

THE FRANKS IN OUTREMER

Studies in the Latin Principalities of
Palestine and Syria, 1099-1187

Alan V. Murray

VARIORUM COLLECTED STUDIES
SERIES





Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

Also in the Variorum Collected Studies Series:

JOHN FRANCE

Warfare, Crusade and Conquest in the Middle Ages

PETER W. EDBURY

Law and History in the Latin East

JAMES M. POWELL

The Papacy, Frederick II and Communal Devotion in Medieval Italy

CHRISTOPHER TYERMAN

The Practices of Crusading

Image and Action from the Eleventh to the Sixteenth Centuries

ROBERT IRWIN

Mamluks and Crusaders

Men of the Sword and Men of the Pen

CHRISTOPHER D. SCHABEL

Greeks, Latins, and the Church in Early Frankish Cyprus

CLIFFORD J. ROGERS

Essays on Medieval Military History

Strategy, Military Revolutions and the Hundred Years War

JONATHAN RILEY-SMITH

Crusaders and Settlers in the Latin East

JAMES M. POWELL

The Crusades, The Kingdom of Sicily, and the Mediterranean

ANTHONY LUTTRELL

Studies on the Hospitallers after 1306

Rhodes and the West

BENJAMIN Z. KEDAR

Franks, Muslims and Oriental Christians in the Latin Levant

Studies in Frontier Acculturation

JEAN RICHARD

Frans et Orientaux dans le monde des croisades

VARIORUM COLLECTED STUDIES SERIES

The Franks in Outremer



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

Alan V. Murray

The Franks in Outremer

Studies in the Latin Principalities of
Palestine and Syria, 1099–1187

First published 2015 by Ashgate Publishing

Published 2016 by Routledge

2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, NY 10017

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

This edition © 2015 Alan V. Murray

Alan V. Murray has asserted his right under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988, to be identified as the author of this work.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Notice:

Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

The Library of Congress has cataloged the printed edition as follows: 2015935294

ISBN 13: 978-1-4724-6885-7 (hbk)

VARIORUM COLLECTED STUDIES SERIES CS1056

CONTENTS

Preface	ix	
Acknowledgements	xi	
THE FRANKISH NOBILITY		
I	The origins of the Frankish nobility of the kingdom of Jerusalem, 1100–1118 <i>Mediterranean Historical Review</i> 4, 1989	281–300
II	A note on the origin of Eustace Grenier <i>Bulletin of the Society for the Study of the Crusades and the Latin East</i> 6, 1986	28–30
III	A little-known member of the royal family of crusader Jerusalem in William of Malmesbury's <i>Gesta Regum Anglorum</i> <i>Notes and Queries</i> 241, 1996	397–99
IV	Norman settlement in the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem, 1099–1131 <i>Archivio Normanno-Svevo</i> 1 for 2008 (2009)	61–85
V	The prosopography and onomastics of the Franks in the kingdom of Jerusalem, 1099–1187 <i>Onomastique et parenté dans l'Occident médiéval</i> , eds K.S.B. Keats-Rohan and C. Settiani. Oxford: Prosopographica & Genealogica, 2000	283–94
VI	How Norman was the principality of Antioch? Prolegomena to a study of the origins of the nobility of a crusader state <i>Family Trees and the Roots of Politics: The Prosopography of Britain and France from the Tenth to the Twelfth Century</i> , ed. K.S.B. Keats-Rohan. Woodbridge: Boydell, 1997, pp. 349–59	1–14

KINGSHIP IN FRANKISH JERUSALEM

- VII The title of Godfrey of Bouillon as ruler of Jerusalem 163–78
Collegium Medievale 3, 1990
- VIII Daimbert of Pisa, the *Domus Godefridi* and the 81–102
accession of Baldwin I of Jerusalem
*From Clermont to Jerusalem: The Crusades and Crusader
Societies, 1095–1500 (International Medieval Research 3),
ed. A.V. Murray. Turnhout: Brepols, 1998*
- IX Dynastic continuity or dynastic change? The accession of 1–27
Baldwin II and the nobility of the kingdom of Jerusalem
Medieval Prosopography 13, 1992
- X Baldwin II and his nobles: baronial factionalism and 60–85
dissent in the kingdom of Jerusalem, 1118–1134
Nottingham Medieval Studies 38, 1994
- XI Kingship, identity and name-giving in the family of 27–38
Baldwin of Bourcq
*Knighthoods of Christ: Essays on the History of the Crusades
and the Knights Templar presented to Malcolm Barber, ed.
N. Housley. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007*

SACRED SPACE AND THE DEFENCE OF THE HOLY LAND

- XII Sacred space and strategic geography in 13–37
twelfth-century Palestine
*Sacred Space in the State of the Teutonic Order in Prussia,
ed. J. Wenta (Sacra Bella Septentrionalia 2). Toruń:
Wydawnictwo naukowe Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika, 2013*
- XIII Constructing Jerusalem as a Christian capital: 1–18
topography and population of the Holy City under
Frankish rule in the twelfth century
*Original English version of 'La construcción de Jerusalén
como capital cristiana: Topografía y población de la Ciudad
Santa bajo el dominio franco en el siglo XII', in Construir la
ciudad en la Edad Media: Encuentros internacionales del
Medioevo 2009, Nájera, eds B. Arizaga Bolumburu and
J.A. Solórzano Telechea. Logroño: Instituto de Estudios
Riojanos, 2010, pp. 91–110*

- XIV The origin of money-fiefs in the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem 1–12
Mercenaries and Paid Men: The Mercenary Identity in the Middle Ages. Proceedings of a Conference held at the University of Wales, Swansea, 7th–9th July 2005, ed. J. France. Leiden: Brill, 2008, pp. 275–86
- XV ‘Mighty against the enemies of Christ’: the relic of the True Cross in the armies of the kingdom of Jerusalem 217–38
The Crusades and Their Sources: Essays Presented to Bernard Hamilton, eds J. France and W.G. Zajac. Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998
- IDEOLOGIES OF CONFRONTATION: FRANKS, NATIVE CHRISTIANS AND MUSLIMS
- XVI Ethnic identity in the crusader states: the Frankish race and the settlement of Outremer 59–73
Concepts of National Identity in the Middle Ages, eds S. Forde, L. Johnson and A.V. Murray. Leeds: Leeds Studies in English, 1995
- XVII *Coroscanne*: homeland of the Saracens in the *Chansons de geste* and the historiography of the crusades 1–9
Aspects de l'épopée romane: Mentalités – idéologies – intertextualités, eds H. van Dijk and W. Noomen. Groningen: Egbert Forsten, 1995, pp. 177–84
- XVIII William of Tyre and the origin of the Turks: observations on possible sources of the *Gesta orientaliū principum Dei Gesta per Francos*: *Etudes sur les croisades dédiés à Jean Richard / Crusade Studies in Honour of Jean Richard, eds M. Balard, B.Z. Kedar and J. Riley-Smith. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001* 217–29
- XIX Biblical quotations and formulaic language in the Chronicle of William of Tyre 25–34
Deeds Done beyond the Sea: Essays on William of Tyre, Cyprus and the Military Orders presented to Peter Edbury, eds S.B. Edgington and H.J. Nicholson (Crusades, Subsidia 6). Farnham: Ashgate, 2014

XX	Franks and indigenous communities in Palestine and Syria (1099–1187): a hierarchical model of social interaction in the principalities of Outremer <i>East Meets West in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Times: Transcultural Experiences in the Premodern World, ed. A. Classen (Fundamentals of Medieval and Early Modern Culture 14). Berlin: De Gruyter, 2013</i>	291–309
Index		1–14

This volume contains xii + 344 pages

PREFACE

This volume brings together twenty essays relating to the history of the principalities established in Palestine and Syria in the wake of the First Crusade. They are divided into four thematic sections. The first of these deals with the identities and origins of those Westerners – primarily nobles and knights – who settled in the kingdom of Jerusalem and the principality of Antioch (I–VI) from 1098 onwards. The second studies the character of the monarchy of the kingdom of Jerusalem from its foundation under Godfrey of Bouillon up to the joint reign of Melisende and Fulk of Anjou, with an emphasis on relations with the nobility of the kingdom and the Latin church (VII–XI). The third brings together four studies dealing with both sacred and secular aspects of the landscape and population of the Holy Land under Frankish rule (XII–XV); at first sight this might seem like a strange combination of subjects, but the cases of the settlement of the city of Jerusalem, the military use of the relic of the True Cross, and wider strategic considerations concerning the defence of the Holy Land all demonstrate how sacred and secular matters were inextricably linked in twelfth-century Palestine. The final section considers how the Franks perceived and interacted with the Muslim and native Christian inhabitants of Syria, Palestine and neighbouring lands, with a particular emphasis on the evidence of the great chronicle of William of Tyre (XVI–XX). Thus while sections 1 and 2 are focused on the first three decades of Frankish rule, sections 3 and 4 relate to the entire period of the principalities of Outremer up to their defeat by Saladin at the battle of Hattin in 1187.

