CHAPTER FOUR

PAUPERES AND THE FIRST CRUSADE:
FROM ANTIOCH TO JERUSALEM

The authority of Peter Bartholomew and Stephen of Valence was greatly enhanced by the decisive victory of 28 June 1098. Not only was the result of the battle an indication for contemporary eyes of God’s judgement, but also during the course of the battle, Stephen’s predicted divine aid was said to have materialised in the form of the three fighting saints leading a detachment of troops. Bruno of Lucca was one of those who claimed to have seen divine intervention during the battle. On 20 July he left Antioch and returned home to describe his experiences, which were put into a letter by the clergy and people of Lucca and widely circulated. He claimed that the crusaders entering battle saw a wonderful white standard and a countless host of knights.

There was a great deal of plunder arising from the victory about which Guibert of Nogent wrote that if a pauper took something that he wanted, no wealthier man (ditior) tried to take it from him by force, but each permitted the other to take what he wanted without a fight. Whether or not this was one of the insertions by Guibert of actual historical material from returned eyewitnesses, it is interesting testimony that Guibert considered the conditions on the First Crusade at this point unusual because the rich were not taking wealth by force from the poor. By contrast Raymond of Aguilers reported conflict over property then took place among the princes and their followers. He wrote that in the period after the victory discordia shook not only the principes, but thefts and robberies took place among their households.

Social tension between rich and poor did not ease once the battle with Kerbogha took place, but rather it found different expression. The key issue that now made manifest this social tension was that

---

1 GF 69.
2 Letter of the clergy and people of Lucca to the faithful, Hagenmeyer, Epistulae et Chartae, p. 166.
3 GN 243.
4 RA 136 (262).
of whether the expedition was to continue to Jerusalem or not. The princes, wanting to avoid plague in Antioch and to consolidate their local gains, scattered throughout the region. Firstly though, they did make an offer to the poor. In a very interesting passage, describing an offer by the princes after the victory over Kerbogha, the author of the *Gesta Francorum* wrote: ‘the princes had it announced throughout the whole city that if by chance there should be present someone *egens* in that place, and lacking in gold and silver, if he wished to remain, having made a compact with them, he would be retained with pleasure.’

To whom was the offer being made? Clearly it was addressed to persons experiencing poverty, but did the princes, after their stunning victory, want to consolidate a labour force or a military following? Were they appealing to non-combatants, footsoldiers, or knights? Some insight on the matter is offered by the reworking of the incident by one of the later authors. Baldric of Dol interpreted the offer as deriving from a concern by the princes for the welfare of the *pauperes* and while this is possible, it has to be borne in mind that Baldric used every opportunity to portray the First Crusade as displaying social harmony between rich and poor. Baldric did, however, offer a clarification of the offer of the princes. His version of the same passage distinguished between those *egeni* who were vigorous (*corpore vegetus*), whom the princes wished to take away into service, and those too weak to leave the city, who were instructed to be maintained from public stipends until recovered.

So, according to Baldric’s interpretation of this passage of the *Gesta Francorum*, even though the language used by the anonymous author had overtones of a feudal legal contract of vassalage, particularly with the use of the verb *retinere*, it was addressed, in fact, to the lower social order. The offer does not seem to have been a popular one. Instead, when Raymond Pilet attempted prematurely to lead an expedition against Ma’arra in July 1098, a great number of poor from Antioch and local Christians unused to combat attached themselves to him. In large part it was their presence that resulted in Raymond Pilet’s forces
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being thrown back by Ridwan of Aleppo. According to the author of the
*Gesta Francorum* it was the Syrians and the gens minuta who fled first.\(^8\)

Expressions of social discontent increased following the death of
Bishop Adhémar of Le Puy, 1 August 1098, the papal legate and the
key figure in maintaining harmony between the princes and between
the different social forces. The final appearance of the term *pauperes* in the
text of the *Gesta Francorum* was in the epitaph to Adhémar: ‘Because he
[Adhémar] was the helper of the *pauperes*, the counsel of the rich, and
he ordered the clergy, preached to and summoned the knights, saying
this, “None of you can be saved unless he does honour to the *pauperes*
and assists them; you cannot be saved without them, and they cannot
live without you.”’\(^9\) Guibert’s version of the same passage returned to
the theme of tension over property. He had Adhémar say that unless the
*minores* were treated as equals and wealth that was obtained unequally
was shared, the magnates would exclude themselves from divine mercy.\(^10\)

For Guibert of Nogent the death of Adhémar also marked the point at
which the *principes* began to argue among themselves, while the *mediocres*
and *vulgus* became insolent, obeying no one single ruler and regarding
all things as equal among them. He added that often, while the desire
of the *vulgus* prevailed, their conduct was inappropriate for the divine
nature of the expedition.\(^11\) This passage is important in showing that
Guibert’s perspective was markedly different from that of Raymond
of Aguilers. While Guibert encouraged acts of charity from magnates
to the poor, he did not approve of the lower social orders acting for
themselves and displaying *insolentia* towards the princes. Albert’s account
of the death of Bishop Adhémar of Le Puy emphasised the respect that
the legate received from all social groupings by reporting that everyone,
*nobiles et ignobiles*, mourned with extreme lamentations.\(^12\)
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No sooner was Adhémar dead, than Peter Bartholomew came forward in an immediate bid to step into the role played by the legate and address the social and political issues facing the crusade. He reported a vision two days after the death of the legate, in which the dead bishop appeared accompanied by St Andrew. First Peter reinforced the legitimacy of the Lance—and therefore his own prestige—by describing Adhémar as appearing before him with terrible burns on his head and face, the scars of being in hell for a time, for having doubted the miracle. Secondly, Peter reported that Adhémar asked that his, by no means inconsiderable following, attach themselves to Count Raymond. Thirdly, Adhémar stated that ‘I have never been as useful to [the Christian forces] as I shall be in future. . . . For I shall dwell with them. . . . I shall appear and offer better counsel than I have done hitherto.’ Although it is unstated, there is no doubt as to whom the dead Bishop would communicate his future, better, counsels.

