

THE JOURNAL OF
ECCLESIASTICAL
HISTORY

VOLUME FORTY-SEVEN

1996



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

The Destruction of Jerusalem and the First Crusade

by JOHN FRANCE

The First Crusade was such an important event with such amazing consequences that it is hardly surprising that an enormous amount of ink has been spent on discovering the reasons why enthusiasm for it was so widespread. Much effort has been spent on examining factors which preconditioned the men of the eleventh century to welcome Urban's appeal in 1095-6. Broadly speaking it has been supposed that the wars against Islam in Spain accustomed men to the notion of Holy War, while the growing authority of the Church in the age of reform predisposed them to obey their spiritual directors – early evidence of this was the Peace and Truce of God first proclaimed by the bishops and clergy of France. Papal initiative in supporting the reconquest of Islamic Sicily and 'corrupt' England, and the influence of papal ideas about the *militia Christi* refined and developed by Anselm of Lucca reinforced the point. The Church threw its authority behind pilgrimage, the great manifestation of the popular piety of the age which was intimately allied to devotion to relics of saints and the cult of their sacred places. The most sacred of all places, and therefore the greatest of pilgrimages, was that to Jerusalem. It was the spiritual reward for this journey to Jerusalem which Urban II offered for those going on the expedition of 1095. These factors have always been the substance of discussion and were systematically analysed by Erdmann in a book which remains the basis of scholarly discussion to this day. Recently some elements of this ensemble have come into question. It has been doubted whether Anselm of Lucca's radical ideas had much influence amongst the emerging chivalry of the age or even in the thinking of the clergy, while the influence of the Peace Movement and even that of the wars in Spain which for so long have been seen as the theatre in which the idea of meritorious war was made popular

ASC = *Anglo-Saxon chronicle*, ed. D. Whitelock, D. C. Douglas and S. I. Tucker, London 1961; *GCA* = *Gesta comitum Andegavorum*, in *Chroniques d'Anjou*, ed. P. Marchegay and A. Salmon, Paris 1856; *GPA* = William of Malmesbury, *Gesta pontificum Anglorum*, ed. N. E. S. A. Hamilton, London 1870; *MGH* = *Monumenta Germaniae Historica: SS* = *Scriptores*; *SS rer. Ger.* = *Scriptores rerum Germanicarum*; *OV* = Ordericus Vitalis, *Ecclesiastical history*, ed. M. Chibnall, Oxford 1969-80

has been called into question.¹ But one factor which has never been doubted and which recent writings have indeed reinforced is the belief that Jerusalem played a major part in the consciousness and devotion of laymen and clerics alike and formed a potent influence upon the people who went on the First Crusade. Erdmann thought that Urban's first concern was to aid the Christians of the east, and that the notion of freeing Jerusalem was only an aspect of this which was exalted by later popular enthusiasm for the liberation of such a sacred place. The critics of this idea, according to one of whom 'the attitude of eleventh-century Christians towards Jerusalem and the Holy land was obsessive', have not doubted the importance of Jerusalem and its place in men's minds.² The attack on Erdmann's ideas has been fruitful and has produced a new emphasis on the vital role of pilgrimage and the sanctity of Jerusalem in preparing men for the crusade and in shaping Urban's ideas; by attaching the notion of a war in the east to the idea of the Jerusalem pilgrimage with its spiritual benefits, Urban created a new idea with enormous appeal. Modern writing, more than ever before, sees the objective of the First Crusade as being 'To deliver Christ's tomb'.³ The idea that before 1095 Jerusalem loomed large in men's minds, was assumed rather than examined in, for example, Bredero's wide-ranging and ambitious article which used material over the period from the tenth century to the thirteenth.

¹ C. Erdmann, *Die Entstehung des Kreuzzugsgedankens*, Stuttgart 1935, trans M. W. Baldwin and W. Goffart as *The origin of the idea of crusade*, Princeton 1977; J. Riley-Smith, *What were the crusades?* London 1977, and 'The First Crusade and St Peter', in B. Z. Kedar, H. E. Mayer and R. C. Smail (eds), *Outremer*, Jerusalem 1982, 41-63; J. Gilchrist, 'The Erdmann thesis and the canon law 1083-1141', in P. Edbury (ed.), *Crusade and settlement*, Cardiff 1985, 37-45; M. Bull, *Knighly piety and the lay response to the First Crusade*, Oxford 1993, 21-69, 70-115. On the wars in Spain Bull adopts some of the ideas of A. Ferreiro, 'The siege of Barbastro 1064-65: a reassessment', *Journal of Medieval History* ix (1983), 129-44.

² Erdmann, *Origin*, 325-34, 364-71; P. Alphanféry and A. Dupront, *La chrétienté et l'idée de la croisade*, Paris 1954-9, i. 42. A. Waas, *Geschichte des Kreuzzuges*, Freiburg 1956, i. 81-4, 94-5, argues that in his letter to Flanders of December 1095 Urban mentions Jerusalem only in passing and that his letter to Bologna of September 1096 is much more explicit, thus illustrating the impact of popular ideas upon the pope's thinking. H. E. Mayer, *The crusades*, Oxford 1990, 10, suggested that Jerusalem played only a limited role in Urban's thinking and agrees with Erdmann and others that popular enthusiasm took over. However, something of an academic consensus is now forming around the idea that Jerusalem was central to Urban's message. The very specific survey of evidence relating to the period just before the crusade by H. E. J. Cowdrey, 'Pope Urban II's preaching of the First Crusade', *History* lv (1970), 177-88, has been enormously influential, and has been powerfully supported by J. Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the idea of crusading*, London 1986, 21 (and in other works too numerous to list) and Bull, *Knighly piety*, 208-10.

³ A. H. Bredero, 'Jérusalem dans l'occident médiévale', in P. Gallais and Y.-J. Riou (eds), *Mélanges offerts à René Crozet*, Poitiers 1966, i. 259-71. This formed the foundation of his chapter 'Jerusalem and the west' in his *Christendom and Christianity in the Middle Ages*, trans R. Bruinsma, Michigan 1994, 79-104. See also S. Mahl, 'Jerusalem in mittelalterlicher Sicht', *Die Welt als Geschichte* xxii (1962), 11-26; J. Richard, *The Latin kingdom of Jerusalem*, trans J. Shirley, North Holland 1979, i. p. xv.