One essay is the original English version of a paper which first appeared in Spanish translation (XIII). Three others have been re-set and given new pagination (VI, XIV and XVII). The remainder are reproduced as published, save for the correction of typographical errors. There are, however, two cases of nomenclature which I would no longer use. One study refers to the second Latin patriarch of Jerusalem as ‘Daimbert of Pisa’. Thanks to the work of Michael Matzke, we now know that the correct form of his name is in fact Daibert.¹ The other point is more important. The titles of two studies refer to the ‘Crusader States’, which was a common designation for all four of the Frankish or Latin principalities in Outremer at the time that these were

¹ Michael Matzke, *Daibert von Pisa: Zwischen Pisa, Papst und erstem Kreuzzug* (Sigmaringen, 1998).

written. After several decades of research, I now regard this term not only as inaccurate, but misleading. After the passing of the founding generation which arrived with the First Crusade, very few of the Western population of Palestine and Syria were actually crusaders, and I have preferred to use the term Franks, as they were known both by themselves and by the indigenous peoples of the region, as elaborated in Essay no. XX. The term 'crusader state' would aptly describe the twelfth-century kingdom of France on the grounds of the contribution it made to the crusading movement, but it is an inappropriate term for the kingdom of Jerusalem, the principality of Antioch, or the county of Edessa, each of whose Frankish inhabitants regarded it as their own *patria*.

Early versions of several of these essays were presented as invited lectures or conference papers, and I am glad to place on record my thanks to those individuals who organised these events and provided hospitality, as well as to the institutions which granted financial support: Benjamin Z. Kedar and the Institute for Advanced Study of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem (V); Katharine Keats-Rohan and the Linacre Unit for Prosopographical Research (VI); Jesús Angel Solórzano Telechea, Beatriz Arizaga Bolumburu and the Instituto de Estudios Riojanos in Logroño (XIII); Jonathan Riley-Smith and the Eastern Mediterranean Seminar at the Institute of Historical Research, London (X); John France and the Centre for Conflict Studies at the University of Wales, Swansea (XIV); Carolyn Muessig, George Ferzoco and the Centre for Medieval Studies of the University of Bristol (XV); Kurt Villads Jensen and the Institut for Middelalderstudien, University of Southern Denmark (XVIII). I have discussed many points at issues with these colleagues, as well as with Hugh Kennedy, Susan Edgington, Jonathan Phillips, Michael Matzke, and Graham Loud. I am especially grateful to Bernard Hamilton, who was not only the external examiner of my doctoral thesis, but in his capacity as editor of the *Bulletin of the Society for the Study of the Crusades and the Latin East* accepted for publication a short research note (II) which became my first published work. My greatest debt of thanks, however, is owed to Hans Eberhard Mayer, who has not only discussed numerous historical problems at great length in correspondence, but most generously provided me with offprints and copies of his own work which have proved both invaluable and inspiring over many years of research.

ALAN V. MURRAY

Calverley, Yorkshire
March 2015

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Grateful acknowledgement is made to the following persons, institutions and publishers for their kind permission to reproduce the papers included in this volume: Taylor & Francis Group (www.tandfonline.com) (I); Prof. Edoardo D'Angelo on behalf of the Centro Europeo di Studi Normanni (IV); Dr K.S.B. Keats-Rohan on behalf of Prosopographica et Genealogica, Oxford (V); Boydell and Brewer Ltd, Woodbridge (VI); Collegium Medievale: Society for Medieval Studies, Oslo (VII); Brepols Publishers, Turnhout, Belgium (VIII); Medieval Institute Publications, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo (IX); *Nottingham Medieval Studies* (X); Wydawnictwo naukowe Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika w Toruniu (XII); Brill, Leiden (XIV, XVII); Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin (XX).

Every effort has been made to trace all the copyright holders, but if any have been inadvertently overlooked the publishers will be pleased to make the necessary arrangement at the first opportunity.

PUBLISHER'S NOTE

The articles in this volume, as in all others in the Variorum Collected Studies Series, have not been given a new, continuous pagination. In order to avoid confusion, and to facilitate their use where these same studies have been referred to elsewhere, the original pagination has been maintained wherever possible. Article XIII is the original English version of the published essay, and articles VI, XIV and XVII have been reset with a new pagination.

Each article has been given a Roman number in order of appearance, as listed in the Contents. This number is repeated on each page and is quoted in the index entries.

The Origins of the Frankish Nobility of the Kingdom of Jerusalem, 1100–1118

Most historians of the crusader states have tended to assume that the nobility of the early Latin kingdom of Jerusalem was essentially Lotharingian in character, being drawn predominantly from the followers or vassals of the first two monarchs: Godfrey of Bouillon, who before the First Crusade was duke of Lower Lotharingia, and his brother and successor Baldwin I.¹ However it is not clear on what evidence this assumption is based. While the nobilities of the principality of Antioch and the county of Tripoli have been discussed within the context of larger monographs on these states² there has been no systematic examination of the origins of the early nobility of Jerusalem.

In this essay I therefore propose to analyse the composition of the early Frankish nobility of Jerusalem in terms of its European origins. The chronological parameters chosen are those of the reign of Baldwin I, 18 July 1100 to 2 April 1118. The short reign of Baldwin's predecessor Godfrey of Bouillon has been excluded on purpose as many of the crusaders in the Holy Land during this one year period returned to Europe and must therefore be considered pilgrims rather than settlers. However it will be found that most of Godfrey's vassals are in fact included as they were still represented in the next reign. Certainly the earlier date allows us to include the important group known as the *domus Godefridi* which mounted a *coup d'état* in favour of Baldwin I on Godfrey's death.³

The nobility constituted only a minority of the Frankish population of the kingdom, itself a minority among native Christians of various rites, Muslims, Jews, and Samaritans.⁴ The only medieval figure for the size of the nobility derives from the list of knights and sergeants in Chapter 271 of the *Livre* of John of Ibelin.⁵ John himself was writing some time after 1260, but the precise nature of his itemized list suggests he was using as his source a text, probably dating from the last quarter of the twelfth century, which detailed the military service of the kingdom at that time.⁶ John himself gives the total knight service owed to the king as 577 knights. However, the addition of the separate items cannot give a total of less than 647 and can be interpreted as giving as many as 675.

Yet even this figure cannot represent the true number; several fiefs are missing from the list, while we also know of the existence of mercenary knights who are similarly not included.⁷ Since the kingdom was grievously short of manpower it is safe to assume that the kings were concerned to make use of every knight available. Bearing this consideration in mind as well as the omissions from John of Ibelin's list, it is likely that in the period before the battle of Hattin the total knight service of the kingdom, excluding the military orders and the mounted sergeants who belonged to the burghess class, was well in excess of 700 knights.

This figure does not necessarily hold good for the early twelfth century. Knight service was essentially determined by the extent of the territories held by the Franks, especially the cities, which could be enfeoffed to tenants-in-chief and in turn to their vassals, or whose revenues provided money-fiefs in the case of the royal domain. The kingdom in this period was considerably smaller than in the second half of the twelfth century. The reigns of Godfrey, Baldwin I, and Baldwin II saw a gradual conquest of the Muslim coastal cities and of inland border areas such as Oultrejourdain and the Hauran. The port of Tyre was not captured until 1124, while Ascalon remained a Muslim enclave within the frontiers of the kingdom until 1153. The pattern of expansion in the early period would indicate a gradual increase in the knight service the kingdom could support.

