that the discovery of the Holy Lance of Antioch was *not* a direct impetus for the battle. In particular, there is a widely-recognized chronological gap between the lance's discovery and the engagement.<sup>113</sup> Raymond d'Aguilers claims that the lance was discovered under St. Peter's Basilica on 14 June 1098, but historians claim that the battle was not fought until 28 June 1098.<sup>114</sup>

In fact, Raymond d'Aguilers was one of the first people to attempt to justify the delay. Raymond invented a dubious oration in his narrative of the discovery of the lance, claiming that St. Andrew required the crusaders to wait for over a week (at least 21 June) until they were allowed to "celebrate" the discovery of the lance.<sup>115</sup> This oration enables Raymond to gloss over the temporal gap in his narrative, but there is no way of knowing if the crusaders heeded this command.<sup>116</sup> Despite Raymond's preemptive attempt to explain the gap, the question still remains: if the lance's discovery directly encouraged

---

<sup>111</sup> Fulcher of Chartres, ch. 19, p. 101.

<sup>112</sup> Ralph of Caen, ch. 100-102, p. 118-120.

<sup>113</sup> Thomas Asbridge, "The Holy Lance of Antioch: Power, Devotion and Memory on the First Crusade," *Reading Medieval Studies* 33 (2007), 11-14; Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 226; Marius Kjørmo, *The Holy Lance of Antioch: A Study on the Impact of a Perceived Relic during the First Crusade*, Master's Thesis, (University of Bergen, Spring 2009), 71-72. See John France, *Victory in the East*, 278-9 where he also highlights the chronological gap and doubts the lance's impact. Asbridge seizes on this chronological gap to categorically reject the idea that the discovery of the Holy Lance of Antioch was the impetus for battle.

<sup>114</sup> Raymond d'Aguilers, 57.

<sup>115</sup> Raymond d'Aguilers, 58; Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 226.

<sup>116</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 226; Thomas Asbridge, "The Holy Lance of Antioch: Power, Devotion, and Memory on the First Crusade," *Reading Medieval Studies* 33 (2007), 11.

the crusaders to break the siege, why did the army wait two weeks before they faced the enemy outside the walls?<sup>117</sup>

However, there is an overlooked nuance in Raymond's oration in which the crusaders may have been actively prevented from storming out of the gates immediately after the discovery.<sup>118</sup> According to Raymond d'Aguilers, St. Andrew proclaimed, "the Lord orders you to celebrate the date of the discovery of His Lance on the octave of the following week."<sup>119</sup> I doubt whether an entire army could contain its jubilation at the discovery of a holy relic for two weeks, however, the Provençal excavators may not have announced the discovery of the relic to the entire army in order to observe the weeklong hiatus that St. Andrew commanded. With this conjecture, the army would not have learned about the lance until 21 June, which would have left the crusaders with only one week to prepare for the battle.<sup>120</sup> Therefore, the chronological gap between the discovery and the battle may have been only half as long as commonly believed. A hiatus of one week would have given the army plenty of time to prepare for battle, and the attrition of enthusiasm for the lance would be minimal.

Furthermore, it is not clear on what specific day the Battle of Antioch *actually* occurred. 28 June is the commonly accepted date of the battle, but it may have also happened on 26 June.<sup>121</sup> The anonymous author of the *Gesta Francorum* is quite vague

---

<sup>117</sup> Thomas Asbridge, "The Holy Lance of Antioch: Power, Devotion, and Memory on the First Crusade," *Reading Medieval Studies* 33 (2007), 11; Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 226.

<sup>118</sup> Raymond d'Aguilers, 58; Thomas Asbridge, "The Holy Lance of Antioch: Power, Devotion, and Memory on the First Crusade," *Reading Medieval Studies* 33 (2007), 11. Although the oration must be read askance, it still counts as evidence against Asbridge's claim that the crusaders were actively prevented.

<sup>119</sup> Raymond d'Aguilers, 58.

<sup>120</sup> Thomas Asbridge, "The Holy Lance of Antioch: Power, Devotion, and Memory on the First Crusade," *Reading Medieval Studies* 33 (2007), 11. Here, Asbridge highlights the chronological gap between the discovery and the battle.

<sup>121</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 226. Asbridge does not specifically cite any piece of scholarship that claims the battle was fought on June 28. See Asbridge's dates for the discovery and the battle in the middle of the page do not contain citations. Hans Eberhard Mayer also states that the battle occurred on June 28: Hans Eberhard Mayer, *The*

about the chronology after the lance's discovery, but the *Gesta* author also describes how a council met to prepare for battle in between the discovery and the battle.<sup>122</sup> There is truly no way of knowing how long either the council meeting or the battle preparations reported in the *Gesta* took, so the precise date for the battle that the leaders agreed upon cannot be determined.<sup>123</sup> Furthermore, the date of the lance's discovery, 14 June 1098, is only provided by Raymond d'Aguilers.<sup>124</sup> We have no other primary sources with which to crosscheck Raymond because he provides, by far, the most detail on the Holy Lance in the first place. The specific dates for the lance's discovery and for the battle are actually ambiguous, and they cannot be used to dispute the motivational impact of the relic.

As leading figures of the Provençal contingent, the excavators were certainly interested in buoying the confidence of their starving soldiers. Throughout the First Crusade, Adhemar consistently consoled crusaders in dire straits, giving pre-battle sermons and personally leading cavalry charges. During their eight-month sojourn at Antioch, Adhemar galvanized his troops to capture the Iron Bridge and oversaw three days of penance after the catastrophic loss of his standard and the subsequent earthquake. Most likely, the army looked to Adhemar for guidance in the midst of the defeatist milieu of the "Second Siege of Antioch," and the discovery of the lance gave Adhemar the power to inspire the crusaders to action. Just before the crusaders opened the gates to face

---

*Crusades* trans. by John Gillingham (Oxford, 1988), 56 ft. 22, 57. But, in discussing the events before the battle of Antioch, Mayer cites Stephen Runciman, who claims that the battle occurred on June 26: Stephen Runciman, "The Holy Lance Found At Antioch," *Analecta Bollandiana* 68 (1950), 197.

<sup>122</sup> *Gesta Francorum*, 65-66, 67 ft 2. Rosalind Hill's claim that the chronology is vague. Asbridge claims that the *Gesta* implies that the battle occurred immediately after the discovery, but clearly he is wrong because it is vague: Thomas Asbridge, "The Holy Lance of Antioch: Power, Devotion, and Memory on the First Crusade," *Reading Medieval Studies* 33 (2007), 11.

<sup>123</sup> Marius Kjørmo, *The Holy Lance of Antioch: A Study on the Impact of a Perceived Relic during the First Crusade*, Master's Thesis, (University of Bergen, Spring 2009), 70-71; Thomas Asbridge, "The Holy Lance of Antioch: Power, Devotion, and Memory on the First Crusade," *Reading Medieval Studies* 33 (2007), 11-12. Asbridge and Kjørmo carefully study how long medieval battle preparations took to serve their arguments. However, they have taken the date of the battle for granted.

<sup>124</sup> Raymond d'Aguilers, 57.

Kerbogha, Adhemar is reported to have given a sermon to the army with the lance in his hand.<sup>125</sup> As the designated speaker at Antioch, Adhemar most likely would have given the announcement of the lance's discovery as well.

If Adhemar were to use the relic to promote battle, he needed to carefully craft his speech to the army. In this speech, Adhemar would have called the relic the Holy Lance and he would have professed his support for it. Thus, it is entirely plausible that Adhemar, along with the other excavators, delayed the announcement of the lance's discovery, from 14 June to 21 June, in order to tailor the content of the message to uplift their beleaguered soldiers and inspire them to fight. Riding out of Antioch to face Kerbogha on either 26 June or 28 June, Adhemar deployed the hallowed relic for its designated purpose: battle.<sup>126</sup>

#### The Standards at the Battle of Antioch

As a weapon and a holy relic, the Holy Lance of Antioch was the appropriate battle standard for the warrior bishop. However, Adhemar carried not one, but two battle standards as he charged into the most pivotal battle of the First Crusade. The previous winter, Adhemar's nameless standard bearer was killed and his banner of the Virgin Mary was taken. In late June, Adhemar brought a new standard bearer in tow: Heraclius of Polignac. Most likely, Heraclius was related to the lords of Polignac.<sup>127</sup> In the early days of Adhemar's ecclesiastical administration, the lords of Polignac challenged his

---

<sup>125</sup> Robert the Monk, 169. As the editor's note on ft. 25, this sermon is not mentioned in any other chronicler, not even the *Gesta*.

<sup>126</sup> The differences in dates comes from my aforementioned analysis of the competing dates for the battle.

<sup>127</sup> John France, *Victory in the East*, 45-46 ft. 58. France explicitly states that Heraclius, a member of the House of Fay-Chapteuil, was related to the Lords of Polignac. Also see John France, *Victory in the East*, 285.

election as bishop, but Adhemar's family forcibly suppressed the Polignacs.<sup>128</sup> Since Heraclius served as Adhemar's standard bearer, one of the most honorific roles for a knight, it appears that the two families were reconciled by the time of the First Crusade. Unlike his predecessor, Heraclius of Polignac earned a name for himself in the chronicles because he did not let Adhemar's standard fall into the hands of the enemy. In the midst of battle, Heraclius sustained a wound, but he gave the standard to someone else lest he be killed.<sup>129</sup> Thus, Heraclius avoided losing Adhemar's second standard, preserving their division's prestige and *esprit de corps*.

However, which standard did Heraclius bear on behalf of Adhemar that fateful day? There is no evidence that Adhemar's banner of the Virgin Mary was actually replaced after it was captured. During the eight-month siege, the crusaders surely had enough time to weave a new banner, but did they have enough materials or expertise? Raymond d'Aguilers describes how the Turks defiled the banner of the Virgin Mary upon its capture, but he does not mention the banner afterward.<sup>130</sup> Furthermore, Raymond d'Aguilers merely calls Heraclius a "standard-bearer," which is a broad term that does not require one to carry a banner.<sup>131</sup>

Perhaps the standard that Heraclius bore was not the banner of the Virgin Mary. If Heraclius' standard were the Holy Lance of Antioch, Heraclius would have bequeathed the lance to another soldier because it clearly survived the battle intact.<sup>132</sup> However, I cannot empirically determine which standard Heraclius carried. It is simply a matter of

---

<sup>128</sup> John France, *Victory in the East*, 45.

<sup>129</sup> Raymond d'Aguilers, 63; Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading*, 76.

<sup>130</sup> Raymond d'Aguilers, 40.

<sup>131</sup> Raymond d'Aguilers, 63.

<sup>132</sup> Raymond d'Aguilers, 63. As Raymond claims, Heraclius bequeathed the banner to another soldier.

speculation. At the very least, a member of the clergy carried the lance and not a layman: the anonymous *Gesta* author and Robert the Monk both claim that Adhemar, a bishop, personally bore the lance; Albert of Aachen states that a “certain cleric” carried the relic; and Raymond d’Aguilers, who was a priest, asserts that he bore the lance.<sup>133</sup> As a knight, Heraclius would not have carried the lance. Based on the sources, the most reasonable conjecture is that there were two battle standards in Adhemar’s division during the Battle of Antioch: one carried by a priest and one carried by Heraclius. The former standard was definitely the Holy Lance of Antioch and the latter standard was most likely the banner of the Virgin Mary.