Peter also had Adhémar emphasise the value of charity extended to the *pauperes*. According to Peter the Bishop said that he was saved from a punishing fire by a robe returned to him by the Lord, because on his ordination as bishop he had presented it to a certain *pauper*. St Andrew then intervened to address the split among the princes over the issue of who should rule Antioch. The saint was non-committal as to which individual prince should command Antioch, but was very clearly hostile to restoring the city to the Byzantine Empire, using the example of Nicea as a city won by God for the Christian forces only to be given away. St Andrew added that to use force to obtain the city was illegal and unrighteous, which was clearly an attempt to head off a coup attempt by Bohemond by threatening him with the united disapproval of the entire Christian body. Already by the time of the vision Bohemond had violently ousted Raymond’s troops from the citadel of Antioch and was tightening his grip over towers and gates. St Andrew’s message in response was that peace was essential as disunity could lead to disaster.

A major theme of the vision concerned the poor crusaders. St Andrew commanded that there should be a public accounting of the wealth of the princes through their bishops followed by a redistribution of wealth
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to the *pauperes*.  This seems to be a direct alternative to the offer of the princes to take the poor into their service. Many *pauperes* had marched for over two years without experiencing any form of lordship; this proposal by St Andrew for a public accounting of the wealth of the princes followed by increased donations to the poor would have been immensely more palatable to them. This vision of Peter Bartholomew then, was a highly political one, shaped by the immediate circumstances, particularly those arising from the death of the papal legate.

The most striking feature of the vision was the confident tone in which one of the poorest of the crusaders was addressing one of the most senior princes. Count Raymond was reminded of his faults and given orders. Even at this early stage of his career the manner of Peter Bartholomew was becoming bolder. But neither the social weight of his supporters among the *pauperes*, nor his appeal to the patronage of Count Raymond were sufficient to impose the demands of the vision on the crusade leaders. Raymond of Aguilers reported that the words of St Andrew were first believed but due to continuing strife over whether to acknowledge the Byzantine emperor as ruler, and other discords, the property of the *pauperes* was destroyed and nothing came of the advice that the *principes* had obtained from St Andrew. Nonetheless, through his association with the Lance and under the protection of Count Raymond, Peter Bartholomew remained in a position to reassert himself if the opportunity presented itself.

The longer time passed without the Christian forces reuniting and pressing on to Jerusalem, the greater the hardship on the *pauperes*. Lacking any form of income other than plunder, victory over Kerbogha had brought the *pauperes* only temporary relief from the hardship they were suffering. Not only did famine conditions continue inside the city but in August there was an outbreak of a plague that, reported Albert of Aachen, killed an uncountable multitude, whether *nobiles proceres* or *humilis vulgus*. Albert reflected the discontent of the poor from the perspective of the Lotharingian contingent in his account of the period from September to November 1098. He reported that Duke Godfrey of Lotharingia was urged to undertake warfare by the complaints of the *pauperes Christi*. Godfrey, having learned of the attacks of the
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Armenian lord Bagrat, brother of the robber prince Kogh Vasil, from messengers sent by his brother Baldwin, now ruler of Edessa, undertook an expedition north from Antioch to Turbessel (Tell Bashir) and Ravendel. Albert wrote that the Duke set out because of this incident ‘and the complaints of the pauperes.’20

By October 1098, according to Albert, a great dissension took place among the populus. And many of the populus of Duke Godfrey, Robert of Flanders and Bohemond, who had no faith or trust in their replies and their words about going to Jerusalem before long, withdrew themselves.21 Raymond of Aguilers had a similar account of the same period, from the Provençal perspective. Count Raymond of Toulouse was described as leading a raid, 14–17 September 1098, from Antioch, pro causa pauperum.22 Raiding again in the latter half of the month, the Count assembled his knights that he might lead the plebs pauperum, who were suffering hunger and weariness at Antioch, into Palestine.23 These ‘commoners of poor means’ seem to be a variation on pauperes used by the author to avoid direct repetition of very similar phrases. So too with the appearance of populus pauperum in a sentence that arose in the historian’s account of a third raid led by Count Raymond, which captured Albara on or about 25 September 1098.24 Raymond of Aguilers also singled out the pauperes as being most affected by the expedition being stalled at Antioch due to the discord of the princes at the end of October 1098.25

During this period Peter Bartholomew consolidated his position within the Provençal contingent with further visions. One took place during the foraging expedition of Count Raymond 14–17 September. This time the visionary spoke aloud in the night in the tent that housed the count’s chaplaincy and subsequently attempted to draw the others present into supporting the revelation, but Simon, a chaplain, covered his head. The Bishop of Apt was not sure if he had seen a vision or whether he had been dreaming. He shook awake the chronicler Raymond of Aguilers, who felt that he was in the presence of extra light and great emotion,
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as if Holy Grace had entered his soul. Peter Bartholomew explained that was indeed the case as the Lord had been present for some time. The message of the Lord and St Andrew was for Count Raymond and it was a strong one. They claimed that although he had received the gift of the Holy Lance he had nonetheless sinned badly. Therefore he was commanded to do penance before Peter Bartholomew. The visionary was playing for high stakes by confronting Count Raymond in this way and he risked reprisals from the wrath of the Count’s vassals or the Count himself if he made an error of judgement.

It was an extraordinary encounter, most unusual in any medieval period, that a servile youth would seek to dictate to a prince of great age, dignity and standing. The particular theology of the crusade, adapted to the mood of a politically large body of suspicious and discontented pauperes, had allowed Peter Bartholomew to project himself into a prominence that he could never otherwise have achieved. This is not to portray the visionary as necessarily a charlatan. Although there were certainly rogues in France at this time who cynically traded on the credulity of others to obtain an income, equally those monks who created false documents to serve the Church saw themselves as divinely inspired rather than forgers. Peter Bartholomew might well have understood his role in this light, acting out of necessity, to save a divine expedition that might otherwise disintegrate through the rivalry of the princes. He had to strike a careful balance; promoting Count Raymond over the other princes but at the same time giving voice to the criticisms of the count raised by the poor. His room for manoeuvre was narrow, as his visions were making many enemies, particularly among the other princes. By coming forward and taking up a significant position as a leader of the expedition Peter Bartholomew was playing with fire, literally.