According to Fulcher of Chartres Baldwin I had 300 knights and as many foot-soldiers at the beginning of 1101.⁸ A considerable number of these had come with him from Edessa, and must have belonged to the *comitatus Baldewini* formed by him in 1097–98.⁹ Therefore the force available to Godfrey after the departure of the majority of the pilgrims in the summer and autumn of 1099 must have been somewhat smaller. Since Fulcher describes Baldwin's men as being distributed among Jerusalem, Jaffa, Ramla, and Haifa it is unclear whether he was including the followers of Tancred in Galilee. At any rate it is possible that many of these left with him in March 1101 when he assumed the regency of Antioch after the capture of Bohemund.

We can obtain an idea of the number of knights in the following years by examining accounts of the pitched battles fought by the Franks. It is clear that when threatened by major invasions from Egypt or Damascus garrisons were reduced to an absolute minimum in order to raise as large a field army as possible.¹⁰ The First Battle of Ramla (September 1101) was fought *cum omni virtute peditum et equitum*.¹¹ The number of knights was put at either 260,¹² or 300.¹³ At the Second Battle of Ramla (May 1102) the army comprised 200 knights many of whom were crusaders who had newly arrived from Europe; however in

this case the figure did not represent a full mobilization as the army which was defeated by the Egyptians in the initial engagement was subsequently reinforced by 80 more knights from Galilee and 90 sergeants from Jerusalem.¹⁴ This gives a total figure of 280 knights including pilgrims. At the Third Battle of Ramla (August 1105) the Franks managed to put 500 knights into the field, a figure which would appear to represent maximum strength and may again have included visiting pilgrims.¹⁵

For the rest of this reign we are dependent for figures on one source, Albert of Aachen, who gives the following information: for the expedition to Edessa in 1110, 600 knights;¹⁶ for the army defeated by the combined Turkish forces of Maudūd of Mosul and Tughtikīn of Damascus in 1113, 700;¹⁷ for the expedition to northern Syria in 1115, 500.¹⁸ These numbers seem suspiciously high when compared with the figures given for similar campaigns in the next reign by Fulcher of Chartres: 250 knights – including a contingent from the county of Tripoli¹⁹ – for the relief expedition to Antioch after the *Ager Sanguinis* in 1119, and 300 for the expedition to Antioch in 1122.²⁰ It is striking that on average Albert's figures are twice as high as Fulcher's, that is 500–700 as opposed to 250–300. Although Albert is normally a reliable source he was writing in Europe while Fulcher, writing in Palestine, was better placed to obtain information on numbers. It would be unlikely that the Franks would wish to unduly weaken the defences of the kingdom for lengthy periods. Therefore the expeditions to northern Syria must have represented a smaller proportion of the total forces available than the armies which fought defensive battles within the frontiers of the kingdom. Bearing this in mind, Fulcher's figures for the reign of Baldwin II show a greater correspondence with those for the first few years of the kingdom rather than with those for the middle period which are attested to only by Albert.

It should be stressed that all of these figures deal only with able-bodied adult males. To arrive at a global figure for the entire Frankish nobility we would of course have to include women, children, and males who were too old or too unfit for military service. Such a calculation would involve establishing a reliable quotient for the size of Frankish families in the East. Evidence for this is limited, especially in view of the problematic factor of infant mortality in a colonial group outside its traditional environment. Moreover, although some crusaders were accompanied by their wives and in some cases children we do not know what percentage they were of the whole group, whereas it is safe to assume that most knights in the later kingdom were married and had families. However a comparison between the numbers of knights in the armies of the early kingdom and the figures of

John of Ibelin (taking his omissions into account) would seem to suggest that the total knight service in the reign of Baldwin I was considerably smaller than that of the second half of the century; a tentative figure would be something between one-half and two-thirds of the later total.

This initial consideration of numbers is essential to any discussion of the origins of the nobility. The most important prosopographical source material comprises the charters of the period. Most of those which survive were issued by the king or by ecclesiastical institutions; private documents are rare. Therefore the evidence is 'top-heavy' in that most of the nobles appearing as issuers or witnesses on surviving documents tend to be drawn from the ranks of the *principes* rather than the simple knights. Furthermore, we cannot hope to successfully identify the place of origin of all of the individuals whose names have come down to us. Nevertheless, considering the relatively small size of the nobility, a survey of the proportion whose origins can be identified may lead to important conclusions about the character of the group as a whole. Some knights brought wives and families with them from Europe, while others were joined by members of their families or more distant relatives some time after the initial settlement. Shared origins were not limited to kinsmen. Waldemar Carpinel was accompanied on the crusade by a *gens* or retinue which remained with him in the Holy Land.²¹ The cases of Eustace Granarius and Joscelin of Courtenay discussed below also show that *principes* were associated in Outremer with *militēs* who originated in the same areas in Europe. It is likely, therefore, that evidence about the origins of the most important and most prominent members of the nobility will provide clues about the origins of others who rarely or never appear on documents. What now follows is a survey of those members of the nobility whose provenance can be identified, grouped according to their area of origin. In most cases personal names are given in a form which appears in the original sources. Where the place of origin can be identified with a reasonable degree of certainty this is given in its modern form, along with a precise location in parenthesis: in France (F) by *département* and *arrondissement*, in Belgium (B) by province and *arrondissement*, and in Italy (I) by region and province.

The most logical area of origin to consider first is Lotharingia, since scholarship has repeatedly stressed the importance of the Lotharingian element in the early Jerusalem nobility. However in contrast to the accepted view the only noble in this period who is definitely known to have been in Godfrey's service before the crusade was his chamberlain Stabelo, who first appears as a member of the ducal household during the march across Hungary.²² We can find two other cases where

sumames suggest their bearers were also vassals of Godfrey from his allodial territory of Bouillon. *Philippus de Bulon* was present at the Second Battle of Ramla.²³ A Walter of Bouillon is known only from a toponym to which he gave his name, mentioned in a charter of 1148 as the *casale quod Galteri de Bulion nuncupatur*; he was probably identical with, or a relative of the Walter of Bouillon who was present at the sale of allods to the abbey of St Gertrude at Nivelles by Godfrey and Baldwin in 1096, a fund-raising venture where other crusaders were present.²⁴

Warnerus de Greis was count of Grez-Doiceau, in Flemish Graven (B, Brabant, Nivelles), situated between the county of Louvain and the episcopal territory of Liège. He was not a vassal, but a kinsman of Godfrey, being described by Albert of Aachen as *cognatus ipsius ducis* and *vir nobilissimus et propinquus ejus*. He acted as Godfrey's deputy during the monarch's last illness; this position along with his comital status and kinship with the duke would explain why he was accorded the leadership of the group of household knights who mounted a coup in favour of Baldwin I on Godfrey's death, although Warner himself died only a few days later.²⁵

A larger element within the Lotharingian group had no known feudal or kinship ties with the Ardennes-Verdun family. *Gutmannus de Brussella*, mentioned between 1102 and 1115, was a Brabantine from Brussels, a possession of the counts of Louvain, long-standing rivals and enemies of the Ardennes-Verdun family.²⁶ *Lithardus vero Cameracensis* or *de Cameraco civitate Galliae* came from the episcopal territory of Cambrai in the extreme west of Lower Lotharingia. He commanded the garrison of Jaffa in 1105 and was probably identical with the *Lithardus tertius vicecomes Joppitarum* and the *Lethardus vicecomes* who gave land at Akhzhiv to the abbey of St Mary of Josaphat.²⁷ *Gerardus de Hainacorum de praesidio Avesnes* came from Avesnes-sur-Helpe (F, Nord, Avesnes). In 1100 he was granted the fief of St Abraham or Hebron but was killed at the Second Battle of Ramla in May 1102.²⁸ Another Hennuyer was *Giselbertus de castello quod dicitur Cuvin, vir illustris*, killed at Sidon in 1108. The castle of Couvin (B, Namur, Philippeville) was an allodial possession of Baldwin II of Mons, Count of Hainault, and was sold by him to the Church of Liège in 1095 in order to raise funds for the crusade.²⁹ It is likely that both Gerard and Giselbert left Europe in the service of Baldwin of Hainault but transferred to that of Godfrey after the count disappeared in Asia Minor while on an embassy to Alexius Comnenus. *Milo de Claro Monte*, a knight of Godfrey's household in 1100, presents problems on account of the frequency of his sumame as a toponym in French-speaking countries. However there is a case to be made for a connection

with Clermont-sur-Meuse (B, Liège, Huy), a fortress purchased at great expense by the bishop of Liège in 1095. The Giselbert, Count of Clermont, who is documented in 1083 and 1091, is probably identical with the *Giselbertus de Claro Monte* who figures as a member of Baldwin's household in Cilicia in the winter of 1097. It is therefore likely that Milo was originally a vassal of Giselbert who, like Godfrey himself, sold his domains to raise funds for the crusade.³⁰