In any examination of the importance of Jerusalem to western Christendom one event of the eleventh century would seem, on the face of it, to offer us a useful litmus test and is mentioned by virtually every modern writer on the crusades. In 1009 the caliph of Cairo, al-Hakim bi-Amr Allah (996–1021), ordered a persecution of Christians within his lands and the destruction of the Holy Sepulchre and many other churches. Such a desecration would surely have had an enormous impact on a Europe deeply conscious of the Holy Places. It is reported by two contemporary writers, Adémar of Chabannes writing at Angoulême and Limoges in the 1020s and Rodulfus Glaber at Auxerre in the 1030s; their works have received a great deal of attention from modern historians.⁴ But it is not generally understood how isolated these two accounts are. The only other writers who ever mentioned this destruction can be shown pretty certainly to have known the texts of these two works directly or indirectly. Hugh, abbot of Flavigny (1096–1115), compiled a great history of the world from the creation to 1112 and he reported the destruction of the Holy Sepulchre. However Hugh made such massive use of Glaber's *Histories* that his work is a witness to their text and there is no doubt at all that they were his source for this information.⁵ Under Abbot Arnaud of Sens (1096–1124) an important complex of historical writing was produced, generally known as the *Chronicon Sancti Petri Vivi* and this contains the entry: 'Anno MVIII Hoc anno sepulcrum Christi destructum est sub Heinrico imperatore et Francorum rege Roberto.' The

⁴ Adémar of Chabannes, *Chronique*, ed. J. Chavanon, Paris 1897, 169–71. Adémar died on pilgrimage to Jerusalem in 1034. His work went through many recensions on which see J. Lair, *Études critiques sur divers textes des Xe et XIe siècles*, Paris 1899. Adémar also mentioned the destruction of the Holy Sepulchre in his account of the abbots of St Martial of Limoges, *Commemoratio abbatum Lemovicensium basilice S. Marcialis Apostoli*, PL cxli.83. A new study of Adémar shortly to be published is that of R. Landes, *Apocalyptic age: the life and times of Adhémar of Chabannes (989–1034)*, who has recently discussed some of his ideas in 'Between aristocracy and heresy: popular participation in the Limousin Peace of God, 994–1033', in T. Head and R. Landes (eds), *The Peace of God: social violence and religious response in France around the year 1000*, Cornell 1992, 184–218. Rodulfus Glaber, *The five books of the histories*, ed. J. France, Oxford 1989, 132–7. Glaber (c. 980–c. 1047) passed much of his life at St Germain d'Auxerre but he spent a long period in the service of St William of Dijon whose biography he wrote, and he served at Cluny under St Odilo for a short period as well as at many lesser houses: *Histories*, pp. xix–xxiv. On Caliph Hakim see *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, ed. J. H. Kramers, E. Levi-Provençal, J. Schacht, B. Lewis and C. Pellat, London 1960, s.v. 'al-Hakim', iii. 76–82, and 'al-Aziz', i. 823–5; M. Canard, 'La destruction de l'Église de la Resurrection par le Caliphe Hakim et l'histoire de la descente du feu sacré', *Byzantion* xxv (1965) 16–43, who makes it clear that the eastern sources support Glaber's date of 1009 and not 1010 given by Adémar, on which see also A. Gieysztor, 'The genesis of the crusades: the encyclical of Sergius IV (1009–12)', *Medievalia et Humanistica* vi (1950), 13. See also the study by B. Schaller, 'Zur Kreuzzugszyklika Papst Sergius IV', in H. Mordek (ed.) *Papsttum, Kirche und Recht im Mittelalter: Festschrift für Horst Fuhrmann zum 65 Geburtstag*, Tübingen 1991, 135–53.

⁵ Glaber, *Histories*, 132 n. 2, pp. xc–xci, ci–cii. Flavigny was made subject to the rule of Helderich of St Germain d'Auxerre (989–1010), and it is likely that Hugh actually used Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, ms latin 10912, the probable partial autograph of Glaber's work.

Sens writers, however, most certainly were familiar with the text of Hugh of Flavigny.⁶ It is interesting that sources produced at Sens much closer to the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, notably the work of Odorannus, make no mention of the destruction of 1009.⁷ The only other document to mention it is the encyclical of Pope Sergius IV (1009–12) according to which Sergius called for an expedition to Jerusalem to revenge the destruction of the Holy Sepulchre. There is little doubt, however, that this document is a forgery made at the abbey of Moissac around the year 1096, probably to create a precedent and therefore legitimise the appeal for the crusade.⁸ That part of the text of the encyclical referring to the destruction of the Holy Sepulchre is so brief that it could certainly be derived from any of the earlier sources mentioned. By the time Urban arrived at Moissac in mid May 1096 on his great journey preaching the crusade he had already spent much time in Limoges, where some in his entourage could easily have come across and used Adémar's works. Alternatively Moissac is known to have had unusually close relations with Jerusalem in the eleventh century, including the safeguarding of properties held by the Holy Sepulchre, and this could represent a local tradition.⁹

There is, therefore, a surprising paucity of references to the destruction of the Holy Sepulchre in 1009. The failure of certain of the French sources to mention it is extraordinary. The *Gesta consulum Andegavorum* was given its present form by John of Marmoutier about 1170, but he was working on the text of Thomas of Parcée, prior of Loches who, about 1160, revised an older history of the counts of Anjou by Odo of Marmoutier. Thomas of Parcée drew on Glaber's *Histories* very heavily indeed for information about the counts of Anjou and particularly for Fulk Nerra (987–1040) who went to Jerusalem at least three times. By the time Thomas was writing one of Fulk's descendants, Fulk V (count of Anjou 1109–29), had been king of Jerusalem (1131–43). Fulk Nerra visited Jerusalem in 1002/1003, 1008 and in 1039/40; on the last occasion he died at Metz from where his body was taken for burial to the abbey of Loches which he had founded. Thomas did not mention the destruction of 1009 and the other works in the Angevin group of chronicles are equally silent.¹⁰ The

⁶ *Chronicon Sancti Petri Vivi (dile de Clarius)*, ed. R. H. Bautier and M. Gilles, Paris 1972, pp. xxxvi–xxxix, 106. The editors think it possible that Glaber's work was known at Sens.

⁷ *Historia Francorum Senonensis 688–1034*, MGH SS, ix. 364–9. Odorannus of Sens was a deeply learned monk and a precise contemporary of Glaber but his *Chronicon 675–1032*, in *Odoranni Senonensis opera omnia*, ed. R. H. Bautier and M. Gilles, Paris 1972, is equally silent on this event. He shows some interest in Jerusalem in his *Collection of canons*, 128, where it is mentioned in a penitential context and his *Ad Acembertum* where it is cited figuratively (pp. 230, 235).

⁸ Gieysztor, 'Genesis of the crusades', 28–30.

⁹ *Ibid.* 21, 30; Bull, *Knightly piety*, 256–7.