Faced with the news of this vision from his own clerical household Count Raymond prevaricated before Peter privately told him his sin, after which he confessed and performed penance. The political content of the vision consisted of a demand for an immediate resumption of
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the crusade and an attack on the advisers of the count for their evil counsel. Whatever difficulties Count Raymond had in controlling an unruly and disparate following were by this point clearly compounded by the role of Peter Bartholomew. Just why Raymond accommodated the self-proclaimed visionary in the tent of his chaplaincy in the first place becomes more understandable in the light of Raymond of Aguilers’ observation that during the siege of Antioch, it was proclaimed that Count Raymond was nobody because he was believed to be shirking from battle. Having incurred this problem, namely about the substance of his courage, he suffered such great hostility from his men that he was almost estranged from his household.30 Once he had leapt at the chance of increased authority through supporting the legitimacy of the Holy Lance, which Peter Bartholomew humbly and cleverly cited as being evidence of particular divine favour for Raymond, the count was in no position to doubt the subsequent visions. His choice was either to have the Lance accompanied by a special status for Peter, or to discredit them both. Count Raymond followed the direction of Peter’s latest vision.

On 5 November 1098 the senior princes, their immediate followers and the clergy met in the cathedral of St Peter. It soon became clear that a deep division remained between Count Raymond, who reminded Bohemond of the oath they had taken to the Byzantine emperor, and the Norman prince who was determined to hold the city. Raymond of Aguilers reported that as a result frustration grew among the populus. The fact that he used a wider term at this point than pauperes is indicative that a wide social grouping wished to press on to Jerusalem. The people threatened to choose their own leader to lead them onward and even to tear down the walls of the city if no resolution was come to.31 A compromise was resolved, that in practice favoured Bohemond. Oaths were taken and the expedition resumed by the princes with agreement that their first goal should be the reduction of Ma’arra. It was Count Raymond and Robert, count of Flanders, who led the first army out of Antioch, 23 November 1098, accompanied, wrote William of Tyre, by a great number of pauperes.32

Once underway, the apostles returned to give advice to the crusaders through their now powerful intermediary, Peter Bartholomew. On the
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night of 30 November 1098, at the siege of Ma’arra, Peter Bartholomew claimed to a mass assembly the next day, SS Peter and Andrew, initially clad in the ugly and filthy clothing of *pauperes*, visited him. The saints explained that this dress was the garb in which they came to God, a point that no doubt was welcomed by the poor crusaders.\(^{33}\) Their initial appearance also gave an answer to the critics of Peter Bartholomew who could not believe that God would reveal himself to one so lowly.\(^{34}\) The saints then outlined their criticisms of the crusade and how they should be addressed:

Among you are murders and plunders and thefts, there is no justice and very many adulteries, although it is pleasing to God if you all take wives. Concerning justice, however, the Lord commands thus: that if anyone does violence to a *pauper*, whatever is in the oppressor’s house should entirely be made public. Concerning tithes, however, the Lord says that if you pay them, he himself is willing to give you what is necessary.\(^{35}\)

Peter Tudebode had a description of the same vision of Peter Bartholomew in his most marked departure from the *Gesta Francorum*. It was drawn from the account of Raymond of Aguilers but is worth noting in full, as it is clear from his other comments concerning the siege of Ma’arra that Peter Tudebode was an eyewitness to events there and that his borrowing from Raymond can be considered corroborative.

St Andrew announced to Peter Bartholomew . . . that the Lord had instructions: *Love your brothers as yourself* (Lev 19:34). And they should return that part which He individually retained, when He created the world itself and all the creatures that are in it, namely a tenth part of all things that are possessed. He himself will give the city in a short time and fulfil all His will. He ordered the aforementioned tithe to be divided into four parts, one of which was to be given to the bishop, another to the priests, another to the churches and the other to the *pauperes*. This they all conceded after it was recited in a council.\(^{36}\)
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These reports suggest that the vision contained four significant points. The first was that justice was seen as being required on behalf of the *pauperes*, to defend them from violence from their fellow Christian oppressors. The second, that the solution to the presence of large numbers of unmarried women on crusade was that they be married; a response that contrasted with the policy of the senior clergy who were more inclined to drive women from the crusade altogether.\(^{37}\) The third point was that once again the Peter Bartholomew raised the idea of a public accounting of the resources available to the crusaders, this time of those suspected of taking goods from the *pauperes*. Lastly the vision raised the idea of taking a tithe for the church and the *pauperes*. This reflects the harsh poverty that existed among the Christian forces at the siege and that would shortly drive some of the poorest crusaders to acts of cannibalism.

At a council of Count Raymond’s faction the following day, which was attended by the people as well as the nobles, a partial concession was made to the needs of the poor crusader. A collection was taken to which the faithful offered generous alms.\(^{38}\) Having been inspired by this vision of Peter Bartholomew, reported Raymond of Aguilera, the army was now aroused and willing to attempt to seize the city, in order that the *plebs pauperum* means should be liberated.\(^{39}\) The subsequent attack, 11 December 1098, demoralised the population of Ma’arra to the point that they abandoned their defences and the *pauperes* took advantage of the now established tradition of looting to break into the city at night to secure all the plunder and houses, after the *milites* had forced a way into the city during the day. When the *milites* entered the next morning they found little they could take away with them.\(^{40}\)

The plunder clearly only ameliorated the hardship faced by the *pauperes* for a short interval. Within a month of the fall of Ma’arra the *pauperes* engaged in acts of cannibalism. According to Peter Tudebode the *pauperes peregrini* began to split open the bodies of the pagans, because they came across bezants hidden in the stomachs. Others then fell to the meat of these for scraps of food. As a result the
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seniores had the pagans dragged outside the gates of the city, where they made mountains of them and afterwards they were burned.41 The *Gesta Francorum* formed the basis of Peter Tudebode’s phrasing, but typical of the anonymous’s limited social vocabulary, he did not distinguish the *pauperes* from the *seniores*.42 According to the *Chanson d’Antioche* it was the *tafurs* who ate the bodies of the Saracens.43

Among the Christian forces at Ma’arra a major political upheaval now took place, one in which the latent alliance of *pauper* and *miles* that had recently made threats towards the *principes* at Antioch became manifest. Count Raymond had hoped to use the town as a base for a principality that he could hold as a vassal of the Byzantine emperor. But in the harsh circumstances of December 1098 this was an ambition that neither the *pauperes* nor the *milites* would support. Around Christmas 1098 at a council of the Provençals the *milites* sided with the *pauperes* in insisting that the Count lead the way to Jerusalem, failing which they demanded that he hand over the Holy Lance and the people would march to Jerusalem with the Lord as their leader.44

Count Raymond therefore arranged a conference with the other princes to negotiate the terms on which the expedition would continue. This meeting took place at Chastel-Rouge, probably on 4 January 1099, but came to nothing. According to Robert the Monk, when the other princes departed, many *iuvenes* remained at Chastel-Rouge, ‘on fire’ to complete the journey to Jerusalem.45 Count Raymond, however, now allocated a significant number of his knights and footmen to garrison Ma’arra. As a result, reported Raymond of Aguilers, the *pauperes* began to worry that the Christian forces would be diminished by the allocation of a garrison to every captured city between Antioch and Jerusalem.46 They decided to force Raymond’s hand and destroy the walls of the city, making it defenceless and unsuitable as a base for Raymond’s local operations.