Adhemar’s standards were two sides of the same coin. The banner of the Virgin Mary was a militaristic symbol imbued with religious significance and the Holy Lance of Antioch was a relic used for making war. Before the First Crusade, banners and relics were relegated to their separate secular and spiritual spheres, but the two material cultures converged at the Battle of Antioch.<sup>134</sup> A chronological relationship between the two standards neatly summarizes their relationship. On 29 December 1097, Adhemar’s first banner was stolen by the Turks, and the next day, Peter Bartholomew received his first visions of St. Andrew and the lance. Almost exactly six months later, Adhemar carried both standards in the fateful battle that saved the crusader army. Thus, banners and relics should be studied holistically in regard to the battle standards of the First Crusade.

The banner of the Virgin Mary and the Holy Lance of Antioch embodied the dual identity of the “two swords;” moreover, Adhemar himself was the First Crusade

---

<sup>133</sup> *Gesta Francorum*, 68; Robert the Monk, 173; Albert of Aachen, IV, ch. 47, p. 168; Raymond d’Aguilers, 63.

<sup>134</sup> Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, 43. Here, Erdmann notes that “relics and battle standards were two spheres that began to unite circa 1000 AD,” but he fails to analyze this relationship in the context of the First Crusade.

incarnate. Charged with personally guiding the expedition by Urban II, Adhemar's role was more dynamic than the clergymen and knights whom he accompanied. He was responsible for rallying the troops during the Battle of Antioch, and the most effective way to magnify their morale was to implement the archetypal battle standards of the era. In advance of the battle, Adhemar had to physically create both standards. The banner of the Virgin Mary was either rewoven or replaced after 29 December 1097. Based on the way that the "Byzantine view" aligns with the chroniclers' disparate accounts, it would be wise to assume that it is correct: the Holy Lance of Antioch was originally just a Holy Nail that the diggers *fashioned* into a Holy Lance.<sup>135</sup>

Through the banner and the lance, Adhemar took peaceful symbols of Christianity – the Virgin Mary and the crucifixion – and turned them into symbols of war. As the most vocal leader of the campaign, Adhemar was instrumental in the lance's fabrication and viewed the lance as an expedient, yet temporary tool to boost the crusaders' morale. By carrying the Holy Lance of Antioch with the banner of the Virgin Mary, Adhemar set aside his concerns in order to motivate the army to perish in battle rather than in hunger. As these battle standards were secular and spiritual symbols, Adhemar himself straddled the line between profanity and piety. Adhemar viewed the lance as a "single-use" relic, meaning that he could disavow it after it served its function in the Battle of Antioch.

Battle standards were as dynamic as the crusaders themselves, but soon after the Battle of Antioch, they became just as partisan. Like Tancred and Baldwin at Tarsus, Bohemond and Raymond of Toulouse jockeyed to have their banners raised above the

---

<sup>135</sup> Stephen Runciman, "The Holy Lance Found At Antioch," 203.

citadel of Antioch after Kerbogha's retreat.<sup>136</sup> The ensuing discord between the Norman and Provençal factions smoldered until the fire for Peter Bartholomew's trial was lit. In order to accomplish their objective – the capture of Jerusalem – the crusaders would have to set aside their differences. In the next chapter, we will explore how a detente was achieved through a liturgical procession around the walls of Jerusalem, in which each faction's idiosyncratic battle standard was given equal treatment.

---

<sup>136</sup> On Bohemond's blood red banner, see Albert of Aachen, IV, ch. 23, p. 149; Fulcher of Chartres, *Fulcher of Chartres: Historia Hierosolymitana, A History of the Expedition to Jerusalem* trans. and ed. by Harold S. Fink and Frances Rita Ryan, (New York: University of Tennessee Press, 1973), ch. 17, p. 99.

## Chapter 3

## Jerusalem

---

In the minds of the crusaders, the discovery of the Holy Lance of Antioch made victory against Kerbogha an inevitability. Casting aside the possibility of divine intervention, the Battle of Antioch was one of the most improbable military successes of the crusading era. Kerbogha's army was at least twice as large as the crusaders, who were beset by famine and exhaustion after months of besiegement. Taking advantage of Kerbogha's diffuse detachments of soldiers, the crusaders concentrated their forces at the Bridge Gate, which was five kilometers away from Kerbogha's camp. On 29 December 1097, Adhemar lost his banner of the Virgin Mary in a skirmish outside this gate.<sup>1</sup> On 28 June 1098, the crusaders engaged the enemy over this section of the walls once again. This time around, the crusaders bore not only Adhemar's banner, but also the Holy Lance of Antioch. These two battle standards were used in tandem, but the Holy Lance was recognized as the object that decided the battle. According to one chronicler, Kerbogha was rendered "motionless" by the sight of the Holy Lance and "the hearts of his men shook" because of the relic's hypnotic power.<sup>2</sup> In reality, Kerbogha could not have been mesmerized by the relic because he did not even get the chance to engage his enemy. The crusader attack on the Bridge Gate was so far away from Kerbogha's camp that by the time he mobilized his troops, the crusaders had already broken the Turkish vanguard.

---

<sup>1</sup> Raymond d'Aguilers, *Raymond d'Aguilers: Historia Francorum Qui Ceperunt Iherusalem*, trans. by John Hugh Hill and Laurita L. Hill (Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1968), 33.

<sup>2</sup> Albert of Aachen, *Albert of Aachen's History of the Journey to Jerusalem vol. 1*, trans. by Susan B. Edgington (Farnham, England: Ashgate Publishing, 2013), IV, ch. 52, p. 172.

Realizing that the crusaders had already secured a tactical victory, Kerbogha refrained from throwing the rest of his forces into the fray and prudently retreated.<sup>3</sup>

Instead of pursuing Kerbogha, the crusaders returned to the city to consolidate their holdings. A Turkish garrison still held the citadel of Antioch, which was a thorn in the side of the crusaders for the two weeks that they were shut inside the walls. Once the crusaders made their last-ditch effort on the Bridge Gate, the garrison raised a black banner over the citadel to warn Kerbogha that battle had commenced. After seeing Kerbogha's forces flee, the garrison surrendered the citadel to the crusaders who remained inside Antioch. Raymond of Toulouse, who was sick and could not fight, took this opportunity to pursue his territorial ambitions while the rest of the crusader princes were still engaged in battle. Lowering their black warning flag, the Turkish garrison accepted Raymond's banner as a token of protection.<sup>4</sup>

Like the banner exchange at Tarsus, the banner exchange at Antioch represented not only the capitulation of the enemy, but also a territorial claim to the city. Laden with plunder from Kerbogha's siege camps, the rest of the crusaders shuffled back inside the walls of Antioch to see Raymond's banner flying over the citadel. Bohemond, who orchestrated the infiltration of Antioch and led his troops against Kerbogha, was understandably furious. As the crusader with the strongest claim to the city, Bohemond convinced the Muslim garrison to swap Raymond's banner with his blood-red Norman

---

<sup>3</sup> This whole paragraph is based off of John France, *Victory in the East: A Military History of the First Crusade* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 284-294.

<sup>4</sup> Anonymous, *Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum* trans. and ed. by Rosalind Hill (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1962), 70-71

banner.<sup>5</sup> After this replacement, Raymond retaliated against Bohemond by sending his own troops to attack the Bridge Gate, which was occupied by fellow crusaders.<sup>6</sup>

The union produced by the discovery of the Holy Lance of Antioch was ephemeral. As displayed by the exchange of their banners atop the citadel of Antioch, Raymond and Bohemond's dispute over the city smoldered for months, sidelining the entire expedition. Jerusalem was only a few weeks' march away from Antioch, but it took until the spring of 1099 for the army to set off for the Holy City.

### Leaving Antioch

Bohemond was not initially forthcoming about his desire to rule Antioch.<sup>7</sup> As the crusader princes deliberated about rumors of an impending enemy force, Bohemond proposed that ““if [one of the princes] can capture the city or engineer its downfall by any means, by himself or by others, we will agree to give it to him.””<sup>8</sup> Bohemond's liaison with Firuz preceded this seemingly spontaneous proposal. This poorly disguised scheme failed to deceive the other princes, but they agreed to deliver the city to Bohemond so long as the Byzantine Emperor did not arrive and lay claim to Antioch himself.<sup>9</sup> Raymond of Toulouse was the one voice of dissent in this decision.<sup>10</sup>

Raymond of Toulouse entertained hopes of occupying the city for himself, but he masqueraded his ambitions just like Bohemond. Raymond was adamant that Antioch

---

<sup>5</sup> On Bohemond's blood red banner, see Albert of Aachen, IV, ch. 23, p. 149; Fulcher of Chartres, *Fulcher of Chartres: Historia Hierosolymitana, A History of the Expedition to Jerusalem* trans. and ed. by Harold S. Fink and Frances Rita Ryan, (New York: University of Tennessee Press, 1973), ch. 17, p. 99.

<sup>6</sup> Albert of Aachen, V, ch. 2, p. 178.

<sup>7</sup> *Gesta Francorum*, 44-47.

<sup>8</sup> *Gesta Francorum*, 44; Albert of Aachen, IV, ch. 15, p.144.

<sup>9</sup> *Gesta Francorum*, 45.

<sup>10</sup> Raymond d'Aguilers, 37.

should be returned to its former master, the Byzantine Emperor, claiming that each prince “swore upon the Cross of the Lord, the crown of thorns, and many holy relics that we would not hold without consent of the Emperor any city or castle in his dominion.”<sup>11</sup>

Many oaths were consecrated upon holy relics in this era, but the oaths that Raymond referred to occurred upon the army’s arrival in Constantinople.<sup>12</sup> The Emperor originally intended for the crusader princes to be his vassals, meaning that they had to recognize the Emperor’s authority over their conquests.<sup>13</sup> When met with resistance from the crusader princes (Raymond and Bohemond were the most difficult, unsurprisingly), the Emperor forged agreements with them on a case by case basis.<sup>14</sup>

Quibbling over specific terms, Bohemond and Raymond swore slightly different oaths to the Emperor, yet both appear to have agreed to maintain Byzantine territorial integrity.<sup>15</sup> In return, the Emperor also swore to send Byzantine troops and supplies to aid the crusaders.<sup>16</sup> However, the Byzantine general who accompanied the crusaders starting in Constantinople, Tatikios, deserted the Siege of Antioch before its capture.<sup>17</sup> Tatikios’

---

<sup>11</sup> Raymond d’Aguilers, 74-75; *Gesta Francorum*, 80-81

<sup>12</sup> Anna Komnene, *The Alexiad* ed. by Peter Frankopan and trans. by E.R.A Sewter (London: Penguin Classics, 2009), X, ch. 8-11, p. 285-296; Fulcher of Chartres, ch. 9, p. 79-80; Albert of Aachen, II, ch. 14-16, p. 53-54; *Gesta Francorum*, 11-13; Raymond d’Aguilers, p. 23-24; J.H. Pryor, “The oaths of the leaders of the First Crusade to Emperor Alexios I Comnenus,” *Parergon* no. 2 (1984), 114. According to the *Gesta*, every crusader except Tancred reached a deal with the Emperor, for Tancred simply sailed across the Bosphorus and entirely evaded an imperial audience. According to Pryor, no crusader prince became the Emperor’s vassal – this would have been inconceivable given that each crusader prince was either an outright independent lord, a vassal of the French King, or a vassal of the Holy Roman Emperor.