¹⁰ *GCA*, 34–157. On Thomas of Parcée's use of Glaber see *Histories*, p. cii; on the pilgrimages see L. Halphen, *Le comté d'Anjou au XIe siècle*, Paris 1906, app. II, 213–18, and Glaber, *Histories*, 212–15. B. S. Bachrach, 'The pilgrimages of Fulk Nerra, count of the Angevins, 987–1040', in T. F. X. Noble and J. J. Contreni (eds), *Religion, culture and society*

fact that Fulk was in Jerusalem almost at the moment of its destruction in 1009 makes this omission all the more surprising.¹¹

Equally silent are the works produced at the monastery of Fleury, on the Loire, which was a great intellectual centre at the beginning of the eleventh century. Neither the *Life* of Robert the Pious (996–1031) nor that of his bastard brother, Gauzlin, abbot of Fleury and archbishop of Bourges (1005–30), contains any reference to the events of 1009 or indeed to Jerusalem; the *Annals of Fleury* and the famous *Miracles of St Benedict* share this silence.¹² Further to the south in Aquitaine the very valuable *Chronique de Saint-Maixent* also fails to mention the destruction of the Holy Sepulchre. The compiler of this text completed the bulk of the work c. 1126 though it was extended to cover events down to 1140. Amongst the works used was an earlier history by Abbot Goderan (1070–80) and that of Adémar of Chabannes.¹³ There is some interest in pilgrimage to Jerusalem and also in the wars in Spain. For the year 1010 the writer carefully records that when Sergius was pope and Robert king of the Franks, William the Great, duke of Aquitaine (994–1030), ordered the reconstruction of Maillezais and appointed Théodelin as its abbot. After this important entry the author goes on to mention the death of William's wife, his remarriage and the subsequent children. This is clear evidence of the use of earlier source material by a compiler writing after the crusade, yet there is no mention of the destruction of the Holy Sepulchre.¹⁴

The Burgundian sources also fail to say anything about the destruction of Jerusalem in 1009. The author of the *Life* of Bishop Hugh of Chalon

in the early Middle Ages: studies in honour of Richard E. Sullivan, Kalamazoo 1987, 205–17, has argued that Fulk made four pilgrimages, in 1003/4, 1009/10, 1035/6, 1039/40. On Fulk v see S. Runciman, *History of the crusades*, Cambridge 1951–4, ii. 177–233; *Liber de compositione castri Ambaziae*, and *Gesta Ambaziensium dominorum* in Marchegay and Salmon, *Chroniques d'Anjou*, i. 3–33, 58–225.

¹¹ According to the *GCA*, 101–3, Fulk paid for poor pilgrims to enter the Holy City and then found entry to the Sepulchre barred by guardians who offered to let him in if he would urinate upon the Holy Place. This he agreed to do but concealed a sheep's bladder full of fine white wine about his person and so fooled the infidels who were then persuaded to let in others. The story is clearly fabulous, as is the legend that on his way he promised to return to Rome and to kill Pope Sergius' enemy Crescentius (which he eventually did). This second pilgrimage must have happened before 1009, as Halphen, *Comté d'Anjou*, 214–15, argues, for there is no hint of destruction.

¹² Helgaud of Fleury, *Epitoma vitae regis Rotberti pii*, ed. R. H. Bautier and G. Labory Paris 1965; André de Fleury, *Vie de Gauzlin*, in L. Delisle (ed.), *Mémoires de la Société archéologique de l'Orléannais*, Orléans 1853, ii. 257–322; *Annales Floriacenses*, 626–1058, PL cxxxix. 581–4; *Les miracles de Saint Benoît*, ed. E. de Certain, Paris 1858.

¹³ *Chronique de Saint-Maixent 751–1140*, ed. J. Verdon, Paris 1979, pp. viii–xi, xiii–xix.

¹⁴ *Chronique de Saint-Maixent* on Jerusalem pilgrimages: the revelation of the head of St John the Baptist by Felicius and his companion pilgrims to Jerusalem (p. 53) – they brought it to St Jean d'Angély in the time of Pepin son of Louis the Pious (817–38); Abbots Amalbert of St Florent (955–85), Robert (985–1011), Audebert (1011–13) and Giraud (1013–22) all go to Jerusalem, the last dying there (p. 89); death of Giraudus the Jerusalemite (p. 149). On the wars in Spain see J. Verdon, 'Une source de la reconquête chrétienne en Espagne; la Chronique de Saint-Maixent', in Gallais and Riou, *Mélanges R. Crozet*, i. 273–82; *Chronique de Saint-Maixent*, 106–9.

(999–1039) certainly used Glaber's *Histories* and mentions his pilgrimage to Jerusalem in 1036, but not the events of 1009. The annalist of Beze also knew the *Histories* and is silent on this event. The chronicler of St Bénigne of Dijon certainly knew Glaber's *Life* of St William but he made no use of the *Histories* and Jerusalem is not touched upon at all.¹⁵ Further north the history of the bishops of Cambrai and the chronicle of St Andrew of the same city have nothing on the events of 1009 although in both there is some interest in the east, notably in the frustrated journey of Liébert, bishop of Cambrai, in 1054 when he was apparently accompanied by a large group of pilgrims. At Laodicea they met Hélinard, bishop of Laon, who advised them to turn back in view of major difficulties on the roads to Jerusalem. The chronicle of St Andrews has a long story about Baidilo bringing back the relics of the Magdalene from Jerusalem and, interestingly, mentions the monk Albert who travelled to Jerusalem just before the First Crusade. Minor annals from the same area are also silent on the destruction of the Holy Sepulchre.¹⁶ Anselm of Liège wrote a notable series of *Lives* of the bishops of his diocese without even mentioning Jerusalem and this silence continues in the contemporary writings of this diocese.¹⁷ The famous pilgrimage of Richard of St Vannes in 1026–7 is recorded in his life, in the work of Hugh of Flavigny and in the *Chronicle of St-Riquier*; this last work expresses some interest in Jerusalem in contrast to the work of Lambert of Ardres.¹⁸ It is perhaps more surprising that we find the same silence on the destruction of Jerusalem in the great compilation of Sigebert of Gembloux who was born about 1030 and died in 1112. Towards the end of his life he wrote a history of the world from 381 to 1111. Sigebert was painstaking in his pursuit of information and records something of the history of Jerusalem and instances of pilgrimage. There are passages of his which are very reminiscent of some in the *Histories* of Glaber, though his knowledge of that work cannot be proved. However, he was a very careful historian with a wide range of knowledge about the early eleventh century. It is very odd, therefore, that the events of 1009 never came to his attention.¹⁹

¹⁵ *Gesta episcoporum Autissiodorensium* in *Bibliothèque historique de l'Yonne*, ed. L. M. Duru, Auxerre–Paris 1850–63, i. 387–8; Glaber, *Histories* pp. xcvi–xcvii, civ–cv; *Annales Besuenses*, MGH SS ii. 249; *Chronicon Sancti Benigni Divionensis*, in *Analecta Divionensia*, ed. L. V. E. Bougaud and J. Garnier, Dijon 1875, 1–230.