The bishop of Albara, acting for the Count, used threats and force to prevent the poor, including the sick and infirm, from destroying the city defences. But as soon as his guards passed by, people returned to
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their task. Count Raymond on his return to the city was furious but helpless. He bowed to the alliance of poor pilgrim and knight and set off southwards, *pro causa pauperum*, wrote Raymond of Aguilers. On the march through the Buqaia, the plain that connects inner Syria to the sea, in January 1099, those *pauperes*, who because of their weakness lingered a long way behind the army, were killed by Turkish forces. The situation of the *pauperes* and the whole army improved, however, reported Raymond of Aguilers, following the arrival of provisions from the emir of Shaizar in January 1099. Day by day the *pauperes* regained health, the *milites* became stronger, and the army seemed to multiply. Soon after, 28 January 1099, the *pauperes* again grabbed plunder from under the noses of the *milites* at Hosn al-Akrad. While Count Raymond with certain *milites* strained in the battle, the *pauperes*, having obtained booty, began to leave, one after the other. Next the poor footsoldiers took to the road, and after these the common knights.

Count Raymond still harboured ambitions in the region. Raymond of Aguilers reported a very interesting speech by Tancred against diverting the expedition from its goal of Jerusalem, at a time, during January 1099, when Count Raymond was considering the capture of Jabala: ‘God visited the *plebs pauperum* and us, and must we therefore turn aside from the journey?’ The Norman faction of the expedition was willing to endorse the idea that God was making his will known through visions, provided that the visionaries endorsed the idea of moving southwards. Bribed with a huge amount of gold and silver from the emir of Tripoli, however, and with a temporary restoration of loyalty from his *milites* who anticipated further tribute, Count Raymond did manage to divert the crusade to ‘Arqa (‘Akkār) and began a three month siege on 14 February, 1099. The support for this action quickly became lacklustre, especially after the emir of Tripoli ceased his payments. Soon, wrote Albert of Aachen, all persons, *parvi et magni*, pressed for a continuation of the journey to Jerusalem according to their vow.
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At some point in March 1099 the idea of taking a tithe was implemented. According to Raymond of Aguilers, ‘it was announced there at that time that the people should give tithes of all things which they had captured, since there were many pauperes in the army and many infirm people. And it was ordered that they should deliver a fourth part to their priests whose masses they attended, a fourth to the bishops and the remaining two [fourths] to Peter the Hermit whom they had placed in charge of the pauperes, from the clergy and the people.’ This is an interesting passage, clearly the source of Peter Tudebode’s phrasing for the earlier vision of Peter Bartholomew. The division of pauper, cleric and populus looks a little like the traditional tripartite division of those who work, pray and fight. But this cannot be Raymond’s meaning as Peter the Hermit was not in charge of the entire expedition. Rather it seems that he had a special responsibility for non-combatants, as was seen again before the battle of Ascalon, 12 August 1099, where he was left behind in Jerusalem after the fighting forces had left, in order to lead the processions and services.

The complex division of the tithe might well reflect the confused organisation of the expedition at this point. As well as horizontal divisions between rich and poor, there were vertical ones between the different regional contingents, many of which were hostile to Count Raymond of Toulouse. The distribution of the tithe looks like a compromise. All the tithe was intended to go to the clergy, the pauperes and the infirm, but apart from a share that was given communally to those most in need by Peter the Hermit, like the stipend mentioned by Baldric available to the sick in Antioch in August 1098, the rest was distributed to the clergy through their particular regional contingents.

On the night of 5 April, during the now deeply unpopular siege, another vision occurred to Peter Bartholomew, which he dictated to Raymond of Aguilers. The peasant visionary had been brooding on why Christ had favoured Stephen of Valence by not only appearing before him on the cross but also addressing him. That night Peter Bartholomew caught up to his rival with a vision of St Peter, St Andrew
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and Christ, in which Christ addressed the visionary. The Lord had a five-fold assessment of the crusading expedition. The first rank of the crusaders consisted of those who fought and who after dying would be seated on God’s right. In the second rank were the auxiliaries, the rear guard for the fighters. In the third rank were crusaders who acted to provide supplies to the fighters. But those of the fourth rank were reprehensible as they stayed away from combat. Even worse, in the fifth rank were the cowards who urged other crusaders not to join the battles or even furnish arms to the fighters. These types of crusader were compared to Judas and Pontius Pilate. Christ then gave orders intended for Count Raymond concerning the cowards. The crusaders were to be called together and the alarm sounded, then the shirkers would be discovered. They should then be executed and their worldly goods given to those of the first rank. The Lord also gave a command to the crusaders regarding justice, which was that they appoint judges according to family and kin. These judges should have the right to take the possessions of a defendant, giving half to the plaintiff and half to the authorities.56

This vision was to cost Peter Bartholomew his life. The visionary had kept his influential position by striking a balance between enhancing the authority of Count Raymond and by articulating the needs of the pauperes. His enemies included the secular vassals of the count and the nobility of the other factions. As has been noted, although the Normans were sceptical of the Holy Lance, it seems that Tancred was willing to utilise the message of the visionary so long as it advocated continuation of the expedition towards Jerusalem. By siding with the unpopular perspective of the count at ‘Arqah, the visionary had made a fatal mistake. The attitude of the Norman contingent hardened against him. Worse, the last message that the now politically active body of poor crusaders wanted to hear was that they must bestir themselves in this siege or risk execution for cowardice. By advocating a continuation of the siege of ‘Arqa Peter Bartholomew precipitated a clash with the other princely factions and by alienating himself from his supporters amongst the pauperes he allowed his enemies the chance to bring him down.