Rodulfus de Monzon or *Mozon* has been claimed by Riley-Smith as originating from 'Menonville', which he does not identify and which is hardly justified by the forms of his name.³¹ It is far more probable that Ralph was originally a follower of the crusader called *Ludowicus de Montione* or *Ludowicus de Monzunz filius comitis Tirrici de Muntbiliart* who can be identified as Louis of Mousson (F, Meurthe-et-Moselle), a son of Thierry I, Count of Bar and Montbéliard.³² Also from Upper Lotharingia came Reinard of Verdun, killed at the Third Battle of Ramla in 1105.³³

To these Lotharingians it would make sense to add two Germans who like them were imperial subjects. *Wicherius Alemannus* was claimed by Du Cange and Rey as a member of a Provençal family. However this is unlikely as it was above all by German authors that his exploits were celebrated; he was for example one of only three Franks named in the account of the First Crusade given in the anonymous *Kaiserchronik*. Since even the Rhinelander Albert of Aachen uses the surname *Alemannus* this is probably meant in the tribal sense of 'Swabian' rather than simply 'German', which is confirmed by the poet Metellus of Tegernsee who describes him as *Suevus Wicherus* as well as giving the more precise information *Fuldanus pauper ... minister*.³⁴ The Gunter mentioned as one of the *domus Godefridi* in 1100 is undoubtedly the same *Guntram* commemorated along with his compatriot Wicher by the Franconian John of Würzburg.³⁵

The Lotharingian-German element was easily outnumbered by nobles from Flanders and Artois, that is, the domains of the count of Flanders and his vassal counties of Boulogne, Lens, Guînes, and Saint-Pol. Those from the Flemish domains proper had mostly come to Palestine with Robert II, Count of Flanders, and included prominent members of the Flemish nobility. *Gerbodo de castello Winthinc*, killed at the Second Battle of Ramla in 1102, can be identified as Gerbod III, Lord of Scheldewindeke (B, Oost-Vlaanderen, Gent), younger son of Gerbod II, Lord of Oosterzele and Advocate of St Bertin's Abbey.³⁶ *Rodulfus de castello Alos, quod est in Flandria* was the second of Ralph, Advocate of St Peter's Abbey at Ghent, and Gisela of Luxembourg, sister-in-law of Count Baldwin IV of Flanders. His elder brother Baldwin was lord of Aalst (B, Oost-Vlaanderen, Aalst), Waas,

and Drongen. He originally went on crusade with his nephews Gilbert, who subsequently returned home, and Baldwin II of Aalst, who was killed at Nicaea on 13 June 1097. Ralph himself was killed at the Second Battle of Ramla in May 1102.³⁷ Arnulf, the *armiger nobilissimi iuvenis ... probus eques ac princeps de castello Aldenardis* killed in an ambush by Muslims near Ascalon in 1106 can be identified as Arnulf II, Lord of Oudenaarde (B, Oost-Vlaanderen).³⁸ *Balduinus de Hastrut castellis Flandriae*, first mentioned in 1102, came from Heestert (B, West-Vlaanderen, Kortrijk) which was known as *Hestrud* in the Walloon dialect. He may have been a relative of the *Ansel de Hestrut et Balduinus frater eius* who appear on a charter for the abbey of St Bertin in 1119.³⁹ Baldwin is last mentioned under this surname at the Third Battle of Ramla in 1105. However a certain Baldwin appears in charge of the defences of Ramla in 1107. He would seem to have held land there by 1115 when a royal charter confirmed to Josaphat two carrucates given by *Balduinus ... in territorio Ramensi*, who appears again in 1119 as *Balduinus de Ramatha*. It is thus possible that this Baldwin, who was an ancestor of the famous Ibelin family, was in fact identical with the Fleming Baldwin of Heestert.⁴⁰ The brothers Hugh and Gerard *de Falchenberch* or *Falkenberc* derived their surname from the village of Fauquembergues (F, Pas-de-Calais, Saint-Omer) in the diocese of Thérouanne. Hugh became lord of Tiberias in 1101, but both brothers died in 1106 during fighting against Tughtikī of Damascus.⁴¹ Another Ternois was Hugh, lord of Hebron, first mentioned in 1104, whose origins are given by the *Versus de viris illustribus dioecesis Tarvanensis*:

Et castrum quoddam, quod Sancti dicitur Abraham, Hugo Rebecensis tenuit, miles generosus.

Hugh therefore came from Rebecques (F, Pas-de-Calais, Saint-Omer) just outside Thérouanne. He can be identified with the *Hugo de Resbeca* who witnessed an undated charter issued by Gerard, bishop of Thérouanne, sometime before the crusade.⁴² Other, less prominent Flemings who are identifiable by their surnames were Eustace and Hugh of Cassel (F, Nord, Dunkerque), while Godfrey's butler *Winricus* is described as *Flandriense* by Albert of Aachen.⁴³

Of the knights who came from the Flemish satellite counties the majority seem to have been vassals or kinsmen of Godfrey's elder brother Eustace III of Boulogne. The most prominent was Eustace *Granarius*, who became lord of Sidon and Caesarea and at the end of his life acted as regent for the captive Baldwin II in 1123. He probably came from the county of Saint-Pol which was held as a fief from the count of Boulogne.⁴⁴ *Aaluns de Belram*, who witnessed a document issued by

Eustace in 1116, was probably a vassal of his, from Beaurain-Château (F, Pas-de-Calais, Montreuil-sur-Mer) on the River Canche.⁴⁵ Another apparent vassal of Eustace in Palestine was *Azo de Drouino*, possibly from Drouvin-le-Marais (F, Pas-de-Calais, Béthune).⁴⁶ *Petrus de Lens* is known only from his donation to the Hospital, sometime before 1110, of the *casale* of Dirberham on the eastern shore of Lake Tiberias. Richard has suggested that he was a follower of the Artesian Gervase of Bazoches, but it is more likely that he was originally a vassal of Eustace of Boulogne, whose family had held the county of Lens from the middle of the eleventh century.⁴⁷ *Anselmus de Parenti* is documented in Palestine between 1110 and 1126; he held land between Bethlehem, Artasium and Bethbezan. Parenty (F, Pas-de-Calais, Montreuil-sur-Mer) is a village situated on the Course, a tributary of the River Canche, and thus lay within the *pagus Bononiensis*.⁴⁸ Fulk of Guînes obtained the lordship of Beirut sometime after its capture by the Franks in 1110. He was the second son of Baldwin I, Count of Guînes, a small county situated between the *pagus Bononiensis* and its detached dependent territory of Marck, and was also a kinsman of the Boulognes.⁴⁹

This was a near-unique status in this period. Apart from Fulk himself and Warner of Grez who died a few days after Godfrey of Bouillon, we know of only one relative of the ruling dynasty actually resident in the kingdom between 1100 and 1118. Describing the casualties sustained in the defeat of the Franks of Jerusalem by Tughtikīn of Damascus and Maudūd of Mosul in 1113, William of Malmesbury comments:

Ceciderunt ibi plures quos ego quoque noram; inter quos
Godefridus abnepos ejus nothus, jam inde a pueritia umbram
virtutis vultu colorans, veritatem animo spirans.