¹⁶ *Gesta episcoporum Cameracensium*, MGH SS vii. 393–525; *Chronicon Sancti Andreae castri Cameracesii*, MGH SS vii. 532, 535–6, 550. On the pilgrimage of Liébert see also Comte Riant, 'Inventaire critique des lettres historiques de croisade', *Archives de l'Orient Latin* i (1881), 53; *Annales Blandinenses* (ending 1292), and *Annales Formoselenses 777–1136*, MGH SS vii. 20–34.

¹⁷ Anselm, *Gesta episcoporum Leodiensium*, PL cxxxix. 1065–1102.

¹⁸ *Vita Richardi*, MGH SS xi. 288; Hugh of Flavigny, *Chronicon*, MGH SS viii. 404–5; Hariulf, *Chronicon Centulense* (fifth century–1104), ed. F. Lot, Paris 1894, 210; Lambert of Ardres, *Historia comitum Ghisnensium et Ardensium dominorum* (800–1203), MGH SS xxiv. 557–642.

¹⁹ Sigebert of Gembloux, *Chronica*, MGH SS vi. 320, 322, 335, 355, 361, 362, 367. His *Liber de scriptoribus ecclesiasticis*, PL clx 547–92, is notably painstaking, on which see also Glaber, *Histories*, pp. cii–civ, where there is a discussion of the possible relationship

The tradition of writing long chronologies represented by Sigebert and Hugh of Flavigny was much more highly developed in the German lands. Heriman the Lame's impressive compilation from the creation to 1054 mentions the history of Jerusalem in the early Middle Ages and Charlemagne's contacts with the east. Much the same events are chronicled by Bernold and Marianus Scotus, Saxo and Frutolf of Michelsberg (attributed to Ekkehard of Aura), all writing in the late eleventh or early twelfth centuries.²⁰ Less systematic were the surveys of the *Annales Quedlinburgenses* and the annals associated with it, but they mention Charlemagne and his contacts with the east.²¹ In none of these, or indeed in any German source, is there a mention of the destruction of the Holy Sepulchre in 1009. One of the most important sources for German history in the late tenth and early eleventh centuries is the chronicle of Thietmar of Merseburg. He became bishop of that see in 1009 and has a very full entry for that year, yet there is no mention of the destruction of the Holy Sepulchre. He cannot be accused of lack of interest in Jerusalem for he tells the story of Hidda who died there in the late 960s (also mentioned by Saxo) and he also reports the sack of Luni in 1016 by the Saracens ('inimici Christi').²² The *Annales Quedlinburgenses* and *Hildesheimenses* also have very full entries for 1009/1010 recording an eclipse, the succession of Thietmar at Merseburg and the burning of the new church at Mainz. The Hildesheim annal records the penitential pilgrimage of Count Theoderic in 1059 which is also mentioned by Bernold (who also refers to the death of Pope Sergius under 1009) who names his companions, and by Sigebert of Gembloux.²³ In fact, although

between his works and those of Glaber. In addition Sigebert, *Chronica*, 354, tells the story of a monk returning from Jerusalem to Sicily where souls were tormented for their sins in 'Vulcan's pot', meaning Vesuvius (Glaber, *Historie*, 74 uses the same term) from whence they were liberated by the prayers of the monks of Cluny. This led to the establishment of the Feast of All Souls. This is essentially the same story told by Jotsald, *De vita et virtutibus sancti Odilonis abbatis*, PL cxlii. 926-7, as leading to the establishment of the new feast, but in variant form. Glaber has the same tale but the main character is a merchant of Marseilles travelling in Africa while a manuscript of the *Historie* changes this to a merchant of Tiffauges and attributes the liberation of souls to the monks of Marmoutier. This ms (Paris, BN lat. 6190) is of western French origin. On Sigebert see J. LeClercq, *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, 2nd edn, ed. J. Hofer and K. Rahner, Freiburg 1957-65, ix. 746.

²⁰ Herimannus Augiensis, *Chronicon*, MGH SS v. 92-3, 101; Bernoldus, *Chronicon*, MGH SS v. 414, 419; Marianus Scotus, *Chronicon*, MGH SS v. 542; Saxo, *Chronicon*, MGH SS vi. 570, 619; *Chronica Frutolfi. Frutolf's und Ekkehards Chroniken und die anonyme Kaiserchronik*, ed. F. J. Schmale and I. Schmale-Ott, Darmstadt 1972.

²¹ *Annales Quedlinburgenses* (Creation-1025), *Annales Hildesheimenses* (AD-1137), and *Annales Weissemburgensium* (708-1147), MGH SS iii. 447-604.

²² Thietmar, *Chronicon*, MGH SS rer. Ger. 332-8, 68-70, 452-4; Saxo, *Annales*, MGH SS vi. 619.

²³ *Annales Quedlinburgenses*, and *Annales Hildesheimenses*, MGH SS iii. 79-80, 93, 105; Berthold *Annales* (under 1073), MGH SS v. 275-6; Bernold names the companions of Theoderic as Widerolt and Marcuart: MGH SS v. 429; Sigebert (under 1068): MGH SS vi. 361.

we are used to thinking of France as the great country of pilgrimage and crusade, it is very evident that the Germans were just as inclined to venerate the Holy Sepulchre. In the German sources, as in the French, when there is mention of a reason for going to the Sepulchre it is for prayer, 'in orationem' and references to penance are not common.²⁴ It is no more difficult to discover traces of pilgrims in the German than in the French sources.²⁵ Overall, given the volume of contemporary and near contemporary writing and the plethora of careful later histories, the total omission of any mention of the destruction of the Holy Sepulchre in 1009 is very surprising.

There is the same silence in the Anglo-Norman sources. Dudo of St Quentin wrote about Normandy and has only a passing reference to Saracens, while William of Poitiers was concerned only with northern Europe. William of Jumièges refers to Jerusalem twice allegorically and to the pilgrimage of Duke Robert the Magnificent in 1035. Ordericus mentions many pilgrims to Jerusalem and does not hesitate in his account of Robert Guiscard's death-bed speech to anticipate the First Crusade – but even so, he seems to be entirely ignorant of the events of 1009, as are the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and 'Florence' of Worcester. Perhaps the most interesting silence is that of William of Malmesbury, a careful historian whose *Gesta regum* contains a brief history of Jerusalem, but who fails to mention the events of 1009.²⁶ There is real interest in Jerusalem amongst the Anglo-Norman writers and many pilgrims are mentioned.²⁷ The Italian sources also fail to record the destruction of the Holy Sepulchre in 1009. There are references to pilgrims, and these are especially numerous in the Monte Cassino chronicle.²⁸

The destruction of the Holy Places in 1009 owes its prominence in modern writing about the crusades to the fact that we tend to write history with the benefit of hindsight, looking for events which appear to anticipate what we seek to explain. One reason why we have fallen so easily into this trap is because the work of Rodulfus Glaber is extremely well-known. His remark that the world about the year 1000 was clad 'in a white mantle of churches' is one of the most famous of historical quotations but it is far from being the only well-known passage in the work. Adémar of Chabannes's work is not quite so celebrated, but both

²⁴ Bernold, *Chronicon*, 455 mentions four Swabian clerics who in 1092 'Ierosolimam in orationem profecti sunt'.