---
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The legitimacy of the Lance was immediately challenged at a two-day council of the clergy 6-7 April 1099.\(^{57}\) The chief author of this controversy, William of Tyre later wrote, was Arnulf of Chocques, the friend and chaplain of the duke of Normandy.\(^{58}\) Testimony was taken from Arnulf against the Lance. In favour of the authenticity of the relic were not only Peter Bartholomew but also other visionaries of lowly status, including a priest Peter Desiderius, chaplain to Isoard I, count of Die (a senior noble in the company of Raymond of Toulouse), who had come to the attention of the Provençal chaplaincy at Antioch with a vision concerning the relics of St George.\(^{59}\) Peter Desiderius claimed also to have seen a vision of the singed Adhémar. Ebrard, a priest, said that Mary, Christ’s mother, had appeared to him while he was in Tripoli shortly before Antioch’s capture and told him of the Lance. Stephen of Valence repeated his story of Christ’s appearance, and while not claiming to have had foreknowledge of the Lance, believed that it was part of Christ’s promise of aid to the crusaders. The bishop of Apt and Raymond of Aguilers himself both were inclined to support the Lance, but hedged their testimony, the bishop by being uncertain if his vision of the Lance may have been a dream, and the chronicler through his wavering defence of the Lance.\(^{60}\) Raymond of Aguilers was later confronted by Peter Bartholomew and in tears admitted to the visionary that he had secretly desired to see the miracle of the Lance confirmed by ordeal.\(^{61}\)

According to Raymond of Aguilers, Arnulf backed down when faced with this testimony, effectively a rallying of a section of the clergy to Peter Bartholomew. He was about to perform penance for his false accusation, when he changed his mind. William of Tyre’s later summary of the situation was that for a long time the pilgrims discussed this matter, hesitating between different opinions.\(^{62}\) Albert of Aachen’s report of a schisma among the Christian forces suggests the matter was the cause of a serious split.\(^{63}\) Evidently, despite his loss of prestige from the latest
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\(^{58}\) WT 7.18 (366).
\(^{59}\) RA 111–13 (257). For Peter Desiderius see J. Riley-Smith, The First Crusaders, p. 216; for Isoard I, count of Die see RA 66 n. 2, see also J. Riley-Smith, First Crusaders, p. 213.
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\(^{63}\) AA v.32 (378).
vision, Peter Bartholomew had enough support to make the crisis a close run thing. Tipping the balance were probably those, like Raymond of Aguilers, who sincerely believed in Peter and his visions but wished to see them proven. Finally, Arnulf faced down the visionary, who then offered to undertake an ordeal by fire to prove his testimony.64

The body of people who demanded that the visionary Peter Bartholomew test the legitimacy of the Holy Lance were termed plebeculae by Guibert. He wrote that the rumour began to circulate that the discovery of the relic had been staged and that it was merely a lance, therefore an enormous plebeculae began to mutter (mussitare).65 As has been noted, to ‘mutter’ was extremely disobedient conduct from the perspective of an abbot of a Benedictine monastery.66 Guibert was a supporter of the legitimacy of the Holy Lance and therefore his sense of the term plebeculae here is thus probably pejorative, ‘a mob of commoners.’ Guibert also wrote that the pile of timber needed for the trial was heaped up by many of the populus, ‘eager for novelty,’ a classical phrase employed by Guibert for tumultuous and irresponsible crowds.67

The ordeal of Peter Bartholomew is one of the most vivid descriptions of trial by fire in the Middle Ages. The sources for the First Crusade are extremely consistent in the description of it, less so on the meaning of the outcome.68 Two huge pyres were set alight, with a small path between them. Raymond of Aguilers, the chronicler, was master of ceremonies and shouted aloud the issue to the eager crowd: if God and St Andrew had talked to Peter Bartholomew, he would walk through unhurt, if it was a lie, Peter and the Lance that he carried would be consumed by the flames.69 Clad only in a tunic Peter Bartholomew carried the Lance through the fire and emerged from the flames to hold the Lance aloft and scream ‘God help us.’ He was mobbed by the crowd and had to be forcibly rescued from them by Raymond Pilet.

In the light of the Gospel depiction of the passion of Christ it is significant that in his account of this event Raymond of Aguilers described the watching crowds at the ordeal initially as populus, then
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65 GN 262: Incipit itaque enormis plebeculae passim mussitare…
66 See above p. 115.
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multitudo populi, then turba as they progressed from praying, to watching, to charging across to Peter and inflicting wounds more lethal than those of the flames.\textsuperscript{70} In Guibert’s account of the ordeal he wrote that the vulgus surrounded the visionary to seize his clothes like relics.\textsuperscript{71} Moreover, the outcome of the trial led to a division among the vulgus, who unreliable and fickle in their judgment, were now disturbed by an even worse form of confusion.\textsuperscript{72} Albert of Aachen and Fulcher of Chartres both considered the outcome to have been more decisive. For Albert the ordeal led to a decline in the veneration of the relic. To a great extent it was now thought that the relic had only come into being through the ambitions of Count Raymond.\textsuperscript{73} Fulcher described the followers of the Lance as becoming sad and disillusioned, although he noted that it continued to be venerated by the count.\textsuperscript{74}

Twelve days after his ordeal Peter Bartholomew was dead. Not only had he to contend with burns but the wounds inflicted upon him by his enemies among the mob that engulfed him had been deep; furthermore his back was probably broken.\textsuperscript{75} With the death of the visionary came the final disintegration of the hegemony of Count Raymond’s entourage over the crusade, particularly because those Southern French followers of the Bishop of Le Puy who had joined the familia of the Count after the death of their lord no longer co-operated with their Provençal comrades.

Around 18 April 1099, during the siege of ‘Arqa, at a point where the emir of Tripoli was refusing to pay further tribute, emissaries from Emperor Alexios I Comnenus caught up with the main body of crusaders, to complain about Bohemond’s possession of Antioch. Their arrival reawakened Count Raymond’s aspiration of using the presence of crusaders, who might otherwise leave following the capture of Jerusalem, to win a principality that could be held as a fief from the Emperor. He advocated stepping up the siege and waiting for aid from Alexios before journeying on to Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{76} Raymond of Aguilers noted that the majority of people rejected these arguments, but the
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crusade remained at an impasse due to the large entourage of Count Raymond.\textsuperscript{77} Prayers, fasting and alms for the people were proclaimed in the hope of resolving the situation, and another vision promptly occurred. Into the vacuum created by the death of Peter Bartholomew stepped the priest and visionary Stephen of Valence.