William's editor, Stubbs, identified this Godfrey as a nephew of Godfrey of Bouillon; however William is discussing Baldwin at the time, and *ejus* refers to him. This information might seem dubious if it were not confirmed by the witness-list of a royal charter, dated 12 June 1112, which gives the name *Gotafredus nepos regis*. No source gives the slightest indication of any children, legitimate or otherwise, of Godfrey of Bouillon. On the other hand the formulation used by the English writer William indicates that the second Godfrey was known to him personally, suggesting that he may more likely have been an illegitimate son or grandson of Eustace III of Boulogne, who held extensive lands in England.⁵⁰

To the Flemish-Artesian group we might add knights from the neighbouring area of Picardy. *Rotger de castello Roiset* or *Roseit* came from Rozoy-sur-Serre (F, Aisne, Laon), whose lords were still bearing

the name Roger in the 1170s. This settler was probably a kinsman of the *dominus Roger de Rosoit* who was present at the foundation of the priory of St Peter at Bouillon by Godfrey II of Lower Lotharingia (grandfather of Godfrey of Bouillon) in 1069.⁵¹ *Drogo de Nahella* or *Nigella* was originally on one of the so-called people's expeditions. At Constantinople he was imprisoned and kept in chains by the emperor, but was later released and joined Godfrey's army. He accompanied Baldwin during the conquest of Edessa, and on the latter's accession in 1100 presumably accompanied him to Palestine where he is attested up to 1126. We know of a Drogo, son of Ralph, Lord of Soissons (F, Somme, Péronne) and brother of Ivo II, Lord of Nesle and Count of Nesle. His presence in France, however, is well documented between 1115 and 1157. It is nevertheless likely that the crusader was a member of this family, probably belonging to the same generation as Ralph.⁵²

The *Gervasius dapifer* who witnessed a royal charter of 1104 was undoubtedly the same knight who received the lordship of Tiberias on the death of Hugh of Fauquembergues in 1106, only to be captured and executed by Tughtikīn of Damascus two years later. He is described as *miles egregius ... isdem Gervasius vocabatur apud castrum Basilicas pagi Suessionici nobiliter oriundus*. Gervase was advocate of the church of Mont-Nôtre-Dame and brother of Hugh, Lord of Bazoches-sur-Vesle (F, Aisne, Soissons), and was also related to the lords of Milly in the Beauvaisis.⁵³ This connection may well explain the presence in Galilee of *Guido de Miliaco*, a substantial landholder around Nablus documented between 1108 and 1126, who has been identified as originating from Milly-sur-Therain (F, Oise, Beauvais).⁵⁴ *Ado de Cheresio* or *Cirisy* is attested in the kingdom from 1102 to 1115. He was probably originally a relative or vassal of Gerard, Lord of Quierzy (F, Aisne, Laon) who took part in the crusade but returned to France and was assassinated in the cathedral of Laon in January 1110. Ado had evidently been accompanied or subsequently joined by his wife Richoldis and son Warmund. Like others of the Picards this family group appears to have held land in Galilee; before 1115 they donated to St Mary of Josaphat the *casale* Lichorat (Khirbet el-Kura) situated to the south of Toron.⁵⁵

Men of the Norman race made up two of the major contingents on the crusade: those from Normandy and England under Duke Robert, and those from southern Italy under Bohemund and Tancred. Tancred himself was prince of Galilee until March 1101.⁵⁶ *Robertus de Apulia* was a Norman knight who had settled in Anzi (I, Basilicata, Potenza). He was on crusade with Bohemund but had certainly entered Godfrey's service by March 1100 and was later assigned the revenues of Arsuf.⁵⁷ *Robertus filius Gerardi* was the second son of Gerard, Count of

Buonalbergo (I, Campania, Benevento) and had served Bohemund as constable and banner-bearer. Both Roberts are last heard of in Jerusalem as part of the group which summoned Baldwin I to take the throne on Godfrey's death in July 1101; in the case of Robert FitzGerard it is clear that he returned to Italy before 1112.⁵⁸

It is impossible to establish with absolute certainty the contingents with which the other Normans had been on crusade, although the balance of the evidence suggests they had come with Duke Robert. *Rodulfus de Montpinzon*, also known from the *domus ducis Godefridi* of July 1110, can be identified as a son of Ralph of Montpinçon (F, Calvados, Lisieux), the steward of William the Conqueror and benefactor of the abbey of Saint-Evroul who died *circa* 1103. Orderic Vitalis relates that Ralph the younger *in via Ierusalem peregrinus obierat*. However this does not necessarily mean that he died on the way to Jerusalem, as Chibnall translates the phrase; it could also mean that he died in the Holy Land before he could return to Normandy, and would also explain why his presence in Palestine is known only from this one reference.⁵⁹ *Reinerus de Brus* or *Brus*, killed in 1113, probably belonged to a branch of the famous Anglo-Norman family of Brus or Bruce which originated from Brix (F, Manche, Cherbourg). In view of the similarity of names it is likely that he was also the father of the *Rainerius de Brus* or *Rainerius cognomine Brus* who is first documented in 1125 and became lord of Banyas after its capture by the Franks in 1129.⁶⁰ Similarly, *Galterius Bigotus*, known only from 1108, was probably a member of the family of Bigot or Bigod whose eponymous fief was situated at Courvaudon (F, Calvados, Caen).⁶¹ With the Normans we could also include the Englishman Robert, son of Godwin. He had shared Edgar the Atheling's Scottish exile, and accompanied him to the Holy Land where he was killed at Ramla in 1102.⁶² Lastly, we have the *Willelmus filius comitis Normannorum* who appears in 1108. He was an illegitimate son of Robert Curthose, born during his exile in France. After the defeat of his father by William the Conqueror in 1106 he came to Jerusalem, more as a refugee than a settler, but seems to have been given the lordship of Tiberias on the death of Gervase of Bazoches and is last heard of as lord of Tortosa in the county of Tripoli.⁶³

The next sizeable element in the Jerusalem nobility can be described as comprising knights from Francia in its narrower sense, that is the lands of the French royal domain, which extended over the Ile-de-France, the Orleannais and the Gâtinais, and the surrounding territories of the counts of Champagne, Brie, and Chartres and their vassals. On the crusade these men had been predominantly in the armies of Hugh of Vermandois, brother of the king of France, and

Stephen of Blois, although Baldwin of Bourcq, from the periphery of Champagne, had chosen to accompany Godfrey and Baldwin, succeeding the latter as count of Edessa. After the desertion of Stephen of Blois from the crusading army it is likely that many if not most of his followers attached themselves to other leaders, especially since this occurred during the siege of Antioch when many knights were in financial difficulties.

Under Baldwin I we find several individuals who originated in Francia from an early date. *Fredericus de Corbolio* probably came from Corbeil-Essonnes (F, Essonne, Evry). A *Fruicus de Curbulo* or *Fredericus de Curbuilo* often appears in charters of Philip I of France in the period 1066–85; this identification would indicate that Frederick was a fairly old man by the time he arrived in Palestine, and thus explain his early disappearance from Jerusalem documents.⁶⁴ The surname of *Hugo de Burg*, present at the Second Battle of Ramla in 1102, suggests he was originally a follower of Baldwin of Bourcq (F, Ardennes, Vouziers), son of the count of Rethel and successor to Baldwin I both as count of Edessa and king of Jerusalem.⁶⁵ The most prominent of these early arrivals was undoubtedly *Radulfus de Fontanello*. He had a fief south of Bethlehem and was a frequent witness to royal and patriarchal charters. He first appears at the siege of Antioch, when he temporarily deserted from the crusading army. The contemporary descriptions *Radulfus de Fontanellis et alii Andegavorum* and *de Fontanella Radulphus et is Turonensis* point to a place-name deriving from a diminutive of Latin *fontanum* situated in Touraine or Anjou; the most probable place of origin would therefore be La Fontanelle (F, Loir-et-Cher, Vendôme), situated between Blois and Tours, Tours having been held by the Angevins from the counts of Blois.⁶⁶

In other cases, however, the dating of the appearance of men from Francia indicates that they had not been involved in the crusade but only subsequently emigrated to the Holy Land. *Andreas de Valdemunt* or *Baldemunt*, mentioned in 1108 and 1115, was probably a relative of the Andrew of Baudement (F, Marne, Epernay) who was related to the counts of Corbeil and served as seneschal to Count Theobald II of Champagne between 1111 and 1133.⁶⁷ Hugh of Le Puiset (F, Eure-et-Loir, Chartres), was a son of Hugh I Blavons, Lord of Le Puiset and vicomte of Chartres, and Alice, daughter of Guy I of Montlhéry. After acting as guardian to his nephew Hugh III up to around 1106 he came to Palestine with his wife Mabel of Roucy, appearing as *Hugo de Puzath* in 1110.⁶⁸ He was soon followed by a cousin who arrived in Palestine by a more circuitous route. *Joscelinus videlicet de Cortenay, vir nobilis de Francia, de regione quae dicitur Gastineis* came from Courtenay (F, Loiret, Montargis) in the Gâtinais. He was the second son of Joscelin,

son of Atho, Castellan of Châteaurenard. His mother was Isabella, daughter of Guy of Montlhéry and Hodierna of Gometz. Joscelin did not leave France until after the First Crusade, going first to Edessa where he profited from his blood relationship with its count, Baldwin of Bourcq, being given the vast lordship of Turbessel, but was deprived of this fief in 1113 and came to Jerusalem where he was granted the principality of Galilee.⁶⁹