²⁵ See appendix.

²⁶ Dudo of St Quentin, *De moribus et actis primorum Normanniae ducum*, ed. J. Lair, Caen 1865; William of Poitiers, *Histoire de Guillaume le Conquérant*, ed. R. Foreville, Paris 1952; William of Jumièges, *Gesta Normannorum ducum*, ed. E. M. C. van Houts, Oxford 1992, 6–7, 11; William of Jumièges, *Gesta Normannorum ducum*, ed. J. Marx, Rouen 1914, 247; OV iv. 32–5; *ASC*; 'Florence' of Worcester, *Chronicon ex Chronicis*, ed. B. Thorpe, London 1848–9 – part of a new edition of this work by R. R. Darlington and P. McGurk, *The Chronicle of John of Worcester* is now available in Oxford Medieval Texts so in references I have noted also the year; William of Malmesbury, *Gesta regum Anglorum*, ed. W. Stubbs, London 1887–9, ii. 424–5.

²⁷ See appendix.

²⁸ See appendix.

were almost the only historians writing in France in the first third of the eleventh century. The period around 1000 has long been seen as marking an important stage in western development and these two chronicles cast a vital light upon it. This is why modern historians have paid so much attention to them. Moreover there has been little attempt to understand why these two writers gave the events of 1009 such prominence.

Adémar de Chabannes died at Jerusalem and his interest in the pilgrimage to Jerusalem is reflected in his chronicle. It is very notable that in the first part of his work, where he was relying on earlier sources, his references to Jerusalem are quite different from those in the section covering his own lifetime. They are much more formal, simply dry records comparable to those of the chronologists which have been noted. His later references concern people he knew who had been to Jerusalem and are much livelier. The same degree of interest is evident in Glaber's *Histories*.²⁹ But the story of the destruction of Jerusalem in 1009 as it occurs in both accounts is essentially an antisemitic tale. There are considerable differences of detail between the two accounts but they have an obvious common core: the Jews of the west incited the caliph to persecution by telling him that vast armies of Christians were about to march against him. Glaber's version is much the more developed and savagely antisemitic in accordance with his general hatred of Jews. Adémar tells us that persecution of Jews at Limoges had already started on the orders of the bishop. Glaber places the story after that of Raynard, count of Sens, 'the Judaiser' although the events at Sens happened well after 1009. It

²⁹ In the earlier part of the chronicle Adémar refers to events in the history of Jerusalem on pp. 45, 89, 91, 96, 99, 126. In that part which deals with his own lifetime the references are numerous: in the late tenth century Aldouin, bishop of Limoges (990-1012), and his brother Guy return from Jerusalem safe and sound (p. 162); Peter I, abbot of Dorat, became tyrannical after the illness of his father and the deaths of his advisor Ainard on pilgrimage to Rome and his brother Raymond at Jerusalem. After he had been to Jerusalem he improved (p. 168); Raoul de Coué, bishop of Perigueux, returned from Jerusalem and died in either 1003 or, as the text of Adémar implies, c. 1009 (p. 171); Gaubert of Malemort dies after his return from Jerusalem (pp. 171-2); 1017/18 the Byzantine Empire closes its boundaries to pilgrims going to Jerusalem through anger at the Norman interference in Italy (p. 178); 1026-7 William Tallifer, count of Angoulême, Odo of Bourges, lord of Déols, Richard, abbot of St Cybard with Giraut Fanesin his intendant and Humphrey later abbot of that house joined the pilgrimage of Richard of Verdun to Jerusalem via Germany and Hungary where they were welcomed by King Stephen. On his return William was welcomed with great pomp and made Humphrey abbot of St Cybard in succession to Abbot Richard who had died in Greece. William died in 1028 (pp. 189-92); following William Tallifer's example the bishops of Poitiers and Limoges and Count Fulk (of Anjou?) went to Jerusalem (p. 194).

In Glaber's *Histories* references are as follows: Richard of Normandy sends money to Jerusalem and Mount Sinai (pp. 36-7). (See also *Vita Symeonis*); Fulk Nerra and his pilgrimages (pp. 60-1, 212-15); Christ and the destruction of Jerusalem (pp. 66-7); pilgrimage to Jerusalem redirected by the conversion of Hungary (pp. 96-7); mass pilgrimage and the destruction of the Holy Sepulchre (pp. 132-7); mass pilgrimage after the millennium of the Lord's Passion including Lethbaud of Autun, Robert of Normandy and Ulric, bishop of Orléans (pp. 198-205).

seems likely, therefore, that news of the destruction of Jerusalem arrived in the west at a time when the Jews of France were being persecuted, and that the story, as it is given, is an antisemitic invention designed to place the blame for a disaster upon them. The wave of antisemitism may well have been connected with the contemporary persecution of heretics.³⁰ There is no indication where Glaber and Adémar found the story. Glaber's version is much the more highly developed. According to him a Christian renegade from Moutiers-Saint-Marie, a house where Glaber resided roughly at the time he was writing this account in the mid-1030s, ten years after Adémar, was employed by the Jews of Orléans to take messages to the caliph alleging that the Christians of the west were planning to march on his lands. The only obvious link between the two men was that both were members of the broad Cluniac family which was patronised and protected by Robert the Pious of France, whose court seems to have played a major role in the persecution of Jews and heretics. It is perhaps worth noting also that there were a number of church councils which might have served to transmit and elaborate the Jerusalem story, though nothing in what survives of their formal business casts light upon the matter.³¹ Thus the story as we have it in both chronicles owes its prominence to a particular circumstance, the persecution of the Jews. The accounts of both writers reflect their involvement in a wave of enthusiastic antisemitism which seems to have passed over France at this time, and which quickly spent its force, even in their own accounts, for both record that the Jews soon returned to their faith.³²

The silence of the historical sources for the eleventh and early twelfth centuries can be explained in a number of ways. Many later writers would have recognised the antisemitism of the story as it is found in the works of Glaber and Adémar and perhaps chosen not to repeat it. There was a

³⁰ Glaber, *Histoires*, 132-7, 128-9; Adémar, *Chronique*, 169-71. On the evidence for a general persecution of the Jews at this time see R. Chazan, '1007-1012: initial crisis for northern European Jewry', *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* xxxviii-xxxix (1970-1), 101-17. Glaber is in general deeply hostile to Jews and virtually all his references to them are pejorative: corruption of the Old Testament Jews referred to in the context of simony (pp. 70-1); Reynaud the Judaizer (pp. 128-9); destruction of Jerusalem (pp. 132-7); Jews linked to heretics (pp. 176-7); Jews spurn Christ (pp. 230-1); mention of Moses in a rather more neutral context (pp. 186-7).