<sup>13</sup> Fulcher of Chartres, ch. 9, p. 79-80 ft. 4; J.H. Pryor, “The oaths of the leaders of the First Crusade to Emperor Alexios I Comnenus,” *Parergon* no. 2 (1984), 114.

<sup>14</sup> Albert of Aachen, II, ch. 14-16, p. 53-54; *Gesta Francorum*, 12-13; Raymond d’Aguilers, 23-24; J.H. Pryor, “The oaths of the leaders of the First Crusade to Emperor Alexios I Comnenus,” 114.

<sup>15</sup> Albert of Aachen, II, ch. 18-20, pp. 56-58, ft. 23 and 27; Raymond d’Aguilers, 24; *Gesta Francorum*, 11-13, Fulcher of Chartres, ch. 9, p. 79-80; J.H. Pryor, “The oaths of the leaders of the First Crusade to Emperor Alexios I Comnenus,” 124-130.

<sup>16</sup> *Gesta Francorum*, 12.

<sup>17</sup> *Gesta Francorum*, 34-35; Raymond d’Aguilers, 37; Albert of Aachen, IV, ch. 40, p. 163. Albert claims that the Byzantines deserted in June of 1098, but in fact they deserted in January. Also see Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade: A New History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 178-179; John France, *Victory in the East*, 243.

desertion outraged the crusaders, who viewed it as a breach in the agreements made with the Emperor.<sup>18</sup> In discussions after the Battle of Antioch, Raymond paid lip service to the Emperor in order to oppose Bohemond, but Raymond clearly flouted his obligations to the Emperor as well.<sup>19</sup> Judging by his occupation of towers and flashpoints throughout Antioch, Raymond's ulterior motives were to install his own men in the city.<sup>20</sup>

Immediately after the capture of Antioch, the princes agreed not to resume their march into the Holy Land until November of 1098, when the weather was less severe.<sup>21</sup> By November, the crusaders were short of provisions and money, so the army decided to target less significant yet wealthy cities in the surrounding region rather than marching off towards Jerusalem.<sup>22</sup> Raymond and Bohemond made a tentative peace agreement with each other, and both princes set off towards the city of Ma'arrat-an-Nu'man.<sup>23</sup> Raymond's army artfully constructed a siege tower, enabling the crusaders to take the city in just two weeks.<sup>24</sup> In a departure from previous conquests, the crusaders put the entire city to the sword, massacring innocent civilians.<sup>25</sup> Although Bohemond and Raymond cooperated in conducting the siege, they began to squabble over the city's

---

France attempts to exonerate the Byzantines for deserting, claiming that they were actually on a resupplying mission, but nevertheless, they never returned to the expedition.

<sup>18</sup> Albert of Aachen, IV, ch. 40, p. 163. This passage also claims that Emperor Alexius led an army as far as Philomelium in order to relieve the crusaders, but the Emperor turned back. Even though Alexius was apparently convinced by crusader deserters that the situation at Antioch was hopeless, Alexius and Tatikios both failed to hold up their end of the bargain. By failing to come to the aid of the crusaders, the Byzantine's credibility was disregarded after the miraculous victory at Antioch, meaning that the crusader princes could secure lands for themselves without any qualms.

<sup>19</sup> *Gesta Francorum*, 75-6

<sup>20</sup> Raymond d'Aguilers, 65; *Gesta Francorum*, 61; Albert of Aachen, V, ch. 2, p. 178

<sup>21</sup> *Gesta Francorum*, 72; Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 261-276.

<sup>22</sup> *Gesta Francorum*, 77.

<sup>23</sup> Raymond d'Aguilers, 75; *Gesta Francorum*, 75-7.

<sup>24</sup> Raymond d'Aguilers, 78-79; *Gesta Francorum*, 78-9.

<sup>25</sup> *Gesta Francorum*, 80. This slaughter prefigures the atrocities afflicted by the crusaders during the remainder of the campaign, but the deeds of those who remained to occupy Ma'arrat-an-Nu'man were some of the most infamous of the First Crusade. Facing starvation within a month of the city's capture, the crusader garrison was widely reported to have eaten the remains of the Muslim civilians they murdered. Also see Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 278.

spoils. They could not extricate the capture of Ma'arrat from their simmering quarrel over Antioch. The capture of Ma'arrat took place six months after the Battle of Antioch, yet Bohemond brought this sore subject to the fore, stating that he would refuse to negotiate with Raymond at Ma'arrat unless he “cedes the Antiochene towers.”<sup>26</sup>

Although the Norman and Provençal leaders had dug in their heels at Antioch, their inflexibility does not fully explain why the army tarried for so long before marching to Jerusalem. In spite of how the chroniclers portray Jerusalem, the leaders of the First Crusade failed to specify that the city was the final objective of the campaign. The most reliable source for Urban II's proclamation of the First Crusade in 1095, Fulcher of Chartres, omits any mention of Jerusalem.<sup>27</sup> The “liberation of the Holy Sepulchre” was an idea that was engendered during the expedition: it is first mentioned by Bohemond in a letter written in September of 1098 – *after* the capture of Antioch.<sup>28</sup> Urban lured the common foot soldier to the First Crusade by extolling the virtues of a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, but his objectives for the expedition were limited to re-establishing relations with the Byzantines and recovering their lands.<sup>29</sup>

The First Crusade encapsulated two movements: a popular armed pilgrimage (*Marschziel*) and a papally-ordained military campaign with clearly defined diplomatic objectives (*Kriegsziel*).<sup>30</sup> Adhemar died in August of 1098, leaving the crusaders without a spokesman for the pope's political aim of maintaining an alliance with the Byzantines. In establishing Bohemond as the undisputed ruler of Antioch after months of

---

<sup>26</sup> Raymond d'Aguilers, 79. Perhaps this is apocryphal.

<sup>27</sup> Fulcher of Chartres, ch. 3, p. 65-67, ft. 1.

<sup>28</sup> Fulcher of Chartres, ch. 24, 107-112; Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, trans. by Marshall W. Baldwin and Walter Goffart (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977), 371

<sup>29</sup> Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusading*, 370.

<sup>30</sup> Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusading*, 269, 332, 351.

deliberation, the crusader princes implicitly agreed to break their agreement with Emperor Alexius.<sup>31</sup> Only after the crusader princes broke diplomatic relations with the Byzantines was the army able to march to Jerusalem. However, the crusader princes did not put Jerusalem on their planned itinerary in 1096. As the crusader princes quarreled for months in the wake of the Battle of Antioch, the campaign's original diplomatic objectives were eschewed, giving way to the popular desire to march on to Jerusalem.

The march to Jerusalem was facilitated by a diplomatic rift with another party: the Fatimids. Curiously, the crusaders considered making peace with the Fatimids during the first nadir of the Siege of Antioch in early 1098. The Shi'ite Fatimids and the Sunni Turks were natural enemies, and a Crusader-Fatimid alliance would have been mutually advantageous.<sup>32</sup> Fatimid envoys visited the crusader camp at Antioch to negotiate an alliance, but these ambassadors left in February of 1098.<sup>33</sup>

After the crusaders defeated Kerbogha at Antioch in 1098, the Fatimids pressed the downtrodden Turks and swiftly captured Jerusalem in August of 1098. Originally, the Fatimids allowed representatives from the crusaders to visit Jerusalem to negotiate another alliance against the Turks. With the upper hand in negotiations, the Fatimids proposed that the crusaders could only visit Jerusalem if they arrived unarmed and in small batches. Finding these demands unacceptable, the crusaders rebuffed the Fatimid proposal and declared their intention of occupying Jerusalem by force if necessary.<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup> Raymond d'Aguilers, 75. According to Raymond d'Aguilers, the crusaders explicitly spurned the Emperor's oath, mocking those "who covet the Emperor's gold" to stay in Antioch while exhorting a leader to bring the army to the Holy Sepulchre. This dubious oration is a criticism of Bohemond's decision to stay in Antioch rather than continue on to Jerusalem.

<sup>32</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 187, 285-286.

<sup>33</sup> *Gesta Francorum*, 37-8, 42; Raymond d'Aguilers, 40-41; Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 186-187.

<sup>34</sup> This whole paragraph is based off of Raymond d'Aguilers, 89-90; Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 285-6.

Before the Battle of Antioch, the possibility of diplomatic arrangements with the Byzantines and the Fatimids prevented the army not only from embarking to Jerusalem, but also from making the city an objective of the campaign. The failure of these negotiations after Antioch freed the crusaders to choose their next objective. The groundswell of religious enthusiasm after the miraculous victory at Antioch had aligned the *Kriegsziel* with the *Marschziel*, which put the Holy City on the minds of the crusader princes. However, army made the decision to march to Jerusalem only after Raymond and Bohemond resolved their conflict.

Even though Raymond and Bohemond tried to cooperate in earnest, they realized that their differences were irreconcilable at Ma'arrat in January of 1099. While Raymond remained near Ma'arrat after the siege, Bohemond parted ways and returned to Antioch. While Raymond was distracted in the south, Bohemond ejected the remnants of Raymond's garrison from Antioch.<sup>35</sup> Bohemond was now the undisputed ruler of Antioch and Raymond had no hope of regaining a foothold in the city. The feud between Raymond and Bohemond was officially over. Although he did not desert the First Crusade, Bohemond remained in the vicinity of Antioch to consolidate his gains for the rest of the expedition. Bohemond only went as far as the coastal city of Latakia before leaving the main crusader army altogether.<sup>36</sup>

Realizing that Bohemond did not intend to march to Jerusalem, many Normans forswore their allegiances to the fearless leader. Instead of travelling back to Antioch with their kinsman, Robert of Normandy and Tancred decided to stay to join the Provençal faction in January of 1099. Ironically, even the anonymous author of the *Gesta*

---

<sup>35</sup> Albert of Aachen, V, ch. 26, pp. 192-193; Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 286.

<sup>36</sup> Albert of Aachen, V, ch. 33, p. 197; John France, 365-366.

*Francorum*, who was originally with Bohemond, joined Raymond's Provençal contingent as a foot soldier.<sup>37</sup> Raymond gave Robert of Normandy and Tancred financial incentives to join his cause, but common soldiers were encouraged to throw in their lot with Raymond for religious reasons. Because Raymond was "the recipient of the Holy Lance," Provençal soldiers felt it was his duty to lead the army to Jerusalem.<sup>38</sup> If Raymond refrained, the Provençals argued that Raymond should "hand over the Lance to the masses" so that they could complete their march to Jerusalem.<sup>39</sup> Months of factional infighting and idleness clearly demonstrated that the crusaders had strayed from the *Kriegsziel*, and the majority of the crusaders still needed to complete the pilgrimage that convinced them to join the campaign in the first place. Bohemond waited until December of 1099 to visit Jerusalem, but more religiously-fervent Norman soldiers were unsatiated.<sup>40</sup>

After losing out to Bohemond at Antioch, Raymond craved territory in the Levant. His own troops clamored to go to Jerusalem, but so did many soldiers from Bohemond's camp. Raymond realized that if he promised to lead the crusaders to the Holy City, he could recruit disenchanted Normans and create the most numerous crusader force. Raymond would need to cater to the wishes of this motley crusader faction, but along the way to Jerusalem, he could claim new conquests for himself.

However, Raymond's Provençal-Norman faction disbanded within a few months of its formation in early 1099. Raymond shrewdly rode the wave of popular religious

---

<sup>37</sup> Rosalind Hill, "Introduction" to *Gesta Francorum*, xiii.