From around this time we begin to find other men from the same area of France as rear-vassals in Galilee. William *de Buris* or *de Bures* is documented from before 1115 and was associated in Galilee, with his brother Godfrey. In his study of the princes of Galilee, Pirie-Gordon claimed they were members of a Norman family although he gave no evidence for this assertion. On the other hand Albert of Aachen gives their place or origin as *Burs et de terra civitatis Parisius*, now Bures-sur-Yvette (F, Essonne, Palaiseau) south-west of Paris. Bures seems to have been part of the lordship of Gometz-la-Châtel, which had passed to the Montlhéry family at the end of the eleventh century.⁷⁰ *Drogo de Bria*, whose surname probably derives from the district around Briecomte-Robert (F, Seine-et-Marne), is described as *testis Jocelini* in a royal confirmation of donations made by Joscelin and William of Bures to the abbey of Josaphat in 1115.⁷¹

The largest single contingent on the First Crusade was probably that led by Raymond of Saint-Gilles, Count of Toulouse and Marquis of Provence. This was drawn from all over southern France, the area where the crusade had been first and presumably most intensively preached. It seems that a large number of the burgess class was drawn from this group or from subsequent immigration from these areas. A list of burgesses from the town of Magna Mahomeria (al-Bira) in 1156 shows a high proportion of individuals whose surnames indicate that they came from the Languedoc (in its wider sense) and the adjacent lands of Lombardy and Catalonia.⁷²

By contrast we find few Provençals among the nobility. *Gaudemarus Carpinellus* or *Geldemarus cognomine Carpinel* was in all probability a relative of the *Galdemarus Carpinellus* who witnessed a charter for the abbey of Conques which can be dated to 1119/21. By the time the crusaders reached Palestine Waldemar had evidently thrown in his lot with Godfrey, who promised him the port of Haifa. However he and his retinue were expelled from the town by Tancred, and he was compensated with Hebron, eventually regaining Haifa by March 1101, and was killed in battle in September.⁷³ *Romanus de Podio* was in Palestine before 1110 and last appears in 1133. He was originally a follower of Adhemar, Bishop of Le Puy (F, Haute-Loire, Le Puy) and his brothers William-Hugh and Francis-Lambert of Monteil.⁷⁴

The probable explanation for this discrepancy between the numbers of nobles and burgesses in the kingdom is that when Raymond of Saint-Gilles failed to be elected *princeps* in the summer of 1099 the knights of his army, with a few exceptions, either returned to Europe or withdrew from Palestine with him and eventually settled in the county of Tripoli, whose nobility retained an almost exclusively Provençal character up to the reign of Count Raymond III.⁷⁵ Thus for most of the reign of Baldwin I the Provençal element in the nobility was represented exclusively by the Le Puy family.

Italy outside the Norman possessions in the south of the peninsula produced a mere two nobles. *Otto cognomine Altaspata* was a Lombard, nephew of Count Albert of Biandrate (I, Piemonte, Novara). He came to the East with the crusade of 1101 led by Anselm, Archbishop of Milan, and was killed defending Jaffa in 1104.⁷⁶ Balian or Barisan, later lord of Ibelin, was certainly in Palestine before 1115 and went on to found what proved to be the most famous dynasty in the crusader states. Richard had presented convincing onomastic evidence to show that he probably originated in Pisa or Sardinia and came to the East in the entourage of Daimbert, Archbishop of Pisa, who was elected patriarch of Jerusalem at the end of 1099. The fact that Balian was the only nobleman of Italian origin after 1104 would explain why he was only ever known by his Christian name and later by his titles of constable of Jaffa or lord of Ibelin. A surname deriving from an Italian place-name would presumably have little meaning for his peers. Nevertheless, this near-unique origin seems less remarkable if we consider the rise of the Ibelin dynasty. This was based on two foundations: the enfeoffment of Balian with Ibelin by King Fulk and the acquisition of the lordship of Ramla through the marriage of Balian and Helvis, daughter of Baldwin of Ramla.⁷⁷ Yet as we have already seen, there are strong indications that Baldwin was none other than the Fleming Baldwin of Heestert. Thus it would seem that the dynasty had a Flemish origin as well as an Italian one, although Balian's Pisan origins were evidently of so little importance that the compilers of the *Lignages d'Outremer*, a work with a strong Ibelin bias, replaced it with a completely spurious descent from the counts of Chartres.⁷⁸

This survey of the Jerusalem nobility between 1099 and 1118 has established the European origins of 55 adult male nobles. Breaking down these names into different groups, we are left with the following figures: from Flanders and Picardy, 23; from Lotharingia and the rest of the empire, 12; from the Ile-de-France and surrounding territories, 9; from Normandy, England, and Norman Italy, 7; and from the remainder of Italy and the Languedoc, 2 each. Considering the rela-

tively small size of the Frankish nobility it is likely that this constitutes a proportion large enough to tell us about the origins of the entire body.

A sizeable contingent of Lotharingians remained with Godfrey of Bouillon after the return of the majority of their compatriots to Europe. Yet, with the prominent exception of Gotmann of Brussels apparently no Lotharingians were left after 1110. When Godfrey of Bouillon left Europe in 1096 he sold or mortgaged all of his possessions. The connections of the ruling house with Jerusalem were thus broken, and the losses among the Lotharingians who settled in Palestine were not made up in the years after the crusade. There seems to be a similar tendency in the case of the Normans. Two factors may have contributed to this negative development. Firstly, many of the Norman followers of Tancred during his first tenure of Galilee may have departed with him after he assumed the regency of Antioch. As he remained an absentee during his second tenure it is unlikely that they returned in 1109. Secondly, the principality of Antioch, whose nobility had a predominantly Norman character, must have been a more obvious goal for Norman settlers coming to Outremer. This must certainly have been the case after 1119 when the Antiochene nobility itself suffered heavy losses at the battle known as the *Ager Sanguinus*. The *curia* of Antioch reached an agreement with Baldwin II, who acted as regent in the subsequent period, that the fiefs of the dead Antiochene nobles should be kept in the hands of their families wherever possible, even if this meant that their successors had to be brought over from Europe.⁷⁹

As far as Flemings, Picards, and Francians are concerned it is striking that most of these men originally came to the Holy Land in the armies of leaders who did not play a particularly active part in the direction of the crusade, possibly because they had no ambition to found principalities in the Holy Land. Stephen of Blois deserted from the crusading army at Antioch, and Hugh of Vermandois and Robert of Flanders returned to Europe after the capture of Jerusalem. Thus knights in these contingents who were dissatisfied with their prospects, or suddenly left leaderless, had strong incentives to throw in their lot with the more resourceful, enterprising or simply more promising leaders, such as Baldwin who had established himself in Edessa and Godfrey who was elected ruler of Jerusalem. We should also bear in mind the European connections of the ruling house. While Godfrey had abandoned his possessions in Lotharingia his elder brother Eustace remained count of Boulogne and Lens and overlord of Saint-Pol. It is above all men from the surrounding areas of Flanders and Picardy who enjoyed royal favour under Baldwin I, which becomes evident when we examine the relatively small group of men who were holders of lordships over the major cities and territories. We find one Provençal, Waldemar

Carpinel, and one Lotharingian, Gerard of Avesnes, both in Hebron;⁸⁰ and one Francian and two Normans, Joscelin, William, and Tancred, all in Galilee.⁸¹ Among the Flemish-Picard group we find Hugh of Fauquembergues and Gervase of Bazoches in Galilee,⁸² while Hebron was held by Hugh of Rebecques, and, as we have already seen, the first lord of Ramla, Baldwin, was probably also a Fleming.⁸³ It is also striking that three of the important coastal cities captured under Baldwin I went to two Flemings: Fulk of Guînes who received Beirut, and Eustace Granarius, who as lord of both Sidon and Caesarea acquired a concentration of power unequalled in this reign.⁸⁴ This development was paralleled in the king's appointments to important ecclesiastical posts. Two patriarchs, Arnulf and Evremar, came from the same village of Chocques near Thérouanne. Baldwin, the first archbishop of Caesarea, was a Fleming, as was Achard of Arrouaise, prior of the *Templum Domini*.⁸⁵

Thus, apart from a small number of knights of Provençal, and Italian origin the vast majority of the Jerusalem nobility in the period up to 1118 can be shown to have originated from four principal areas which formed a contiguous area spreading over northern France and the adjacent parts of the empire: Flanders and Picardy, Normandy, Lotharingia, and Francia. Many of the members of each group must have known each other and possibly also others from different groups before their arrival in Palestine. Yet each of these groups was different in extent and structure. Men from Lotharingia were present in significant numbers among the Frankish nobility. However, few of them had ties of vassalage dating from before the crusade, and their numbers diminished as their losses were not made up by fresh immigration. In terms of numbers and of power, the most important element in the early Jerusalem nobility was made up of men from the coastlands of Flanders and the plains of Picardy.