³¹ There are a number of points of resemblance between the works of Adémar and Glaber though no textual connection can be established: Glaber, *Histoires*, pp. xlvii-xlviii; Chazan, '1007-1012', 112-13. See also R. H. Bautier, 'L'hérésie d'Orléans et le mouvement intellectuel au début du XI^e siècle: documents et hypothèses', *Actes du 95^e Congrès national des sociétés savantes, Rheims 1970: section de philologie et d'histoire jusqu'à 1610*, I: enseignement et vie intellectuelle (IX^e-XVII^e siècle), Paris 1975, 63-88. On Councils of Chelles 1008, Orléans 1022, 1029, Anse 1025, Poitiers 1024, 1031, Limoges 1031, see C. J. Hefele and C. Q. Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles*, Paris 1907-52, iv/2, 913, 924-38, 948, 938, 937, 959, 955-9.

³² For the view that Adémar bears witness to a period of popular religious emotionalism in which violent antisemitism was an element see Landes, 'Between aristocracy and heresy', 184-218.

strain of scepticism about pilgrimage in eleventh-century thought which surfaced even at the time of the First Crusade and this perhaps had its influence.³³ The early eleventh century was an age of poor communications. Rodulfus Glaber had a lively mind but the quality of the information he received varied according to where he was, and he seems to have been better informed in a major centre like Cluny than in a lesser one such as St Germain d'Auxerre. News of an important event might well be unevenly disseminated. The number of people writing anything resembling history at this time was very small. Even so it is strange that no other writer recorded this information if Jerusalem was genuinely important to the men of the age. The significance of this word 'important' must not be begged – for the most part the historians of the eleventh century reported what was local and directly relevant to their lives. This may at first seem at odds with the fashion for long universal histories, compilations springing from the Christian desire to set events in the context of the divine revelation, a development which is both cause and symptom of the widening of their vision as time progressed. However, when it came to the age in which they lived works like that of Heriman the Lambe tend to narrow and it is not difficult to spot the location of a writer like Hugh of Flavigny or even Sigebert of Gembloux. Moreover much material which they would have needed to widen their range was not available to them. The fact is that Glaber's *Histories* were very little circulated and that Adémar's too was primarily of local importance.³⁴ Information seems to have circulated on an erratic basis in this period: it is worth noting that the *Annales Hildesheimenses* record the death of Bishop Gunther of Bamberg in 1065 without mentioning that he died on the Great German Pilgrimage and that many major German sources do not even mention this expedition.³⁵ Some later writers simply did not find out about the destruction of Jerusalem in 1099 when they made their compilations. Others were concerned with very limited objectives – the history of their monastic house or great church, the life of a local notable. It is hard to believe that no contemporary or near contemporary writer heard of the destruction of Christianity's greatest shrine, but the world of eleventh-century men and women was primarily a local world and this influenced their choice of what they recorded. Thomas of Parcé actually had Glaber's work before him when he produced the *Gesta comitum Andegavorum* yet he ignored the story of the destruction of Jerusalem, perhaps because in the age of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem such an event seemed irrelevant. But it is difficult to understand why earlier writers, many men of great standing, should share the silence. Odorannus

³³ See Anselm of Canterbury's letter to Osmund bishop of Salisbury: *Anselmi opera omnia*, ed. F. S. Schmitt, Edinburgh 1946–61, iv. 85–6.

³⁴ Glaber, *Histories*, pp. xcvi–cvi.

³⁵ *Annales Hildesheimenses*, MGH SS iii. 105. There is no mention of the journey of 1064–5 in the *Annales Weissenburgensium*, MGH SS iii. 447–604, or in Berthold, *Annales*, MGH SS v. 264–326.

of Sens was a precise contemporary of Glaber and a leading intellectual of his age, in touch with the royal court and deeply involved in events in the kingdom of France. It is hard to understand his silence. Thietmar was one of the great chroniclers of his age, yet he too is silent on the destruction of Jerusalem. Sigebert of Gembloux wrote at the very moment of the triumph of the First Crusade, and he was a careful and thorough compiler. These three writers, whose lives span the century before the crusade, all share a total silence on the events of 1009 which is difficult to account for if Jerusalem occupied a high place in the minds of the men of that time.

The historical sources of the eleventh century report pilgrimages, often with a lively interest, but they appear as exceptional and rare events in which small numbers of people were involved. There were occasions when the sources report big groups, but historians have been too ready to see in such reports precursors of the First Crusade. Glaber was fascinated by the two millennia of 1000 and 1033, through which he lived, and these seem to have heightened his and his world's awareness of Jerusalem – precisely the same feeling is evident in Adémar of Chabannes.³⁶ Glaber's comment that at the millennium of the Passion 'an innumerable multitude of people from the whole world, greater than any man before could have hoped to see, began to travel to the Sepulchre of the Saviour at Jerusalem' has been much quoted. That he portrays this as a totally exceptional occasion has escaped notice. Moreover he also tells us that kings were amongst these crowds of pilgrims, but we know of no king who went to Jerusalem. When it comes to actual pilgrimages he reports what seem to have been small groups. Much attention has been devoted to the 'Great German Pilgrimage of 1064-5' which has been seen as an event presaging the First Crusade thirty years later.³⁷ The very large numbers given by contemporaries – 3,000 for the French pilgrimage of 1054, 7,000 or even 12,000 for the German one of 1064-5 – have been too readily swallowed by modern writers perhaps over-eager to set the pattern for the First Crusade.³⁸ While there is no doubt that the pilgrimage of 1064 was a very substantial undertaking which attracted much attention, such figures approach the realms of fantasy.³⁹ The army which William the Conqueror gathered for the invasion of England in 1066 was not much bigger than

³⁶ Glaber, *Histories*, pp. lxxiii-lxx; Landes, 'Between aristocracy and heresy', 184-218.

³⁷ The main sources are *Annales Altahenses maiores a. 1065*, MGH SS rer. Ger. (1891), 66-71; Lambert of Hersfeld, *Annales a. 1064-5*, MGH SS v. 168-71; Marianus Scotus, *Chronicon*, MGH SS v. 558-9; *Vita Altmanni*, MGH SS xii. 227-30. The subject has been examined by E. Joranson, 'The Great German pilgrimage of 1064-65', in L. J. Paetow (ed.), *The crusades and other historical essays presented to D. C. Munro*, New York 1928, 3-43.