<sup>38</sup> Raymond d'Aguilers, 79-80.

<sup>39</sup> Raymond d'Aguilers, 80.

<sup>40</sup> Ralph of Caen, *The Gesta Tancredi of Ralph of Caen: A History of the Normans on the First Crusade* trans. by Bernard S. Bachrach and David S. Bachrach, (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing, 2005), ch. 149, p. 156; Thomas Asbridge, *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2000), 45; Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 331. Bohemond went to Jerusalem in December 1099 with Baldwin, who became king shortly thereafter.

fervor to unite this contingent, but what he failed to calculate was that Provençal piety alienated the Norman newcomers. The Provençals fervently revered the Holy Lance of Antioch, treating the relic as if it belonged only to their faction. The three most powerful Provençals – Raymond, Adhemar, and Peter Bartholomew – were responsible for the “pious fraud” that brought the relic into existence.<sup>41</sup> After Adhemar’s death, Raymond and Peter Bartholomew ventured to become the respective secular and spiritual leaders of the First Crusade. Raymond and Peter’s reputations were not simply elevated by their association with the relic; they derived divine authority from the relic.<sup>42</sup>

From monastic reliquaries to imperial armies, the idea that divine favor flowed through those who possess relics was ubiquitous in medieval Christian culture.<sup>43</sup> Because the Holy Lance was carried by Provençal troops, Raymond was styled as “the Lord’s benefaction.”<sup>44</sup> Without any direct relationship to the Holy Lance, Norman soldiers took umbrage to Raymond’s claim to divinely-ordained hegemony over the campaign. As the discoverer of the lance and the witness to divine miracles at Antioch, Peter Bartholomew installed himself as the prophetic visionary of the expedition.<sup>45</sup> Peter was immensely popular among the common soldiers, but as the Provençal-Norman faction marched south in unison, Peter’s visions became increasingly dubious.<sup>46</sup>

---

<sup>41</sup> See my discussion in Ch. 2

<sup>42</sup> Raymond d’Aguilers, 79-80

<sup>43</sup> For information on the use of holy relics in the retinues of Charlemagne and the Holy Roman Emperor, see Laura Hibbard Loomis, “The Holy Relics of Charlemagne and King Athelstan: The Lances of Longinus and St. Mauricius,” *Speculum* 54, no. 4 (October, 1950), pp. 437-456.

<sup>44</sup> Raymond d’Aguilers, 79-80; Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 255-256.

<sup>45</sup> For Peter’s visions at Albara, see Raymond d’Aguilers, 76-77. For Peter’s visions at Arqa, see Raymond d’Aguilers, 93-96.

<sup>46</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 256.

### The Siege of Arqa and the Trial of the Holy Lance

In February of 1099, Raymond led his composite contingent to the city of Arqa in modern-day Lebanon. Raymond's previous excursions all laid on the path to Jerusalem, but the siege of Arqa proved to be a detour. The city was of little strategic value to the campaign, but the siege afforded Raymond the opportunity to secure territory for himself near Tripoli.<sup>47</sup> Even though the size of his army swelled after his alliance with the Normans, Raymond lacked adequate numbers to take the city. The armies of Godfrey and Robert of Flanders were sizable enough to turn the tide, but they were engaged in another siege north of Arqa. According to Albert of Aachen, Raymond invented a rumor in order to lure these German contingents south towards Arqa: Turkish and Arab forces bent on relieving Raymond's siege were amassing at Damascus and Raymond needed the other crusaders to save him. Godfrey and Robert of Flanders were so alarmed by Raymond's plea that they reached Arqa by mid-March. Upon their arrival, Tancred informed them that there was no imminent threat to the Provençal-Norman contingent. Tancred was displeased with his personal earnings while serving under Raymond, so he had no qualms with betraying his employer's true intentions. Overnight, Raymond's credibility was lost, and in disregard for his siege, the new German arrivals decided to set up camp a few miles away from Arqa.<sup>48</sup>

Recognizing that Raymond's grip over the campaign was slipping, Peter Bartholomew made an effort to salvage his liege's reputation by invoking divine aid. On

---

<sup>47</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 287. This area eventually was incorporated into Raymond's county, the County of Tripoli.

<sup>48</sup> This whole paragraph is based off of Albert of Aachen, V, ch. 33-35, p. 197-199; John France, *Victory in the East*, 318; Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 286-287.

5 April 1099, Peter presented his most questionable vision to date to the entire crusader host. Purporting to have seen Christ still alive upon the cross, Peter claimed,

Christ commanded: ‘Have the Count [Raymond of Toulouse] call the leaders and the people together, and have them line up as if for battle or a siege, and at the proper time let the best known herald give the battle cry, God help us, three times, and have him try to complete the military array. Then, as I said to you, you shall see the ranks, and along with the other believers recognize the unbelievers.’<sup>49</sup>

Raymond d’Aguilers, who is our only source for Peter’s vision, omitted the distinctions between a “believer” and an “unbeliever” in this oration. The ambiguity is clearly intentional because it suggests that Count Raymond and Peter would be responsible for discerning “unbelievers,” affording them the opportunity to purge their political rivals. Since Tancred had only just denounced Raymond for his most recent plot, such a ruse particularly threatened the Normans serving in the Provençal faction.

However, a later passage from Raymond d’Aguilers’ account of Peter’s vision clearly defines “unbelievers” as those who doubt the authenticity of the Holy Lance.<sup>50</sup> Arnulf of Chocques, the foremost Norman clergyman and therefore Peter’s ecclesiastical rival, was an outspoken critic of the Holy Lance and was labeled “the chief ... of the unbelievers.”<sup>51</sup> Peter’s plot to collect and crush the Raymond’s dissenters was a step too far in Arnulf’s eyes. To Arnulf, Peter was not simply a lunatic who told fantastic tales, but rather a devious Provençal partisan.<sup>52</sup> With his divine authority in question, Peter proposed a test not only to prove his piety, but also to validate the sanctity of the Holy Lance of Antioch.<sup>53</sup>

---

<sup>49</sup> Raymond d’Aguilers, 95.

<sup>50</sup> Raymond d’Aguilers, 96.

<sup>51</sup> Raymond d’Aguilers, 96.

<sup>52</sup> Ralph of Caen, ch. 102, p. 120; Fulcher of Chartres, ch. 18, p. 100.

<sup>53</sup> Raymond d’Aguilers, 100; Fulcher of Chartres, ch. 18, p. 100; Ralph of Caen, ch. 108-109, p. 126. Ralph says that the “leaders” of the Crusade subjected Peter to his trial, but it is clear from Raymond and Fulcher that Peter Bartholomew personally requested to perform his ordeal.

On 8 April 1099, the entire crusader host witnessed one of the more barbaric judicial customs of the medieval era: a trial by fire.<sup>54</sup> Peter personally elected to carry the lance through a burning pile of wood. If he were to “emerge unsinged,” the relic was truly the lance that pierced Jesus’ side on the cross because the relic’s divine power would have protected him. If Peter were consumed by the fire, then the relic was to be deemed false. Although the trial was designed to produce a binary result, the accounts of the outcome are nebulous. Peter emerged from the fire alive, but he sustained fatal injuries that overwhelmed him two weeks after the trial.<sup>55</sup>

To the Norman and German chroniclers who reported on the trial, Peter was clearly burned by the fire. In their eyes, the lance was just a random shard of metal and Peter was simply a pretender.<sup>56</sup> Raymond d’Aguilers, who claimed to carry the lance into battle against Kerbogha ten months earlier, put forward an alternative sequence of events: Peter Bartholomew actually “emerged unsinged” from the fire, but the crowd was so excited to congratulate the priest that they trampled him. As a result, Peter Bartholomew sustained mortal wounds not from the fire, but from the weight of the overzealous mob.<sup>57</sup> Raymond d’Aguilers clearly telegraphs his intentions to cover-up the embarrassment that the trial caused the Peter, Raymond of Toulouse, and the lance.

Raymond d’Aguilers’ explanation of Peter’s ordeal is preposterous, but it enlightens the crusaders’ mania for holy relics. The Holy Lance of Antioch was such a provocative relic that objects and people associated with it were indirectly turned into

---

<sup>54</sup> Around the time of the First Crusade, ordeals in Europe were gradually being phased out in this period in favor of legal procedure. See David Luscombe and Jonathan Riley-Smith, “Introduction”, *The New Cambridge Medieval History IV c.1024-1198* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 3.

<sup>55</sup> Raymond d’Aguilers, 100-102; Fulcher of Chartres, ch. 18, p. 100-101; Albert of Aachen, V, ch. 32, pp. 196-197; Ralph of Caen, ch. 108-109, p. 126. Ralph says Peter died the following day.

<sup>56</sup> Fulcher of Chartres, ch. 18, p. 100-101; Ralph of Caen, ch. 102, p. 120 and ch. 108-109, p. 126.

<sup>57</sup> Raymond d’Aguilers, 101-102.

relics as well.<sup>58</sup> As Peter walked through the fire, members of the crowd grabbed burnt sticks and coals to save as “relics.”<sup>59</sup> The mob trampled Peter not only to embrace him after his emergence, but also to rip off pieces of his tunic to save for themselves. Peter almost certainly died because of the wounds he sustained in the smoke and flames. However, it is also evident that common Provençal soldiers would have sought to keep a piece of Peter as a spiritual keepsake. Whether or not frenzied relic gatherers contributed to Peter’s injuries is a matter of speculation.

The Holy Lance of Antioch was not universally discounted after the trial and Provençal soldiers continued to carry it as their battle standard for the rest of the campaign. Yet, the Provençal bid for hegemony over the entire army had turned to ashes. To the Norman and German soldiers present at the trial, the Holy Lance of Antioch was unequivocally bogus. The sanctity of the lance was intertwined Raymond’s personal power and Peter’s divine favor. By targeting the lance, the Normans were able to dethrone the two most powerful Provençals.

The trial by fire at Arqa was a spiritual and secular coup that torched factional relations for the rest of the campaign. Tancred and his troops withdrew from Raymond’s service and signed up with Godfrey of Bouillon; Robert of Normandy vacillated, but eventually joined Godfrey’s contingent a few months later. Arnulf of Chocques replaced the deceased Peter Bartholomew as the ecclesiastical leader of the First Crusade. Although the Normans shuffled the hierarchy of the crusaders at Arqa, the campaign’s progress was stalled. Peter Bartholomew died in April of 1099, but in mid-May the entire

---

<sup>58</sup> Raymond d’Aguilers, 101-102.

<sup>59</sup> Raymond d’Aguilers, 101-102.

crusader army (save Bohemond and Baldwin) was still engaged in the Siege of Arqa.<sup>60</sup> Godfrey's newly formed German-Norman contingent became particularly restless and yearned to go to Jerusalem.<sup>61</sup>

However, Godfrey's army did not press on towards the holy city until they were united under one battle standard. Godfrey, Tancred, and Robert of Normandy each had their own unique Christian banners, but these battle standards symbolized their personal, territorial interests. With a strong sense of their own identity, the Normans would have never assented to march under Godfrey's banner. Throughout the medieval era, Normans were particular eager to express their own identity through their battle standards: kite-shaped shields and forked-banners (*gonfanons*) were quintessentially Norman military paraphernalia.<sup>62</sup> As a fellow Norman, Arnulf of Chocques recognized the need for a new, bipartisan battle standard to encourage Normans and Germans alike to head for the Jerusalem. The Battle of Antioch had proven that holy relics were effective battle standards, but the Normans and Germans eschewed the Holy Lance of Antioch. Although he ignited the debate about the authenticity of the lance, Arnulf recognized the utility of possessing a relic with which to unite the crusaders.<sup>63</sup> Towards the end of the Siege of Arqa, Arnulf ordered that a golden cross with the image of Christ be "molded from the purest gold."<sup>64</sup> Like Adhemar at Antioch, Arnulf participated in the fabrication of a Christian relic at Arqa purely to motivate the troops. The Provençal and Norman

<sup>60</sup> For these dates, see John France, *Victory in the East*, 320.