Stephen now reported that Christ, Bishop Adhémar and Mary had appeared to him. The papal legate had shown Stephen his burns, supporting therefore the legitimacy of the Lance, but the legate primarily urged veneration for the relic of the cross that had been brought with him on crusade.\textsuperscript{78} The vision of the Bishop also turned Stephen’s ring into a relic by asking him to present it to Count Raymond as an object through which he should invoke the aid of Mary. The legate had further instructions as to how the Lance should be treated, namely that it should not be shown unless carried by a priest clad in sacred vestments and that it be preceded by Adhémar’s cross.\textsuperscript{79}

The effect of the vision was to eclipse the discredited Lance and substitute the new relics in its place, in particular the cross of the legate, which had been left in Latakia. William Hugh of Monteil, brother of Adhémar, was sent to retrieve the relic. The vision, as reported by Raymond of Aguilers, did not contain a resolution to the issue of the siege of ‘Arqa. It is significant, however, that with the return of William and the cross a new mutiny broke out against Count Raymond and the other princes. This time the \textit{familia} of the Count led the way and the drawback to having absorbed so many followers from the following of Bishop Adhémar of Le Puy became apparent. A great commotion took place in which Count Raymond’s followers set fire to their own tents and departed from the siege.\textsuperscript{80} The count broke into tears and attempted to halt the movement, but, once a part of the Provençal contingent was underway the other crusaders quickly followed. They needed little encouragement from Duke Godfrey of Lotharingia who now urged a resumption of the journey to Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{81}

At Tripoli, from 13 to 16 May 1099, Count Raymond made one last attempt to channel the crusade into the direction he desired. He
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offered gifts to the *nobiles*, that they should besiege Tripoli.\textsuperscript{82} This elicited the stinging rebuke that took the form of another vision. According to Raymond of Aguilers, St Andrew appeared to Peter Desiderius and said to him: ‘go and speak to the count as follows: do not be a plague to yourself or to others because unless Jerusalem is captured you will have no help. Let the incomplete siege of ‘Arqa not trouble you, it is not to concern you that this city or others which are on the route are not at present captured.’\textsuperscript{83} This vision encouraged a further mutiny, with Raymond of Aguilers reporting that the Lord sent so great a love of going to Jerusalem that no one could restrain themselves and they set out in the evening against the decrees of the princes and against the custom of the army.\textsuperscript{84} The resumed march was enthusiastic but hard on those who could not keep up. On or around 18 May 1099 the army was near Jbeil, where those of the *debile vulgus* who had been overcome by the hardship of the journey were buried.\textsuperscript{85} A few days later at a river bank near Sidon they found enough shade for the ‘innumerable’ *debile* and *pauper vulgus* to rest.\textsuperscript{86}

After the investment of Jerusalem, 7 June 1099, the vision of an unnamed hermit gave hope that the city could be stormed, despite the lack of siege machinery. So on the night 12 June a great assault was attempted but beaten back. Thereafter the crusaders settled down to fill the town ditch and build substantial siege engines. Raymond of Aguilers reported that the Christian army at this point had no more than twelve thousand fighters, as well as many who were infirm and *pauperes*.\textsuperscript{87} The work was hard and a great deal of suffering was caused by the lack of drinkable water nearby. In a very interesting comment on the differing extent of hardship on the different social classes, Albert of Aachen wrote that during the siege of Jerusalem ‘a quantity of grapes and a rich supply of wine always abounded for the *primores* and for those who had the money. For the *egeni*, however, and those
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whose means had been exhausted, as you have heard, there was even an extreme lack of water.\textsuperscript{88} The iners vulgus risked drinking bad water and many died of the swelling that resulted from leeches becoming attached to their throats.\textsuperscript{89}

Guibert was disturbed by accounts of the shortages of food and water among the Christians at the siege of Jerusalem and he gave vent to his sympathy for the viri nobiles having to undergo the experience of eating rough bread and drinking bitter liquids. Unconsciously, Guibert was highlighting the same point made more directly by Albert of Aachen, that although the nobility suffered hardship, unlike the pauperes they did not face death from poverty, but rather, upset stomachs.\textsuperscript{90}

During this time the castellan Achard of Montmerle left the siege of Jerusalem to contact six Christian vessels that had arrived in Jaffa on 17 June 1099; he was intercepted by some Arab soldiers and killed. Guibert’s account of this reported not only the death of Achard, but also some of the most respected leaders (honorationes) among the pauperes and the pedites.\textsuperscript{91} This seems to be a clarification of the Gesta Francorum, in which the same incident is reported as involving the death of ‘Achard of Montmerle and the pauperes homines pedites.’\textsuperscript{92} The latter is a slightly ambiguous term that should probably be understood as meaning poor footsoldiers, although Guibert’s separation of pauperes and pedites is a plausible amendment. If Guibert was correct he was providing valuable evidence for the continuing organisation of leadership among bands of pauperes.

The manufacture of great siege towers was an important feature of the siege of Jerusalem. The Gesta Francorum simply reported that Duke Godfrey and Count Raymond had two siege towers made. Non-Christian slaves did some of the work. The senior princes of the expedition had no qualms about selling pagan prisoners as slaves\textsuperscript{93} and were not averse to making use of them, as Raymond of Aguilers indicated in his description of the construction of the siege towers.

\textsuperscript{88} AA vi.7 (412): Vuarum copia et vini affluentia primoribus semper habundabat, et precium habentibus, egenis vero et rebus exhaustis, etiam aque ut audistis nimia erat defectio.
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The men of Count Raymond had taken many fortresses and villages of the Saracens and the Saracens, as if his servi, were afflicted with the work, fifty or sixty of whom carried on their neck great logs that could not be brought by four pairs of oxen, to make siege machines for Jerusalem. Baldric, however, made it clear that the skilled work was done by Christian lignarii and artifices. Fulcher also wrote that on 15 June 1099 artifices were ordered to build machines of war for the siege of Jerusalem.