³⁸ L. Bréhier, *L'Église et l'Orient au moyen-âge*, Paris 1921, 45-8; *Annales Altahenses* suggests 12,000, Marianus Scotus offers over 7,000 and Sigebert of Gembloux, 361, just under 7,000.

³⁹ OV ii. 90, heard of it in the twelfth century, but as noted above n. 35 many contemporary German writers did not.

this. Its maintenance was a wonder of contemporary logistics.⁴⁰ To convey such a huge number of people in a single group all the way to Jerusalem would have raised enormous difficulties and might well have been resisted by Byzantines and Arabs alike in view of its size. The sources give the impression of pilgrims travelling in small bands. There were larger groups like those of 1026, 1054 and 1064, but we have no warrant for supposing that they were very big.

In general the historical writings examined here show a profound local bias. This approach was changing, partly through the development of large-scale world histories, but the process was slow. While these sources often mention pilgrims to Jerusalem before the First Crusade they display little sense of a western Christian identity. Adémar of Chabannes lived in the Aquitaine so his interest in Spain is hardly surprising. He mentions the wars there frequently, yet without much sense of the grand conflict of Islam and Christianity. For example, Ermengaud, count of Urgel, was killed by the Moors of Spain whose ruler chopped off his head and decorated it with gold as a token of victory: Adémar simply notes this in the flat and factual manner which characterises much of his reporting of Spanish events.⁴¹ The Spanish reconquest was obviously gaining momentum in the eleventh century and by the time of the First Crusade the Almoravid incursion was starting to make itself felt across Europe. The story of El Cid who fought against Christians and Muslims should caution us against seeing the situation there simply in terms of Islam versus Christianity.⁴² Given this lack of a sense of western Christendom it is rather hard to see against whom indignation might have been aroused in western writers by the destruction of Jerusalem, especially for those writing after 1040 when the Byzantine emperors rebuilt the Holy Sepulchre. It was a political event in a far-away land, like the attack on Luni or the death of the count of Urgel – the occasion for note but for little else. Clearly Islam as an enemy was seen in a special light but in the pre-crusader age it was a threat only in Italy and Spain and many of the people of these lands had other political preoccupations. The indifference of Europe to the wars in Spain, perhaps even the hostility of Spanish dynasties to outside intervention, should warn us against supposing there was much ideological awareness in eleventh century Europe. The historical sources tend to suggest that Jerusalem in the eleventh-century was seen as a distant and sacred place, but not one which concerned many people for most of the time. Devotion and worship were provincial, with local saints acting as protectors of their localities, spiritual equivalents of

⁴⁰ B. S. Bachrach, 'Some observations on the military administration of the Norman Conquest', *Anglo-Norman Studies* viii (1985), 12, suggests some 8,000 fighting men formed the army and that a further 6,000 were mobilised in support.

⁴¹ Adémar, *Chronique*, 161. For passages on Spain see also pp. 75–8, 87, 89, 91, 95, 97, 99–104, 112, 118, 127–9, 131, 154, 163, 178–9, 180, 194–5.

⁴² H. E. J. Cowdrey, 'Cluny and the First Crusade', *Revue Bénédictine* lxxxiii (1973), 285–311; D. W. Lomax, *The reconquest of Spain*, London 1978.

the feudal aristocracy who were their earthly defenders.⁴³ The writer who is a real exception to all this, who has a real sense of Christendom and in this sense anticipates the historians of the crusader age, is Glaber. He was caught in the grasp of the localism of his age, yet his *Histories* are a poor source for the Burgundy he lived in. In them there is a real sense of ideological conflict with Islam, a real notion of the distinctiveness of the west from other civilisations, Byzantine as well as Islamic, and a formulation of ideas that look forward to the age of the crusade. He is often appallingly badly informed but this fact underlines his struggle to record all that happened especially 'in our continent this side the sea', by which he means what we would call western Christendom.⁴⁴ He speaks approvingly of monks fighting against Islam in Spain and this passage has been cited by almost all major writers on the crusade; only one has remarked how extraordinary and atypical the incident was.⁴⁵ Glaber's popularity amongst modern historians has led to an assumption that there was a sense of western Christian identity which is for the most part lacking in the sources for the eleventh century and this has had its impact on our view of the preconditions for the crusade.

All of this suggests why the destruction of Jerusalem in 1009 is never a theme in any of the early histories of the First Crusade: it was an event which had passed out of human memory. The writers who went on the crusade were preoccupied with telling their own stories and it was left to later writers to place the event in the perspective of Christian revelation. Baldry of Dol knew of the Fatimid capture of Jerusalem about 972 and speaks of the defiling of the Holy Places but he is referring to the years immediately before the First Crusade and, like Guibert of Nogent, centres Urban's appeal on Jerusalem. Robert the Monk follows this but he emphasises that Urban made a powerful appeal to Frankish patriotism. It is only in the great work of William of Tyre that memory of al-Hakim's destruction returns; William's account must have been based on local knowledge for it clearly owes nothing to Adémar or Glaber.⁴⁶

The destruction of Jerusalem in 1009, therefore, was a forgotten event by the time of the First Crusade. Moreover the evidence of the sources looked at here seems to suggest a rather distant attitude to Jerusalem in general. It would now seem appropriate to start to reconsider the place of Jerusalem in contemporary piety and, therefore, its influence upon the calling of the First Crusade.

⁴³ T. Head, *Hagiography and the cult of saints*, Cambridge 1990, investigates the local devotions and cults in the area of Orléans. Of course there was a hierarchy of saints with a few European-wide devotions, but these were only developing in the eleventh century.

⁴⁴ Glaber, *Histories*, 5; J. France, 'War and Christendom in the thought of Rodulfus Glaber', *Studia Monastica* xxx (1988), 105-20.

⁴⁵ Glaber, *Histories*, 82-3 and n. 3 for citations; Cowdrey, 'Cluny and the First Crusade', 289-90.

⁴⁶ *Recueil des historiens des croisades: historiens occidentaux*, Paris 1841-1901, iv. 11-12; iii. 727-9; iv. 123-34, 137-40; Bredero, 'Jerusalem', 268; William of Tyre, *Chronicon, Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis* lxi. 109-14.

APPENDIX OF SOURCES

German sources

Apart from those already mentioned the following are noted:

c. 990 St Adalbert shared out his goods and the money given him by the Empress Theophano then ruling Germany for the voyage: *Vita Sancti Adalberti*, MGH SS iv. 586-7; Arnoldus, *Libri de Sancto Emmerammo*, MGH SS v. 52; Leo Marsicanus et Petrus Diaconus, *Chronica Monasterii Casinensis*, in *Die Chronik von Monte Cassino*, MGH SS rer. Ger. xxxiv. 200-1.