<sup>61</sup> This whole paragraph is based off of Albert of Aachen, V, ch. 36, pp. 199-200; Ralph of Caen, ch. 109, pp. 126-127. The respective German and Norman chroniclers, Albert and Ralph, both detail how the siege of Arqa dragged on pointlessly.

<sup>62</sup> W.G. Perrin, *British Flags: Their Early History, and Their Development at Sea; With an Account of the Origin of the Flag as a National Device* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1922), 2-3, 18. As Admiralty Librarian for the British Navy, Perrin's focus is primarily on the use of the modern British flag, but he provides an excellent overview of the history of flags since antiquity.

<sup>63</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 302

<sup>64</sup> Ralph of Caen, ch. 110, p. 127.

ecclesiastical leaders of the First Crusade used battle standards as instruments to intervene in military affairs. Thus, relics like the Holy Lance of Antioch and Arnulf's cross embody not only the *idea* of holy war, but also the exercise of holy war.

Evidently, Arnulf's creation achieved its designed purpose: the golden cross served as the battle standard for the German-Norman contingent. Personally tending to Arnulf's cross, Godfrey turned the relic into one of the most intimidating battle standards of the era. Once the crusaders reached Jerusalem, Godfrey affixed the golden cross to the top of his siege tower. As Godfrey rolled his machine to the walls, the image of Christ literally floated above the Holy City, suggesting that Christ had descended from heaven to reclaim the city for the Christians.<sup>65</sup> The crusaders besieged Jerusalem on 7 June 1099, but Godfrey's relic-adorned siege tower would not appear on the horizon for a full month.<sup>66</sup> In their fervent rush to reach the Holy City, the crusaders stretched their supply lines, leaving them thoroughly unprepared to conduct a siege against the formidable defenses of Jerusalem.<sup>67</sup>

### The Holy City

The singular importance of Jerusalem in the minds of the crusaders cannot be overemphasized.<sup>68</sup> Jerusalem exerted such gravity upon crusaders and pilgrims alike

---

<sup>65</sup> Albert of Aachen, VI, ch. 16-17, p. 220; Jay Rubenstein, *Armies of Heaven: The First Crusade and the Quest for the Apocalypse* (New York: Basic Books, 2011), 287.

<sup>66</sup> Albert of Aachen, VI, ch. 9-10, pp. 215-216.

<sup>67</sup> Albert of Aachen, VI, ch. 6-7, pp. 213-214.

<sup>68</sup> For explicit topographic and geographic details about the siege of Jerusalem, see Joshua Prawer, "The Jerusalem The Crusaders Captured" *Crusade and Settlement* ed. By Peter W. Edbury (Cardiff: University College Cardiff Press, 1985), 1-16.

because the city was akin to a relic in their minds.<sup>69</sup> Medieval Christians saw Jerusalem not simply as a place that housed relics of Christ, but rather as his temporal domain – as if Christ was the perennial feudal lord of the city.<sup>70</sup> Treating Jerusalem as a *possession* of Christ, the crusaders venerated the city as if it were a piece of his cross.

Pilgrimages to Jerusalem were frequently made by Europeans over the course of the eleventh century.<sup>71</sup> Oftentimes, pilgrimages were completed in the context of holy war but never as a part of one. Once Adhemar suppressed the Polignac family's challenge to his bishopric (about a decade before the First Crusade), Adhemar embarked on a journey to Jerusalem before the First Crusade.<sup>72</sup> Erlembald, the first "knight-saint" in history, became the leader of the *Pataria* movement upon arriving back in Italy after going to Jerusalem.<sup>73</sup> A knight named Odard even completed a pilgrimage to Jerusalem during the First Crusade; he must have been in the Holy City as the army was making its way through Anatolia.<sup>74</sup> Pilgrimage and holy war were both expressions of lay piety, but they were hitherto unconnected until the Council of Clermont.<sup>75</sup> In his proclamation of the First Crusade, Urban ingeniously merged chivalric customs with religious rites,

---

<sup>69</sup> Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986), 21.

<sup>70</sup> Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading*, 21.

<sup>71</sup> Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading*, 20; Jonathan Sumption, *Pilgrimage: An Image of the Mediaeval Religion* (Totowa N.J.: Rowman and Littlefield, 1975), 114-138. These page numbers for Sumption are cited by Riley-Smith. Sumption also mentions the Holy Lance of Antioch on pp. 27, 43-44.

<sup>72</sup> John France, *Victory in the East*, 45-46.

<sup>73</sup> Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, 141.

<sup>74</sup> Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading*, 20. Odard, who completed a pilgrimage to J in 1098, during the Battle of Antioch. For other examples, see Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusading*, 303-304.

<sup>75</sup> Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusading*, 304-5; E.O. Blake, "The Formation of the 'Crusade Idea,'" *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* vol. 21 no. 1 (January, 1970), 11-31, as cited in Marshall W. Baldwin, "Introduction" to *The Origin of the Idea of Crusading* by Carl Erdmann, xxix-xxx.

providing “a pathway towards salvation” for a social class that specialized in committing the sin of murder.<sup>76</sup>

Upon their arrival at Jerusalem, the crusaders felt that all of the blood they had spilt on their journey was justified. However, many of the crusaders were shocked by the actions of Tancred at Bethlehem. With a small contingent of loyal Norman knights, Tancred plundered Bethlehem and “flew his banner over the Church of the Lord’s Nativity as if over a temporal possession.”<sup>77</sup> As the birthplace of Christ, Bethlehem should have been treated as a holy site rather than a personal fief in the minds of the crusaders; the leaders took such umbrage to Tancred’s offense that they organized a meeting to chastise him.<sup>78</sup>

However, the army was beset with a much more pressing issue than Tancred’s territorial claims. Jerusalem was in an arid landscape bereft of natural resources, not least of all water.<sup>79</sup> The Pool of Siloam was one of the few natural sources of water outside of the city walls, but this pond was quickly contaminated and patrolled by the defenders.<sup>80</sup> Without water, the crusaders needed to launch a decisive attack upon the city as soon as possible. However, the barren outskirts of the city were also devoid of wood to construct siege machinery, which the crusaders were also lacking.<sup>81</sup> The siege lay dormant for weeks as the army scoured the countryside for wood. Towards the end of June of 1099,

---

<sup>76</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 39; E.O. Blake, “The Formation of the ‘Crusade Idea,’” 11-31, as cited in Marshall W. Baldwin, “Introduction” to *The Origin of the Idea of Crusading* by Carl Erdmann, xxix-xxx.

<sup>77</sup> Raymond d’Aguilers, 121; Fulcher of Chartres, ch. 25, pp. 115-116.

<sup>78</sup> John France, *Victory in the East*, 16, 331. Tancred treated church of Nativity as a mere “prize of war.” Also see Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 306 and Raymond d’Aguilers, 121. At the aforementioned meeting, the crusaders tried to settle other disputes, including who should rule over Jerusalem in the event that it was captured. Still, Tancred’s capture of Bethlehem was the impetus for the gathering.

<sup>79</sup> Albert of Aachen, VI, ch. 6-7, pp. 213-214.

<sup>80</sup> *Gesta Francorum*, 89; Raymond d’Aguilers, 118; Albert of Aachen, VI, ch. 6, p. 214; Robert the Monk, *Robert the Monk’s History of the First Crusade* trans. by Carol Sweetenham (Farnham, England: Ashgate Publishing, 2005), 198.

<sup>81</sup> Albert of Aachen, VI, ch. 3, p. 212; Ralph of Caen, ch. 118-120, pp. 134-136; Raymond d’Aguilers, 117

the army found sufficient timber for ladders and siege engines from two sources: the foothills south of Jerusalem and crusader supply ships at the nearby port of Jaffa.<sup>82</sup>

With the necessary provisions, the crusaders resolved to assault the city walls. Although the army was logistically prepared, it was disunited politically and spiritually. Continuing to use the Holy Lance of Antioch as their battle standard, the Provençals ostracized themselves from the German-Norman faction and camped on the opposite side of the city. In order for a two-pronged attack on the city to be effective, the leaders of the two factions needed to re-establish a rapport.

At this juncture, another Provençal mystic, Peter Desiderius, came forward to describe a vision of he had of Adhemar's ghost outside of Jerusalem. Frustrated with the siege's progress, the ghost of Adhemar purportedly ordered Peter Desiderius to command the crusader princes to lead a barefoot procession around the city walls. Adhemar prophesied, "If you follow these orders, at the end nine days the city will fall after a violent assault; but if not, the Lord will increase all the misfortunes of the past." Peter Desiderius recounted his vision to Adhemar's brother, a minor crusader prince named William Hugh of Monteil, who then relayed the experience to the rest of the crusader princes.<sup>83</sup>

As the Provençal excavators contrived the Holy Lance of Antioch to motivate their troops during the Siege of Antioch, the crusader princes used Peter Desiderius' proposed procession to ameliorate factional tensions. On 8 July 1099, every crusader

---

<sup>82</sup> On the discovery of wood in foothills, see Albert of Aachen, VI, ch. 3, p. 212; Ralph of Caen, ch. 120, pp. 136; According to Ralph, Tancred personally discovered beams hidden in a cave, which were hidden by the Fatimids during their siege of Jerusalem the previous year. On the ships that arrived from Jaffa on 17 June 1099, see *Gesta Francorum*, 88-89; Raymond d'Aguilers, 119-121; John France, *Victory in the East*, 212, 346. No chronicles explicitly say that timber was given to the crusaders by the ships at Jaffa, but France's assumption is reasonable.

<sup>83</sup> This whole paragraph is based off of Raymond d'Aguilers, 122

contingent present at the siege gathered their respective banners and “relics of saints” to march barefoot around Jerusalem.<sup>84</sup> On 30 December 1097, Adhemar commanded a penitential procession around the crusader camp at Antioch, but the march around Jerusalem was more positive and motivational.<sup>85</sup> The Jerusalem procession outside of Jerusalem closely mirrored Joshua’s march around Jericho – by one account, the crusaders blew trumpets just like the Israelites.<sup>86</sup> The knights and clergy of the First Crusade carried their Christian banners and bellicose relics in unison around the walls of Jerusalem, revealing the convergence of the *Kriegsziel* and the *Marschziel*.