ABBREVIATIONS

- | | |
|----------|---|
| AA | Albert of Aachen, <i>Historia Hierosolymitana</i> , RHC, Occ., Vol. 4 |
| C. Hosp. | J. Delaville Le Roulx, <i>Cartulaire général de l'ordre des Hospitaliers de Saint-Jean de Jérusalem, 1100-1310</i> , 4 vols. (Paris, 1879-1906) |
| C. Sep. | G. Bresc-Bautier, <i>Le cartulaire du chapitre du Saint-Sépulchre de Jérusalem</i> , Documents relatifs à l'histoire des croisades publiées par l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, 15 (Paris, 1984) |

- Cod. Gen.* C. Imperiale di Sant'Angelo, *Codice Diplomatico della Repubblica di Genova*, Vol. 1 (Rome, 1936)
- Delaborde H.F. Delaborde, *Chartes de Terre Sainte provenant de l'abbaye de Josaphat* (Paris, 1880)
- FC Fulcher of Chartres, *Historia Hierosolymitana*, ed. H. Hagenmeyer (Heidelberg, 1913)
- GF *Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitorum*, ed. R. Hill (London, 1962)
- Kohler C. Kohler, 'Chartes de l'abbaye de Nôtre Dame de la vallée de Josaphat, 1108–1291, *Revue de l'Orient latin*, 7 (1900), 108–222
- MGH Monumenta Germaniae Historica, ed. G. Pertz *et al.* (Hanover, 1893–)
- DD Diplomata Regum et Imperatorum Germaniae
- SS Scriptorum in folio
- RHC Recueil des historiens des croisades, ed. Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres (Paris, 1841–1906)
- Occ Historiens occidentaux, 5 vols. (1844–95)
- Lois Les Assises de Jérusalem, 2 vols. (1841–43)
- RRH R. Rohricht, *Regesta Regni Hierosolymitani* (Innsbruck, 1893) and *Additamentum* (Innsbruck, 1904)
- Tafel-Thomas G.L.F. Tafel and G.M. Thomas, *Urkunden zur älteren Handels- und Staatsgeschichte der Republik Venedig mit besonderer Beziehung auf Byzanz und die Levante*, 3 vols., *Fontes rerum Austriacum*, II, sectio XII–XIV (Vienna, 1856–57)
- Versus de viris...* *Versus de viris illustribus diocesis Tarvanensis qui in sacra fuere expeditione*, in C. Moeller, 'Les flamands du Ternois au royaume latin de Jérusalem', *Mélanges Paul Fredericq* (Brussels, 1903)
- WT William of Tyre, *Historia rerum in partibus transmarinis gestarum*, RHC, Occ., Vol. 1

NOTES

1. See, for example, J. Richard, *Le royaume latin de Jérusalem* (Paris, 1953), pp.62–3; J. Prawer, 'La noblesse et le régime féodal du royaume latin de Jérusalem', *Le Moyen Age*, 65 (1959), 42; *Histoire du royaume latin de Jérusalem* (Paris, 1969), Vol. 1, 467–70, and *Crusader Institutions* (Oxford, 1980), p.8; H.E.J. Cowdrey, 'The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem', *History*, 57 (1972), 230; W. Zöllner, *Geschichte der Kreuzzüge* (Berlin, 1977), p.175; J. Riley-Smith, 'The Motives of the Earliest Crusaders and the Settlement of Latin Palestine', *English Historical Review*, 98 (1983), 721–37.
2. J. Richard, *Le comté de Tripoli sous la dynastie toulousaine, 1102–1187* (Paris,

- 1945); C. Cahen, *La Syrie du nord à l'époque des croisades* (Paris, 1940).
3. AA, pp.522–6.
 4. J.S. Russell, 'The Population of the Crusader States', in K.M. Setton (ed.), *A History of the Crusades* (Philadelphia, 1955–), Vol. 5, pp.295–314; J. Prawer, 'Social Classes in the Latin Kingdom: The Franks', in id., pp.117–92.
 5. *La Livre de Jean d'Ibelin*, RHC Lois, Vol. 1, 422–7.
 6. J. Richard, 'Les listes des seigneuries dans le livre de Jean d'Ibelin', *Revue historique de droit français et étranger*, 32 (1954), 565–77.
 7. R.C. Smail, *Crusading Warfare* (Cambridge, 1956), pp.89–94.
 8. FC, pp.389, 353–4.
 9. AA, pp.350, 358, 366.
 10. Smail, *Crusading Warfare*, pp.95–109.
 11. AA, p.549.
 12. FC, p.409; WT, p.425, This discussion of numbers omits the footsoldiers who were of course present at all of these battles.
 13. AA, p.549.
 14. FC, pp.436–55; WT, pp.429–30.
 15. FC, p.496; WT, pp.454–5: 'cum universis regni viribus'.
 16. AA, p.672.
 17. AA, p.695.
 18. AA, p.701.
 19. FC, p.626.
 20. FC, p.549.
 21. AA, p.523.
 22. AA, p.300, 481–2, 593.
 23. AA, p.593.
 24. Comte de Marsy, 'Fragment d'un cartulaire de l'ordre de Saint-Lazaire en Terre-Sainte', *Archives de l'Orient latin*, 2 (1884), 121–57, No. 5 (*RRH*, No. 252); MGH DD, Heinrich IV (Hanover, 1941–78), No. 459.
 25. MGH DD, Heinrich IV, No. 459; S. Bormans and E. Schoolmeesters, *Cartulaire de l'église de Saint-Lambert à Liège* (Brussels, 1893–1933), Vol. 1, No. 29; AA, pp.229, 301, 514, 520–24. Riley-Smith ('The Motives of the Earliest Crusaders', pp.724–6) has claimed Lambert of Montaigu, another Lotharingian kinsman of Godfrey's, as a settler in Palestine on the basis of a mention of a Lambert at the siege of Arsuf (AA, p.510) and of a donation to the abbey of Josaphat in Delaborde, No. 6 (*RRH*, No. 80). In neither instance given by Riley-Smith is the individual referred to by a surname; Lambert was a common Christian name, especially in the diocese of Liège where many of the crusaders came from. The exact wording of the charter for Josaphat is 'Lambertus dedit Deo et Sancte Marie de valle Josaphat casale nomine Soesme situm super flumen quod vulgo Diaboli nuncupatur, laudantibus Goscelino principe Tyberiadis et Willelmo de Buris qui hoc ipsum casale eidem Lamberto prebuerat'. According to these terms the donation could not have been made until 1113, when Joscelin became lord of Tiberias. On the other hand Alberic of Troisfontaines (*Chronica*, MGH SS, XXIII, 815) says that Lambert of Montaigu returned home with his father Cuno. He was undoubtedly in Lotharingia by 3 Sept. 1104 when he attended the feast of St Remaclus at Stavelot, and is subsequently attested in the diocese of Liège (C.G. Roland, 'Les seigneurs et comtes de Rochefort', *Annales de la Société Archéologique de Namur*, 20 [1893], 107ff).
 26. AA, pp.591, 594, 621; *Cod. Gen.*, No. 15 (*RRH*, No. 43); Kohler, Nos. 1, 3, 5, 7 (*RRH*, Nos. 52, 56a, 76a, 76b); *C. Hosp.*, Vol. 1, No. 20 (*RRH*, No. 57); Delaborde, No. 6 (*RRH*, No. 80).
 27. AA, pp.593, 621–2; Delaborde, No. 18 (*RRH*, No. 134); Bartolf of Nangis, *Gesta Francorum expugnantium Iherusalem* RHC, Occ., Vol. 3, 534.
 28. AA, pp.499, 507, 516, 593.
 29. AA, p.655; Bormans and Schoolmeesters, *Cartulaire de l'église*, Vol. 1, No. 29.
 30. AA, pp.522, 526, 350; J. Daris, *Notices historiques sur les églises du diocèse de Liège*, 17 vols. (Liege, 1867–99), Vol. 12, No. 41; J. Miraëus, *Opera diplomatica et*