Madalucus, bishop of Verdun (c. 753-c. 777), *Gesta episcoporum Viridunensium*, MGH SS iv. 43-4; Hugh of Flavigny, 340-51.

Adson, abbot of Saint-Evre de Toul, who died *en route* via Egypt: Widricus, *Vita Sancti Gerardi episcopi Tullensis*, MGH SS iv. 488.

Saint Coloman set off for Jerusalem but was captured and imprisoned in Noricum: *Passio Sancti Cholomanni*, MGH SS iv. 678.

1092 Four unnamed Swabian clerics: Bernold, *Chronicon*, MGH SS v. 455.

c. 1002 A hermit of Bamberg to whom Henry II gave money and instructions to wash a precious chalice in the Jordan: Cosmas of Prague, *Die Chronik der Böhmen des Cosmas von Prague*, MGH SS rer. Ger. 66.

c. 1092 Bishop Erpo had been to Jerusalem: *ibid.* 100; Saxo, *Annales*, MGH SS vi. 727.

1028 Poppo, archbishop of Trier (1016-47), goes to Jerusalem: *Vita Sancti Symeonis heremitaë*, MGH SS viii. 209-11.

1000 Poppo of Stavelot (1020-48) journeys to Jerusalem: *Vita Popponis abbatis Stabulensis*, MGH SS xi. 293-316.

721 St Willibald of Eichstätt goes to Rome, and to Jerusalem in 722: *Vita Willibaldi episcopi Eichstetensis*, MGH SS xv. 1. 90-106.

Anglo-Norman sources

1035 Robert the Magnificent died at Nicaea. He was accompanied by Drogo of Pontoise, count of the Vexin: OV ii. 11, 116; iv. 76 (and Saxo, *Annales*, MGH SS vi. 689).

1040s William, son of Giroie, went to Jerusalem twice: OV ii. 14.

Romanus, a monk expelled from St Evroul, probably went to Jerusalem in the time of abbot Thierry (1050-7): *ibid.* ii. 44.

A knight, Drogo, returning from Jerusalem is entertained at Salerno and routs attacking Saracens: *ibid.* ii. 56. On the significance of this for the Norman settlement in Italy see J. France, 'The occasion of the coming of the Normans to southern Italy', *Journal of Medieval History* xvii (1991), 185-205.

1056/7 Abbot Thierry of St Evroul goes with Herbert of Montrueil and William Bonne-Ame, later (254) abbot of Caen, and others. The Melk hostel where they stayed was governed by a Norman, Ansgot. They were joined by an unnamed

German bishop. Herbert turned back due to illness at Laodicea while Thierry died in Cyprus: OV ii. 69–71; Gundulf, later bishop of Rochester, accompanied them and his *Vita* records that he was saved by a nobleman of their party: *The life of Gundulf, bishop of Rochester*, ed. R. Thomson, Toronto 1977, 26–8, cc. 3–6 – I owe this reference to Martin Brett.

Great German Pilgrimage: OV ii. 90.

Englishman Ingulf, later abbot of Crowland, went to Jerusalem from 1085/6–1109 then took the habit at St Wandrille: *ibid.* ii. 346.

Before 1080 Ralph of Monpinçon died on pilgrimage to Jerusalem: *ibid.* iii. 166.

1087 seizure of the relics of St Nicholas by a ship carrying pilgrims: *ibid.* iv. 55–73.

1092 Nicholas, abbot of Saint-Ouen, went to Jerusalem and died shortly after returning: *ibid.* iv. 306.

Ordericus also mentions Heraclius's recovery of Jerusalem (*ibid.* iii. 60) and Charlemagne's contact with the east (iii. 220).

Capture of Jerusalem by Titus: *ASC*, 7.

Discovery by pilgrim monks of the head of John the Baptist in 448: *ibid.* 9.

1052 Swein, son of Godwin and brother of Harold, goes to Jerusalem: *ibid.* 124. ('Florence' of Worcester, *Chronicon*, i. 209–10, s.a. 1052, adds that he died of cold in Lycia.)

1058 Bishop Aldred of Worcester, having completed the abbey of St Peter at Gloucester, goes to Jerusalem: *ASC* 'D', 124. 'Florence', *Chronicon*, i. 217, s.a. 1058, adds that he travelled via Hungary and was the first English bishop to make the journey.

The hermit Guy goes to Jerusalem, probably in the 1070s: *GPA*, 286.

A fratricide of Cologne goes to Jerusalem: *ibid.* 425–6.

Arnulf, count of Perche, cured of a terrible disease, goes to Jerusalem: *ibid.* 438.

Italian sources

c. 1000 Normans returning from Jerusalem aid Salerno against Saracens: Amatus, *Ystoire de li Normant*, ed. V. de Bartholomaeis, Rome 1935, 207–11. (For the significance of this see France, 'Coming of the Normans', 193–4.)

c. 1059 Gisulf II of Salerno decides to go to Jerusalem: Amatus, *Ystoire*, 207–11.

Mauro of Amalfi helped found a hospital at Jerusalem: *ibid.* 342.

Arnulf, *Gesta archiepiscoporum Mediolanensium* (which ends in 1077), PL cxlvii. 294 mentions Jerusalem, quoting Isaiah i. 23 in the context of condemning the Italian princes for their faithlessness.

Erlembald, younger brother of the author Landulf, goes to Jerusalem: *Landulphi senioris, Mediolanensis historiae libri quatuor*, ed. A. Cutolo, in L. Muratori, *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, Bologna 1942, 45. Landulph Junior, *Historia Mediolanensis*, ed.

THE DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM

C. Castiglioni, Bologna 1934, 5, mentions his own brother Girismannus who survived the crusade of 1101.

990 Leo, a monk, brings piece of the True Cross to Monte Cassino: *Chronik von Monte Cassino*, 189.

c. 988 3 monks of Monte Cassino go to Jerusalem from where one, Liutius, returns about 1000: *ibid.* 190, 221.

998 St Benedict in a vision orders a monk of Monte Cassino to end his sojourn at St Catherine's on Mount Sinai and return: *ibid.* 206.

c. 1020 monks of Monte Cassino returned from Jerusalem: *ibid.* 229.

c. 1000 Norman pilgrims begin the Norman intervention in the south: *ibid.* 236 (See France, 'Coming of the Normans', 193-4).

c. 1022-35 the marquis of Teatina enters Monte Cassino where he is later to become prior, and goes to Jerusalem: *ibid.* 262.

1045 a monk who had lived for forty years at Jerusalem returns to Monte Cassino: *ibid.* 312.

1054/5 Alfanes, later archbishop of Salerno, goes to Jerusalem: *ibid.* 368.

Late eleventh-century pilgrims return with relics from Jerusalem: *ibid.* 438.