After rounding the perimeter of Jerusalem, the crusaders hiked up the Mount of Olives – the site of Jesus’ ascension. With the entire crusader host gathered underneath, Arnulf of Chocques preached from the top of one of the most revered sites in the Christian world. Arnulf’s conciliatory sermon aimed to dissolve tensions between the Norman and Provençal factions, which was inherent in the competing battle standards each group bore before them in the faction. In such a spiritually significant location, Arnulf succeeded in reconciling the crusaders, most notably Raymond and Tancred.<sup>87</sup>

As the crusaders marched down from the Mount of Olives, the army came so close to the walls that a few clerics “reverently bearing relics of the saints” were hit by arrows. Furthermore, the defenders “fixed crosses in mockery and abuse” on the walls to goad the crusaders into battle. However, the crusader army remained patient, secretly

---

<sup>84</sup> Raymond d’Aguilers, 123; Albert of Aachen, VI, ch. 8, p. 215; *Gesta Francorum*, 90; Robert the Monk, 199; Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading*, 93. Raymond d’Aguilers and Albert’s accounts are the only ones to mention the use of relics. Jonathan Riley-Smith mentions this relic procession in his survey of the importance of relics on the minds of the crusaders, and he also cites Raymond. Robert the Monk mentions a procession with “crosses and relics and holy altars,” but he puts this on a different date.

<sup>85</sup> Raymond d’Aguilers, 36; James A. Brundage, “Adhémar of Puy: The Bishop and His Critics,” 205.

<sup>86</sup> Raymond d’Aguilers, 123; John France, *Victory in the East*, 347. See Joshua 6:1-27 on the Fall of Jericho.

<sup>87</sup> This whole paragraph is based off of Albert of Aachen, VI, ch. 8, p. 215.

moving their siege engines to a poorly-defended area of walls in the dead of night after the procession. After their bait and switch preparation scheme was complete, the army launched a full-frontal assault on Jerusalem by 13 July 1099. Without Arnulf's mediation, the crusader army would not have been coordinated for such an attack. Leading the charge was Godfrey's siege engine – bedecked with the golden cross that Arnulf designed so that the army could be united one battle standard.<sup>88</sup>

On 15 July 1099, Godfrey's contingent breached the walls and the crusaders poured into the Holy City. Jerusalem was the center of the Christian cosmos, but the bloodlust of the crusaders during the ensuing slaughter belied the sanctity of the city. The massacre was unfathomable to the chroniclers of the First Crusade, who unanimously employ an allusion to the Book of Revelations for a description of the streets of Jerusalem: “the stream of spilt blood was ankle-deep.”<sup>89</sup>

Wanton murder and pillaging after a siege was common throughout the medieval era, but the chroniclers suggest that the slaughter at Solomon's Temple after the capture of Jerusalem was unprecedented.<sup>90</sup> A few hundred civilians, of all ages and genders, reportedly fled to the roof of the temple for safety.<sup>91</sup> Aiming to extract ransom from these unarmed Jerusalemites, Tancred offered his Christian banner as a “token of protection

---

<sup>88</sup> This whole paragraph is based off of Albert of Aachen, VI, ch. 8-9, pp. 215-216; Raymond d'Aguilers, 123; John France, *Victory in the East*, 348-349. The quotes are all from Albert p. 215.

<sup>89</sup> Albert of Aachen, VI, ch. 21, p. 223; Raymond d'Aguilers, 127-128; *Gesta Francorum*, 91; Fulcher of Chartres, ch. 27, p. 122; Ralph of Caen, ch. 134, p. 148; Jay Rubenstein, *Armies of Heaven*, 290. As Susan B. Edgington notes in ft 26 of Albert's chronicle, similar imagery is found in other chronicles. See this quote from Raymond d'Aguilers: “Riding in blood up to their knees ... Jerusalem was now littered with bodies and stained with blood.” Jay Rubenstein also explores the imagery of the slaughter at Jerusalem.

<sup>90</sup> *Gesta Francorum*, 92: “No-one has ever seen or heard of such a slaughter of pagans, for they were burned on pyres like pyramids, and no-one save God alone knows how many there were.”

<sup>91</sup> Albert of Aachen, VI, ch. 28, p. 228; Fulcher of Chartres, ch. 27, p. 122; Robert the Monk, 201-202. Fulcher estimates that 10,000 people sought refuge on the roof, but Albert of Aachen's estimate of a “few hundred” is the most plausible.

and survival.”<sup>92</sup> However, errant Christian knights charged the roof of the Solomon’s Temple and slaughtered those pining for peace with Tancred.<sup>93</sup> Tancred expressed after the carnage, but this came most likely from his greed and not from a feeling of empathy for the victims.<sup>94</sup>

Christian banners were used to protect surrendered enemies throughout the campaign, notably at Tarsus and Antioch, but the crusaders’ disregard for Tancred’s banner at Jerusalem points to a fundamental change in their approach to holy war. The crusaders put the civilians of Jerusalem to the sword purely because they occupied Christian houses of worship. To Raymond d’Aguilers, it “was poetic justice that the Temple of Solomon should receive the blood of pagans who blasphemed God there for many years.”<sup>95</sup> The crusaders proudly boasted that they wrestled the Holy Sepulchre away from heretics, as if the liberation of Jerusalem’s holy sites were the primary goal of the expedition from the beginning.<sup>96</sup> Yet, the first time the leaders of the First Crusade mentioned “the liberation of the Holy Sepulchre” was in the fall of 1098 – precisely when the princes were arguing about resuming the march to Jerusalem.<sup>97</sup> Reports of Muslim atrocities against Christian pilgrims in Jerusalem circulated before the First Crusade, but the crusaders were not passionate for religiously-motivated vengeance throughout the campaign. In fact, the princes negotiated with representatives of the Fatimid rulers of Jerusalem twice in the prior year; Fatimid delegations camped with the crusaders during

---

<sup>92</sup> *Gesta Francorum*, 91-92; Albert of Aachen, VI, ch. 28, p. 228.

<sup>93</sup> Albert of Aachen, VI, ch. 28, p. 228; Fulcher of Chartres, ch. 27, p. 122; Robert the Monk, 201-202.

<sup>94</sup> Albert of Aachen, VI, ch. 29, p. 228.

<sup>95</sup> Raymond d’Aguilers, 128.

<sup>96</sup> Raymond d’Aguilers, 128; *Gesta Francorum*, 97.

<sup>97</sup> Fulcher of Chartres, ch. 24, 107-112; Thomas Asbridge, “The Holy Lance of Antioch: Power, Devotion, and Memory on the First Crusade,” *Reading Medieval Studies* 33 (2007), 12; David S. Bachrach, *Religion and the Conduct of War c. 300 - c. 1215* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003), 116; Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, 371.

the Siege of Antioch and during the Siege of Arqa.<sup>98</sup> The negotiations at Arqa are especially surprising because the crusader princes had openly claimed their unwavering resolve to recapture the Holy City at this point.<sup>99</sup> The cruelty of the crusaders at Jerusalem stained the memory of the First Crusade, but it was not an inevitable consequence of the campaign's original ideology.

To search for the cause of violence among humans is a futile exercise, but the particular instance of barbarity at Jerusalem is elucidated by the things the crusaders carried as they perpetrated the slaughter. Christian banners and holy relics were used to unite the crusaders to a common cause before the battle, but at Jerusalem, they were viewed as bellicose symbols that justified crusader atrocities. Most signs of the cross symbolize Jesus' suffering and victimization, but Arnulf's golden cross represented the exact opposite. Arnulf's golden cross spread peace within the crusaders' own ranks, but its placement at the top of Godfrey's siege tower reveals its intended use for intimidating the enemy. From accounts of the flag feud at Tarsus, Tancred's banner also bore a sign of the cross. In traditional Christian symbolism, Tancred's flag represented mercy and forgiveness, which the refugees atop Solomon's Temple were appealing for. Yet, the crusaders who murdered these "pagans" felt that Christian symbols, along with Christian holy places, were reserved only for true believers.<sup>100</sup> If anything, those soldiers climbed up to the roof of the temple with the intention of recovering Tancred's banner from people they believed were heretics. To the crusaders at Jerusalem, their battle standards embodied an inverted version of Christian symbolism, in which objects that traditionally

---

<sup>98</sup> Raymond d'Aguilers, 40-41, 89.

<sup>99</sup> Raymond d'Aguilers, 89-90; Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, 285-6.

<sup>100</sup> Raymond d'Aguilers, 128

represented peace were weaponized. The crusaders expressed their piety in the most bellicose fashion possible, which manifested not only in their battle standards, but also in their atrocities.

The Holy Sepulchre was finally in the hands of the crusaders on 15 July 1099. The success of the First Crusade exceeded the expectations of all contemporaries, so the crusaders had no agreed upon who should rule Jerusalem. In order to elect an ecclesiastical and a secular leader of the Holy City, the foremost members of the clergy and the princes withdrew for eight days to debate the issue.<sup>101</sup> Godfrey, who received much of the glory for capturing the walls of the city in the final phase of the siege, was the clear frontrunner. However, the specific title Godfrey would receive posed an issue: in the minds of the leaders, Jerusalem was Jesus' physical and metaphysical domain, which no mortal could usurp. Godfrey therefore chose not be called king, but rather the "Defender of the Holy Sepulchre."<sup>102</sup> This tradition did not last long. Godfrey died within a few months, and his next of kin, Baldwin of Boulogne, succeeded to the throne of Jerusalem and simply styled himself "King of Jerusalem."<sup>103</sup> To the chagrin of the Provençals, Arnulf was elected as the first Latin Patriarch of Jerusalem.<sup>104</sup>

In the early days of his ecclesiastical administration, Arnulf received another, more unique title: "procurator of the holy relics."<sup>105</sup> Just as Adhemar was well aware that the Holy Lance of Antioch was intentionally fabricated for one purpose, so too did Arnulf

---

<sup>101</sup> *Gesta Francorum*, 92

<sup>102</sup> Raymond d'Aguilers, 129-130; *Gesta Francorum*, 92, Albert of Aachen, VI, ch. 33, p. 231; Fulcher of Chartres, ch. 30, p. 124; Jay Rubenstein, *Armies of Heaven*, 298-299, 302-303. For an entire overview of the issue of Godfrey's title, see John France, "The Election and Title of Godfrey de Bouillon," *Canadian Journal of History* 18 (1983): 321-329, as cited by Rubenstein p. 303.

<sup>103</sup> Fulcher of Chartres, Book 1-2, ch. 36 and ch. 1, pp. 136-137.

<sup>104</sup> Raymond d'Aguilers, 131; *Gesta Francorum*, 93.

<sup>105</sup> Albert of Aachen, VI, ch. 39, p. 235.

know that his golden cross had fulfilled its purpose after the Siege of Jerusalem. To commemorate the momentous conquest, Arnulf scoured the churches and holy sites of the city for a new relic. On 5 August 1099, Arnulf discovered a different golden cross, which supposedly held a sliver of wood from Jesus' actual cross.<sup>106</sup> Known as the True Cross, the relic was most likely discovered in the vicinity of the Holy Sepulchre.<sup>107</sup> Similarities to the Provençal excavation of the Holy Lance of Antioch abound, but the True Cross had the longest lifespan of any battle standard of the First Crusade; the armies of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem carried the relic into battle for nearly one hundred years.<sup>108</sup> In 1187, the True Cross was captured by Saladin's army at the Battle of Hattin – a decisive defeat for the crusaders, after which they lost control of Jerusalem forever.<sup>109</sup> Arnulf's discovery of the True Cross marked the beginning of the Kingdom of Jerusalem, but the crusaders had to face one final obstacle – a Fatimid relief army – before they could feel secure in the Holy City.

---

<sup>106</sup> Albert of Aachen, VI, ch. 38, p. 233-234; Raymond d'Aguilers, 131; Fulcher of Chartres, ch. 30, pp. 124-125. The True Cross is called "the Rood of Salvation" by Albert.