From the account of the building of the same siege towers by Raymond of Aguilers it can be determined that these craftsmen were independent paid labourers rather than serfs. He wrote that the artifices were given wages from the collections that were made among the people, or, in Count Raymond’s case, the operarii were paid out from his own wealth. The urgency to have this equipment made, led the council of leaders to order those present to offer their mules and boys to the artifices and lignarii so that they could carry off tree-trunks, poles, stakes and branches for the making of wicker screens. The term operarii seems to have been used by Raymond as synonymous with artifices. Not only is this evident in the first example above, but also in the report that Duke Godfrey and the counts of Normandy and Flanders placed Gaston, viscount of Béarn, over the operarii who were constructing machines, and they prepared wickerworks and material for ramparts for the purpose of attacking the walls. Gaston was described as dividing up the operarii wisely. Count Raymond was left to his own devices, and put William Ricau in charge of his operarii on Mount Zion. Nothing more is known of William Ricau, but John France has observed that the name suggests that he was Genoese.

Sailors from Genoa, who had abandoned their ships at Jaffa, had recently reinforced the Christian army, thanks to their Provençal escort. Raymond of Aguilers states that they aided Count Raymond in the construction of siege equipment with the ropes, iron mallets, nails, axes,
pick-axes and hatchets they had salvaged. These skilled workers were paid, unlike the captured Saracens described above, who were put to work under the direction of the bishop of Albara.

A spate of people came forward during this time, claiming to have messages from God as to how Jerusalem could be taken, but, wrote Raymond of Aguilers, ‘because they were our brothers, they were not believed.’ The crusade remained deeply divided at this point and the disbelief was probably that of the Lotharingians and the Normans to towards those who continued to cling to the Holy Lance and the reputation of Peter Bartholomew.

In the end it was Peter Desiderius who had the authority to determine the final direction of the crusade. Peter Desiderius claimed to have received instructions from Adhémar who urged a fast and that the whole army walk on bare feet around the besieged city. Following this an all-out assault was to take place. It is noteworthy that Peter Desiderius took news of this vision to his lord, Count Isoard of Die and to Adhémar’s brother, William Hugh of Monteil rather than Count Raymond.

It seems likely that the split in the southern French contingent that took place when William Hugh returned with the Adhémar’s cross had continued down to Jerusalem and that the visionary had permanently aligned himself with those who led the ending of the siege of ‘Arqa. Those grouped around Desiderius called a council on 6 July, at which all decided to adopt the legate’s commands. Interestingly, though, the Provençal clergy decided not to announce that a vision of Adhémar was the source of the instruction to walk bare-footed around the city, through fear that it would be disbelieved. Again this was probably due to scepticism by the non-Provençal crusaders.

Although the noisy procession must have seemed bizarre, and was an opportunity for those within the city to mock the Christians, it did serve a practical purpose. It united the rival factions and raised the morale of the army for the effort ahead of it.
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The *vulgus* made an appearance in Albert of Aachen’s description of the fall of Jerusalem on 15 July 1099. They were described as being let into the city once the gates had been breached, where they perpetrated slaughter with extreme cruelty. The *vulgus* here were probably a crowd of lowly non-combatants, rushing in to the fray now that their enemies were fleeing, rather than the common footsoldiers for whom Albert preferred the phrase *pedestre vulgus*.

Once inside the city there was a scramble for the goods of the former citizens. Fulcher, not present, but a resident of the city from 9 November 1100, wrote that after such great bloodshed they entered the homes seizing whatever they found in them. Whoever had entered the home first, whether he was a poor man (*pauper*) or a rich man (*dives*), was in no way to be subject to injury by any other. Whether a house or a palace, he was to possess it and whatever he found in it was his own. They had established this law (*ius*) to be held mutually. And thus many poor (*impobes*) were made wealthy (*locupletes*). William of Tyre’s description of the fall of the city included the report that whoever broke into a house, he claimed it together with all its contents as a perpetual right (*ius*), for it had been agreed among them before the city was captured that once the city had been violently attacked, whatever anyone acquired, he should possess it in perpetuity and without molestation by right of ownership (*ius proprietatis*). Therefore very diligently searching through the city and most energetically taking part in the massacre of the citizens, they broke into the recesses and more hidden places of the city, fixing swords or any other kinds of weapons on the entrance of the house so they should be a sign to those who set foot there that they should avoid these places as already seized.

This is important testimony from a careful historian who was born in Jerusalem a generation later (c. 1130). The same sentiment reappears in Guibert’s description of the sacking of the city. He reported an equality in the method of the Lord’s army, so that even the poorest (*pauperrimi*) should have whatever good things came to them thereafter without doubt or challenge, whatever the station of the man into whose hand it should have fallen first. In Baldric’s version of the sacking of the city the scene appears to be more harmonious than in other sources. The
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houses were discovered to have been filled with all good things. They held on to these hoarded necessities and with an abundance having been discovered they were shared with the *pauperiores*.\(^{112}\)

Ralph of Caen indirectly reported on the importance of the law of property, when he composed speeches for Tancred and Arnulf of Chocques, regarding the valuables that Tancred had stripped from the Temple following the sack of the city. Tancred’s defence was that before the attack he had asked Arnulf who would be the owner of the houses and palaces of Jerusalem. Tancred quoted Arnulf’s reply to that question: ‘it was decreed and universally ordained, that with the town having been entered, he who first seized [the property] will be bequeathed it, no matter who he is.\(^{113}\)

Orderic Vitalis wrote an account of the First Crusade in his *Ecclesiastical History* informed by previous chronicles and returning crusaders. Orderic generally was content to follow Baldric of Dol word for word, but significantly added to the description of the fall of Jerusalem the following lines: ‘everyone freely and peacefully obtained possession of whatever house, great or small, that he first broke into and emptied of pagans, together with all the possessions inside it, and up to the present day he has retained it by hereditary right (*hereditarium ius*).\(^{114}\)

This very distinct right, evidenced by a wealth of testimony, by the time of the later historians (Orderic and William) was considered a legal tradition accepted without question. It seems to have evolved out of the practice already noted, that during the expedition it became accepted practice that whoever first obtained plunder, even if they were poor non-combatants, could not have it forcibly removed from them.\(^{115}\)

For the *pauperes* who had come on the expedition as emigrants the question of property was a vital one to their future status. It is no wonder that they insisted upon a ‘right of ownership’. But as a result of this rule, in addition to religious motivations for a massacre of the inhabitants of the city, such as those expressed by Raymond of Aguilers,\(^{116}\)

---

\(^{112}\) BD 103.

\(^{113}\) RC 701: *Decretum est... atque universaliter sanctum, id suo jure cuique, quodcumque sit, relinquendum, fore, cujus post ingressum urbis primus fieret occupator.*

\(^{114}\) OV 5, 172: *Unusquisque domum qualemcumque magnam seu paruam quam primitus insit, ac ethnicis evacuauit; quietam sibi cum omnibus gazis quae ius erant libere possedit, et usque hodie hereditario iure custodit.*

\(^{115}\) See above pp. 117–8.