<sup>107</sup> Albert of Aachen, VI, ch. 38, p. 233-234; Raymond d'Aguilers, 131; Fulcher of Chartres, ch. 30, pp. 124-125. The chronicles differ as the precise location of the dig. Albert says an abandoned house, Raymond d'Aguilers says the Holy Sepulchre, and Fulcher 125 says a "secret place." See Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading*, 98.

<sup>108</sup> Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading*, 98.

<sup>109</sup> Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading*, 98.

## Epilogue

### Ascalon

---

Within a week of their discovery, the crusaders used the True Cross as their standard in the last major battle of the First Crusade. In early August of 1099, a Fatimid army was making its way to recover Jerusalem and camped at the coastal city of Ascalon.<sup>1</sup> This presented the newly christened “Defender of the Holy Sepulchre,” Godfrey, with his first opportunity to fight as the leader of a united crusading front. Arnulf, the proud leader of the new cult of the True Cross, did not enjoy the same respect. The True Cross was at the vanguard of Arnulf’s German-Norman troops, but the Provençals chose to follow the Holy Lance of Antioch instead.<sup>2</sup> The Fatimid army was reportedly twice the size of the crusaders’ force, but this cohort of knights was buoyed by battle standards associated with the greatest victories of the campaign. In spite of Peter Bartholomew’s ordeal, the Provençals still believed that the Holy Lance of Antioch gave their forces invincibility. Likewise, Godfrey’s German-Norman troops deemed the True Cross to be “beyond doubt a spiritual shield against all the enemies’ missiles.”<sup>3</sup>

The crusaders believed that their victory at the Battle of Ascalon was divinely-ordained, but their success can be attributed to a combination of guile and sheer luck. Approaching the Fatimids around dawn on 12 August 1099, the crusaders caught them by

---

<sup>1</sup> For the Battle of Ascalon, see Anonymous, *Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum* trans. and ed. by Rosalind Hill (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd, 1962), 93-97; Albert of Aachen, *Albert of Aachen’s History of the Journey to Jerusalem vol. 1*, trans. by Susan B. Edgington (Farnham, England: Ashgate Publishing, 2013), VI, ch. 43-51, pp. 237-243; Raymond d’Aguilers, *Raymond d’Aguilers: Historia Francorum Qui Ceperunt Iherusalem*, trans. by John Hugh Hill and Laurita L. Hill (Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1968), 132-135.

<sup>2</sup> Albert of Aachen, VI, ch. 41, p. 236; Raymond d’Aguilers, 133

<sup>3</sup> Albert of Aachen, VI, ch. 43, p. 238.

surprise and fell upon them in their camp.<sup>4</sup> By many accounts, the Fatimids were further deceived by the fact that a flock of sheep decided to run alongside the crusaders' ranks, which made their cavalry numbers seem immensely larger.<sup>5</sup> The combined flock of crusaders and sheep dealt a devastating defeat to the unprepared Fatimid army. As if the nature of this rout were not embarrassing enough, the Fatimids lost their most prized possession to the plundering crusaders – the battle standard of al-Afdal, their commander.<sup>6</sup>

Al-Afdal's standard is the only non-Christian battle standard to be described in the chronicles of the First Crusade. According to the *Gesta*, this standard was a silver pole with a golden apple placed at the top.<sup>7</sup> Robert of Normandy personally smote al-Afdal's standard bearer and he was allowed to keep it as a trophy.<sup>8</sup> Robert could have smelted al-Afdal's standard to extract its valuable metals; after all, it was a "pagan" symbol in the minds of the crusaders. Instead, Robert bequeathed it Arnulf, who displayed it in the Holy Sepulchre alongside the True Cross.<sup>9</sup> Thus, al-Afdal's standard was "dedicated in memory of the Christians' victory."<sup>10</sup>

The Holy Sepulchre, the navel of the crusader cosmos, became an exhibition for the battle standards of the First Crusade. The True Cross, the final iteration of a series of

---

<sup>4</sup> Thomas Asbridge, *The First Crusade: A New History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 325

<sup>5</sup> Albert of Aachen, VI, ch. 45, p. 239; Raymond d'Aguilers, 134-135.

<sup>6</sup> *Gesta Francorum*, 95, 97; Albert of Aachen, VI, ch. 50, p. 242; Jay Rubenstein, *Armies of Heaven: The First Crusade and the Quest for the Apocalypse* (New York: Basic Books, 2011), 305-311. Rubenstein gives a concise summary of the battle and gives us details about the battle standards used in it.

<sup>7</sup> *Gesta Francorum*, 95; Albert of Aachen, VI, ch. 50, p. 242; Jay Rubenstein, *Armies of Heaven*, 309. Albert says the standard was covered in silver, but he omits the detail about the apple. Rubenstein also mentions the standard but does not analyze it.

<sup>8</sup> *Gesta Francorum*, 97, Albert of Aachen, VI, ch. 50, p. 242.

<sup>9</sup> *Gesta Francorum*, 97, Albert of Aachen, VI, ch. 50, p. 242. The *Gesta* says that Robert "redeemed [the standard] for twenty marks of silver and gave [it] to the patriarch in honour of God and the Holy Sepulchre." Whether or not "redeemed" implies that Robert had the standard valued or the standard partially melted down eludes me.

<sup>10</sup> Albert of Aachen, VI, ch. 50, p. 242.

relics contrived by the crusaders throughout the campaign, represented not only the victory of their troops, but also the victory of their faith. Al-Afdal's standard was not merely an inert prize of war, but rather the antithesis of the True Cross, embodying the defeat of the Muslim armies and religion.

The First Crusaders left Europe with myriad banners and relics in tow, but the battle standards they came to revere the most were physically constructed over the course of the campaign. At Tarsus, the crusaders were spatially and psychologically distant from the Holy Land. Christianity was the germ of the crusaders' common identity, but the rivalry of Tancred and Baldwin at this stage was wholly temporal. Their respective battle standards both bore the sign of the cross, but they used these banners for purely political purposes at Tarsus.

As St. Peter's first diocese, Antioch was one of the oldest Christian cities in the world. Therefore, Antioch was the first spiritually significant city the crusaders encountered that lay in enemy hands. At this stage, the leaders of the First Crusade, most notably Adhemar, viewed the expedition as if it were a territorial war to help recover Byzantine and Eastern Christian lands. But the loss of Adhemar's banner of the Virgin Mary to the Turkish defenders on 29 December 1097 dramatically altered the crusaders' perspective of their enterprise. Witnessing the besieged Turks mock Adhemar's banner in contempt, the entire army felt ridiculed. The theft of the banner was surely an affront to Adhemar's personal prestige, but the explanation for the army's malaise at this moment lies in the fact that they felt the Turks had violated the image of the Virgin Mary and Christianity at large.

The desecration of the banner of the Virgin Mary dampened the crusaders' spirits, but the consecration of the Holy Lance of Antioch lifted them. Underneath the Basilica of St. Peter in Antioch, Adhemar and the leading Provençals fabricated the relic in order to rouse enough religious fervor in their soldiers to inspire them to make one last-ditched sortie against Kerbogha. They may have believed that they had discovered a Holy Nail, but they proclaimed the relic to be the Holy Lance because they intended to use it for battle. This gambit worked. As the battle standard for the most pivotal battle of the campaign, the Holy Lance of Antioch proved that holy relics had potent temporal applications. At Antioch, Adhemar carried two battle standards, a banner and a relic, as if he were wielding the biblical "two swords" himself. Through the crosses and saints depicted on them, crusader banners were secular symbols imbued with religious significance. On the other hand, holy relics were purely spiritual objects that were given temporal significance when implemented as battle standards. The banner and lance Adhemar carried during the Battle of Antioch embodied the same secular and spiritual duality, yet both objects emerged from different material traditions.

As the army marched to Jerusalem, Christian relics garnered the same bellicose connotation that banners had represented from time immemorial. The Normans impugned the lance and its Provençal patrons, and Arnulf shrewdly forged a new relic to serve as a competing battle standard. As the "procurator of the holy relics," Arnulf succeeded Adhemar as the ecclesiastical leader of the First Crusade just in time for the army to reach the Jerusalem. On the eve of the city's capture, the crusader princes and ecclesiastical leaders led the army in a procession around Jerusalem. By carrying every factions' respective battle standards in one ceremony, the crusaders showed not only that

the *Kriegsziel* (the hierarchical crusade) and the *Marschziel* (the popular crusade) had converged as ideas, but also that banners and relics had converged as symbols.

Furthermore, the assemblage of these battle standards revealed that the crusaders set aside their factional differences in order to make the fateful assault on Holy City as one force.

After Jerusalem was in the crusaders' possession, Arnulf replaced his golden cross with the True Cross as the battle standard of the army. The discovery of the True Cross commemorated the capture of the city on a secular and spiritual level. The True Cross is a perfect analogue for the lifespan of the Kingdom of Jerusalem: the relic was discovered upon the capture of the Holy City in 1099 and the relic was lost during the Battle of Hattin in 1187, which veritably extinguished the kingdom's military power.

Displayed on high in the holiest temple of the Christian faith, the True Cross was juxtaposed with its converse: al-Afdal's standard. The clash between these two symbols epitomized the violence between the Christian and Muslim faiths that would endure for centuries. However, religious violence was not a primary motivation for the First Crusade. The beginning of the campaign was motivated by the *Kriegsziel*, which emphasized territorial conquest. But during nadir of the Siege of Antioch, the hierarchical goals of the *Kriegsziel* became irrelevant. After the discovery of the Holy Lance of Antioch, the popular objectives of common crusaders, the *Marschziel*, came to the fore. Religious zeal, as displayed by Peter Bartholomew's ordeal and Arnulf's golden cross, spurred the crusaders to march to Jerusalem. Therefore, the campaign became a "holy war" in earnest only after Antioch, and this development is perceptible through the battle standards created during and after the battle. Just as the battle standards of the First

Crusade were invented along the way, the idea of crusade *came to be* during the campaign.

Because I have analyzed the connection between the idea of crusading and the physical objects the crusaders carried with them, my thesis contributes to the study of material culture in the High Middle Ages. One of the most famous historical theories about material culture is the “invention of tradition,” formed by the historians Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger.<sup>11</sup> Hobsbawm and Ranger consider the “invention of tradition” to be most applicable to the rise of nationalism in nineteenth and twentieth-century European history, but they concede that their theory can be applied to a wider range of historical eras:

There is probably no time and place with which historians are concerned which has not seen the ‘invention’ of tradition in this sense. However, we should expect it to occur more frequently when a rapid transformation of society weakens or destroys the social patterns for which ‘old’ traditions had been designed, producing new ones to which they were not applicable, or when such old traditions and their institutional carriers and promulgators no longer prove sufficiently adaptable and flexible, or are otherwise eliminated.<sup>12</sup>

Applying this framework to the First Crusade, one can see that the relics of the latter part of the campaign were “invented,” and they were “traditions” in the sense that they were purported to be genuine relics from the time of Christ. Crusader banners were invented traditions because the papacy and crusader princes appropriated a secular aesthetic tradition – familial banners – and infused them with religious meaning. The Holy Lance of Antioch was invented for motivational purposes when the army was at its weakest point. By the Siege of Arqa, the Provençal cult of the lance was “no longer sufficiently

---

<sup>11</sup> Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger, “Introduction” to *The Invention of Tradition* ed. By Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1983), 4-5.