\(^{116}\) RA 346–8 (300).
the *pauperes* had a powerful material incentive: the previous inhabitants had to be eliminated, for these were to be their new homes.

After the massacre in Jerusalem the Christian leaders were faced with an immense number of bodies that needed to be carried out. Baldric’s *Hierosolymitanae Historiae* had a detail concerning this, not reported elsewhere until it was incorporated into the history of William of Tyre, but which has a note of authenticity about it. Baldric wrote that the surviving pagans were ordered to take the bodies out and, because their numbers were not sufficient, the poor Christians (*pauperes Christiani*), after being given pay (*dato pretio*), engaged in the same work.117 The report in the *Gesta Francorum* agrees that the surviving Saracens dragged out the dead bodies, but has no mention of this being insufficient and the Christian poor being paid for the same work.118 Even if this payment was an invention by Baldric, his report indicates that he considered the *pauperes* on the expedition at this point to be free from compulsory labour. It is noteworthy in this regard that labour at the siege of Jerusalem could not be commanded, except from non-Christian captives: rather, it was voluntary or else had to be paid for.119

Nor does it seem to be the case that after the fall of Jerusalem the Christian poor became serfs; those who stayed as settlers in the Kingdom of Jerusalem were free, rent-paying, farmers. This is the conclusion that Joshua Prawer drew from the charters of the kingdom. For example, those concerning the colonisation of Beit-Jibrin, built in 1136, and whose charters were renewed in 1158 and 1177. These charters show that the settlers had the right to leave the land. Tenures there were hereditary and could be sold, the obligation on the producers being the payment on rent. The rent was not a fixed one based on the amount of land cultivated but, more favourably to the farmers, was *terraticum*, a portion of the crops.120 Similarly with Castle Imbert (Akhzib), colonised by royal initiative 1146–1153. There the inhabitants received houses as hereditary possessions without rent or duty. Each farmer obtained a plot of land for tillage and a further allocation in order to cultivate vines or a garden. Rent to the king was a quarter of the crop, and although these conditions were extremely favourable, the king also obtained
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revenues from his control of baking and bathing.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 140–1.} As Joshua Prawer concluded in his study of charter evidence, ‘with rare exceptions there was no \textit{terra dominicata}, no lordly demesne in the Crusader Kingdom. There is no reason to accuse our documentation. Dozens of villages are minutely described, but the demesne is conspicuous by its absence.’\footnote{Ibid., p. 141.}

Confirmation of the free status of the Christian peasantry of the Kingdom of Jerusalem is indicated by the vocabulary of William, Chancellor of the kingdom (1174) and archbishop of Tyre (1175). William, when describing a settlement near Daron, made a very interesting observation. He explained that, ‘certain cultivators of the fields from the neighbouring places had gathered together and certain of them giving help through mediation they had built there a church and a suburb near the fortress of Daron, where the men of less substance could prosper more easily than in the city.’\footnote{WT 20.19 (937): \textit{Convenerant autem aliqui ex locis finitimis agrorum culturae et negociationibus quidam operam dantes, edificaverant ibi suburbium et ecclesiam non longa a presidio, facti illius loci habitatores: erat enim locus commodus et ubi tenuiores homines facilius proficerent quam in urbis.} The social terms here are \textit{agrorum cultores} for those who initially gathered together, and \textit{tenuiores homines} for the class of people who prospered more easily. Both are unusual terms. Why did William not use the more conventional terms of \textit{rusticus} say, or \textit{agricola}? Almost certainly because the situation he was describing was itself unconventional. The colonists are described as gathering and erecting a church and dwellings on their own initiative. So whilst they were clearly of the lower, labouring, social orders, they seem to have been free from lordship and indeed prospering as a result. The point here is that the evidence from later generations in the crusader kingdom suggests that there was no serfdom and relatively light levels of taxation on Christian farmers. If an aspect of the motivation of the serfs who left for the Promised Land was a wish to improve their social condition, then it seems likely their aim was achieved. The small minority of them, that is, who survived the hardship of the journey.

The payment of the \textit{pauperes} for their work in the siege and in particular the manner in which property was distributed on the fall of Jerusalem is testimony to the political strength of the \textit{pauperes} in the later stages of the crusade. Robert the Monk articulated his admiration for the position of the \textit{pauperes} who had travelled so far and undergone so much hardship with reference to the Old Testament. ‘Then [Jerusalem] enriched...
her sons, coming from afar [Isa 60:4], so that no one in her remained a pauper.\textsuperscript{124} This passage is more theological and literary than historical, although the information it conveys is consistent with other sources, which indicate that the pauperes gained considerable property on the fall of Jerusalem. But its main message, by association with Chapter 60 of Isaiah, was that the journey of the pauperes had culminated in a glorious conclusion and that they had obtained their just reward.

The early crusading sources were not generally sympathetic to the lower social orders. But their evidence is sufficient to show that the pauperes on the First Crusade were not simply a passive body awaiting alms and military success from the milites. The crisis at Antioch as the ‘rope-dancers’ fled the city impelled them to find their voice. Given the inappropriateness of a member of the pauperes attempting to command senior princes directly, the political demands of the pauperes were cloaked in the respectable and orthodox language of visions. Often those writing about the First Crusade have removed from its political context the fervour with which the visions at Antioch were greeted, making the visionaries and their supporters appear irrational. But the outcry in support of the finding of the Holy Lance was an opportunity for the crowds to bring pressure to bear on the knights to come to battle while there was still hope of victory.

Thereafter the presence of the pauperes as an active, creative, force in the direction of the expedition was constant, surging up in alliance with the Norman contingent and the large numbers of knights who were not tightly bound into the following of a senior prince to force the movement onwards, firstly from Antioch itself, then Ma’arra, Jabala, ‘Arqa, and Tripoli. No account of the First Crusade that ignores this pressure from below can be considered a full one. Even at the culmination of the expedition, the fall of Jerusalem, the political momentum of the poor was visible in the fact that their property rights were respected, albeit at the cost of the lives of the local inhabitants.

\textsuperscript{124} RM 868: Tunc quippe filios suos, de longe ad se venientes, ita ditavit quia nullus in ea pauper remansit.