<sup>12</sup> Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger, “Introduction” to *The Invention of Tradition* ed. By Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1983), 4-5.

adaptable” to the needs of the entire army. Naturally, the “promulgators” of the Holy Lance of Antioch, Peter Bartholomew and Raymond of Toulouse, were respectively “eliminated” and discredited. Thereafter, Arnulf invented the golden cross to fill the void. Arnulf’s golden cross was used in the Siege of Jerusalem and likely bore aesthetic similarities to the True Cross, but the capture of the Holy City was such a transformational moment in the minds of the crusaders that Arnulf decided to commemorate the event by inventing the True Cross. The establishment of the Kingdom of Jerusalem was a “rapid transformation of society” because the crusaders completely supplanted the reign of the dominant government and religion in the Holy Land in only half a decade.

The exhibition of Christian and Muslim battle standards in the Holy Sepulchre was the apotheosis of the invented traditions of the First Crusade because it juxtaposed the defunct symbol of the old, defeated Muslim faith with the new, victorious standard of the Christian faith. Moreover, this exhibition raised a new religious dichotomy that would pervade Christian ideology for the rest of the crusading era: the True Cross embodied the “two swords” of the First Crusade, but by contrast with the al-Afdal’s standard, the relic also represented medieval Christianity’s enmity towards Islam.

The banners and relics of the First Crusade were manifestly invented traditions, but I do not draw this comparison in order to compare these battle standards to modern equivalents. By inventing traditions, historical actors create markers of their identity and reveal their own perceptions of their culture. The battle standards of the First Crusade provide a glimpse into how the crusaders conceived of their enterprise. Moreover, the invention of new battle standards over the course of the campaign represented the

evolution of the secular and spiritual thought-world of the crusaders. In that sense, the battle standards of the crusaders speak louder than any of the chronicles of the expedition.

## Bibliography

---

### Primary Sources

al-Athir, Ibn. *The Chronicle of Ibn al-Athir for the Crusading Period from al-Kamil fi'l-ta'rikh Part I*. Translated by D.S. Richards. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing, 2005.

al-Qalanisi, Ibn. *The Damascus Chronicle of the Crusades: Extracted and Translated from the Chronicle of Ibn al-Qalanisi*. Translated and Edited by H.A.R. Gibb. London: Luzac & Co., 1932.

Albert of Aachen. *Albert of Aachen's History of the Journey to Jerusalem*. Translated by Susan B. Edgington. Farnham, England: Ashgate Publishing, 2013.

Anonymous. *Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum: The Deeds of the Franks and Other Pilgrims to Jerusalem*. Translated and edited by Rosalind Hill. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1962.

*Chanson d'Antioche: An Old French Account of the First Crusade*. Translated by Susan B. Edgington and Carol Sweetenham. Farnham, England: Ashgate Publishing, 2005.

Emperor Henry IV. "Henry charges Hildebrand with having stolen his hereditary privileges in Rome, striven to alienate Italy (1076)." In *Imperial Lives and Letters of the Eleventh Century*. Translated by Mommsen, T.E. and Morrison, K.F. New York: Columbia University Press, 1962: 146-147.

Fulcher of Chartres. *Fulcher of Chartres: Historia Hierosolymitana, A History of the Expedition to Jerusalem*. Translated and Edited by Harold S. Fink and Frances Rita Ryan. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1969.

- Guibert of Nogent. *The Deeds of God through the Franks: A Translation of Guibert de Nogent's Gesta Dei per Francos*. Translated by Robert Levine. Rochester: The Boydell Press, 1997.
- Komnene, Anna. *The Alexiad*. Edited by Peter Frankopan and translated by E.R.A Sewter. London: Penguin, 2009.
- Liutprand of Cremona. *Antapodosis (Tit for Tat)*. Translated by F.A. Wright. New York: E.P. Dutton & Company, 1930.
- Pope Gregory VII. *The Correspondence of Pope Gregory VII: Selected Letters from the Registrum*. Translated by Ephraim Emerton. New York: Columbia University Press, 1932.
- . "The Roman Lenten Synod of 1076," *The Correspondence of Pope Gregory VII*. Translated by Emerton, Ephraim. New York: Columbia University Press, 1932.
- . "Dictatus Papae (March 1075)" *Church and State Through the Centuries*. Translated and Edited by Ehler, S.Z. and Morrall, J.B. London: Burns & Oates, 1954: 43-44.
- Ralph of Caen. *The Gesta Tancredi of Ralph of Caen: A History of the Normans on the First Crusade*. Translated by Bernard S. Bachrach and David S. Bachrach. Farnham, England: Ashgate Publishing, 2005.
- Raymond d'Aguilers. *Raymond d'Aguilers: Historia Francorum Qui Ceperunt Iherusalem*. Translated by John Hugh Hill and Laurita L. Hill. Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1968.
- Robert the Monk. *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade*. Translated by Carol Sweetenham. Farnham, England: Ashgate Publishing, 2005.

Tudebode, Peter. *Petrus Tudebodus' Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere*. Translated by John Hugh Hill and Laurita L. Hill. Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1974.

### Secondary Sources

Asbridge, Thomas. *The First Crusade: A New History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

———. “The Holy Lance of Antioch: Power, Devotion, and Memory on the First Crusade.” *Reading Medieval Studies* 33 (2007): 3-36.

———. *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2000.

Bachrach, David S. *Religion and the Conduct of War c. 300 - c. 1215*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2003.

Blake, E.O. “The Formation of the ‘Crusade Idea.’” *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 21, no. 1 (January, 1970): 11-31.

Blumenthal, Uta-Renate. *The Investiture Controversy: Church and Monarchy from the Ninth to the Twelfth Century*. Translated by the author. Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 1988.

Brundage, James A. “Holy War and Medieval Lawyers.” *The Holy War: The Conference on Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 5th, Ohio State University, 1974*. Edited by Thomas Patrick Murphy. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1976: 99-140.

———. “The Army of the First Crusade and the Crusade Vow: some reflections on a recent book.” *Mediaeval Studies*, 33 (1971): 334-43.

———. “Adhemar of Puy: The Bishop and His Critics.” *Speculum: A Journal of Medieval Studies* 34, no. 2 (April, 1959): 201-212.

- Cowdrey, H.E.J. *Pope Gregory VII, 1073-1085*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.
- . “The Genesis of the Crusades: The Springs of Western Ideas of Holy War.” *The Holy War: The Conference on Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 5th, Ohio State University, 1974*. Edited by Thomas Patrick Murphy. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1976: 9-32.
- . “The Papacy, the Patarenes and the Church of Milan.” *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, 5th ser.*, 18 (1986): 25-48.
- Derbes, Anne. "A Crusading Fresco Cycle at the Cathedral of Le Puy." *The Art Bulletin* 73, no. 4 (1991): 561-76.
- Edbury, Peter W. and Rowe, John Gordon. *William of Tyre: History of the Latin East*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Emerton, Ephraim, trans and ed. *The Correspondences of Pope Gregory VII*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1932.
- Erdmann, Carl. *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*. Translated by Marshall W. Baldwin and Walter Goffart. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977.
- Fossier, Robert. “Rural economy and country life.” In *The New Cambridge Medieval History III c.900-c.1024*. Edited. by Reuter, Timothy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999: 27-63.
- France, John. *Victory in the East: A Military History of the First Crusade*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- . “The Election and Title of Godfrey de Bouillon.” *Canadian Journal of History* 18 (1983): 321-329.
- Gibbon, Edward. *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire vol. VII: The Normans in Italy and the Crusades*. Edited and with an introduction by Felipe Fernandez-Armesto. London: The Folio Society, 1989.

Gilchrist, John. "The Erdmann Thesis and the Canon Law, 1083-1141." *Crusade and settlement: Papers read at the First Conference of the Society for the Study of the Crusades and the Latin East*. Presented to R.C. Smail and edited by P.W. Edbury. Cardiff: University College Cardiff Press, 1985: 37-45.

Hobsbawm, Eric and Ranger, Terence. "Introduction." In *The Invention of Tradition*. Edited by Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger, 1-14. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1983.

Jones, Robert W. *Bloodied Banners: Martial Display on the Medieval Battlefield*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2010.

Kehr, Paul. *Die Belehnungen der süditalienischen Normannen Fürsten durch die Päpste 1059-1192*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter und Co., 1934.

Kelly, J.N.D. *The Oxford Dictionary of Popes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.

Kjørmo, Marius. "The Holy Lance of Antioch: A Study on the Impact of a Perceived Relic during the First Crusade." Master's Thesis, University of Bergen, Spring 2009.

Loomis, Laura Hibbard. "The Holy Relics of Charlemagne and King Athelstan: The Lances of Longinus and St. Maurice." *Speculum* 54, no. 4 (October, 1950): 437-456.

Luscombe, David and Jonathan Riley-Smith, eds. *The New Cambridge Medieval History IV c.1024-1198*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Luscombe, David and Riley-Smith, Jonathan. "Introduction." In *The New Cambridge Medieval History IV c.1024-1198*. Edited by Luscombe, David and Riley-Smith, Jonathan. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004: 1-10.

- Mayer, Hans Eberhard. *The Crusade*. Translated by John Gillingham. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- McKitterick, Rosamond. "The Church." In *The New Cambridge Medieval History III c.900-c.1024*. Edited by Reuter, Timothy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999: 130-162.
- Murray, Alan V. "'Mighty Against the Enemies of Christ': The Relic of the True Cross in the Armies of the Kingdom of Jerusalem." In *The Crusaders and Their Sources: Essays Presented to Bernard Hamilton*. Edited by John France and William G. Zajac. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 1998: 217-238.
- Perrin, W.G. *British Flags: Their Early History, and Their Development at Sea; With an Account of the Origin of the Flag as a National Device*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1922.
- Phillips, Jonathan, ed. *The First Crusade: Origins and Impact*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1997.
- Prawer, Joshua. "The Jerusalem The Crusaders Captured." *Crusade and Settlement*. Edited by Peter W. Edbury. Cardiff: University College Cardiff Press, 1985: 1-16.
- Pryor, J.H. "The oaths of the leaders of the First Crusade to Emperor Alexios I Comnenus." *Parergon* no. 2 (1984): 111-141.
- Riley-Smith, Jonathan. *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986.
- . *The First Crusaders, 1095-1131*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Rubenstein, Jay. "What is the *Gesta Francorum* and Who is Peter Tudebode?" *Revue Mabillon* 16 (2005): 179-204.

———. *Armies of Heaven: The First Crusade and the Quest for the Apocalypse*. New York: Basic Books, 2011.

Runciman, Steven. "The Holy Lance Found At Antioch." *Analecta Bollandiana* 68 (1950): 197-209.

———. *A History of the Crusades vol. 1: The First Crusade*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1951.

———. *A History of the Crusades vol. 1: The Kingdom of Jerusalem*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1952.

Sumption, Jonathan. *Pilgrimage: An Image of the Mediaeval Religion*. Totowa N.J.: Rowman and Littlefield, 1975.

Tierney, Brian. *The Crisis of Church and State 1050-1300*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988.

Von Ranke, Leopold. *Weltgeschichte* 8. Leipzig: Verlag von Dunder & Humblot, 1887.

Ward, Benedicta. *Miracles and the Medieval Mind: Theory, Record, and Event 1000-1215*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1982.