- historica*, ed. J.F. Foppens (Brussels, 1723–48), Vol. 2, p.812; Giles of Orval, *Gesta episcoporum Leodiensium*, MGH SS, XXV, 84.
31. AA, pp.526, 531; Riley Smith, 'The Motives of the Earliest Crusades', 725.
 32. Alberic of Troisfontaines, *Chronica*, p.804; AA, p.317; M. Grosdidier de Matons, *Catalogue des actes des comtes de Bar 1022–1239* (Paris, 1922), Nos. 35, 36.
 33. AA, p.623.
 34. AA, pp.507, 522, 526, 531; Robert the Monk, *Historia Iherosolimitana*, *RHC Occ.*, Vol. 3, 867; Alberic of Troisfontaines, *Chronica*, p.811; Charles du Fresne Du Cange, *Les familles d'Outremer*, ed. E.G. Rey (Paris, 1869), p.503; John of Würzburg, 'Descriptio Terrae Sanctae', in T. Tobler, *Descriptiones terrae Sanctae ex Saeculo VII, IX, XII, et XV* (Leipzig, 1874), pp.154–5; *Die Kaiserchronik eines Regensburger Geistlichen*, ed. H. Schröder, MGH, Deutsche Chroniken, Vol. 1 (Hanover, 1895), 382; Metellus von Tegernsee, *Expeditio Hierosolymitana*, ed. P. Jacobsen, *Quellen und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Mittelalters*, Vol. 4 (Stuttgart, 1982), pp.125–6.
 35. AA, p.526; John of Würzburg, 'Descriptio Terrae Sanctae', p.155.
 36. AA, pp.591, 593; E. Warlop, *The Flemish Nobility before 1300* (Kortrijk, 1975), p.1024. In 1096 Gerbod, and his brother Arnulf III of Oosterzele sold the allod of Roquetoire (F, Pas-de-Calais, Saint-Omer) to the abbey of St Bertin for 14 silver marks. The transaction was witnessed by Eustace III of Boulogne and was probably intended to raise funds for the crusade (D. Haigneré, *Les chartes de St Bertin* [Saint-Omer, 1886], Vol. 1, No. 96).
 37. AA, pp.591, 593; H. Hagenmeyer, *Epistulae et chartae ad Historiam primi belli sacri* (Innsbruck, 1901), No. 4, p.139; Warlop, *Flemish Nobility*, pp.587–91.
 38. AA, pp.625–6; Warlop, *Flemish Nobility*, pp.1035–6.
 39. AA, pp.591–3, 621; M. Gysseling, *Toponymisch woordenboek van België, Nederland, Luxemburg, Noord-Frankrijk en West-Duitsland (voor 1226)*, 2 vols (Brussels, 1960), Vol. 1, 463; Haigneré, *Les chartes de St Bertin*, Vol. 1, No. 134.
 40. AA, pp.621, 626; Delaborde, Nos. 6, 7 (*RRH*, Nos. 80, 87).
 41. AA, pp.531, 538, 591, 635–6; *Versus de viris...*, p.190; *Cod. Gen.*, No. 15 (*RRH*, No. 43).
 42. AA, p.621; *Cod. Gen.*, No. 15 (*RRH*, No. 43); *Versus de viris...*, p.192; Th. Duchet and A. Giry, *Cartulaire de l'église de Terouane* [sic] (Saint-Omer, 1881), No. 5.
 43. Eustace: Kohler, No. 1 (*RRH*, No. 52); Delabaoorde, No. 6 (*RRH*, No. 80); Hugh: AA, p.647; Winrich: AA, pp.522, 526.
 44. AA, pp.621, 667, 683, 692; Kohler, No. 7 (*RRH*, No. 76b); Delaborde, Nos. 6, 8, 12 (*RRH*, Nos. 80, 90, 101); *C. Sep.*, Nos. 94, 27 (*RRH*, Nos. 82, 91); WT, pp.473–4, 532, 538, 545; *Versus de viris...*, p.191; A.V. Murray, 'The Origin of Eustace Grenier', *Bulletin of the Society for the Study of the Crusades and the Latin East*, 6 (1986), 28–30.
 45. *C. Sep.*, No. 94 (*RRH*, No. 82).
 46. *Ibid.*
 47. *C. Hosp.*, Vol. 1, Nos. 20, 225 (*RRH*, Nos. 57, 293); Richard, *Royaume latin*, p.82; L. Vanderkindere, *La formation territoriale des principautés belges au moyen âge*, 2 vols. (Brussels, 1902), Vol. 1, 326.
 48. Kohler, Nos. 1, 7 (*RRH*, Nos. 52, 76b); Delaborde, Nos. 6, 14 (*RRH*, Nos. 80, 115); R. Hiestand, *Papsturkunden für Kirchen im Heiligen Lande*, *Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse, Dritte Folge*, 136 (Göttingen, 1985), No. 113 (*RRH*, No. 576). His brother *Gaufridus de Parenti* is first documented in 1125, *C. Sep.*, No. 96 (*RRH*, No. 111) but may have been in the kingdom at an earlier date.
 49. *Versus de viris...*, pp.191–2; Lambert of Ardes, *Historia comitum Ghisnensium*, MGH SS, XXIV, 574–5; Vanderkindere, *La formation territoriale*, Vol. 1, 327–9.
 50. William of Malmesbury, *De gestis regum Anglorum*, ed. W. Stubbs, *Rolls series XC* (London, 1887–89), Vol. 2, 451; *C. Hosp.*, Vol. 1, No. 28 (*RRH*, No. 68a).
 51. AA, pp.358, 591, 593, 636–7; Kohler, No. 1 (*RRH*, No. 52); Delaborde, No. 6 (*RRH*, No. 80); 'Feoda Campanie', in A. Longnon, *Documents relatifs au comté de*

- Champagne et de Brie, 1172–1361* (Paris, 1901–14), Vol. 1, Nos. 22, 140, 168; G. Despy, 'Un fragment d'une *cronica monasterii sancti Huberti in Ardenna*', *Bulletin de la Commission Royale d'Histoire*, 121 (1956), 171–3.
52. AA, pp.299, 304, 305, 315, 398, 442; Kohler, No. 5 (*RRH*, No. 76a); Delaborde, No. 14 (*RRH*, No. 115); W.M. Newman, *Les seigneurs de Nestr en Picardie* (Philadelphia, 1971), Vol. 2, Nos. 2, 4, 6, 7, 10, 12, 15, 16, 18, 31.
53. *Cod. Gen.*, No. 15 (*RRH*, No. 43); Guibert of Nogent, *Gesta Dei per Francos*, *RHC Occ.*, Vol. 4, 260; AA, pp.635, 656–8; M. Bur, *La formation du comté de Champagne 950–1150* (Nancy, 1977), pp.247, 251.
54. Kohler, Nos. 1, 5, 9 (*RRH*, Nos. 52, 76a, 102a); *C. Hosp.* Vol. 1, Nos. 20, 74, 77 (*RRH*, Nos. 57, 112, 113); Delaborde, Nos. 6, 8 (*RRH*, Nos. 80, 90); *C. Sep.*, No. 27 (*RRH*, No. 91); Tafel-Thomas, Vol. 1, No. 41 (*RRH*, No. 105); M.L. Bulst-Thiele, *Sacrae Domus Militiae Templi Hierosolymitani Magistri* (Göttingen, 1974), p.75; Bur, pp.248, 251–2.
55. AA, pp.315, 331–2, 467–8, 494, 593; Kohler, Nos. 3, 6 (*RRH*, Nos. 56a, 81a); Delaborde, Nos. 5, 6, 7 (*RRH*, Nos. 79, 80, 87); J.F. Benton (ed.), *Self and Society in Medieval France: The Memoirs of Abbot Guibert of Nogent (1064?–1125)* (New York, 1970), pp.156–60.
56. R.L. Nicholson, *Tancred* (Chicago, 1940), pp.103–21.
57. AA, pp.514–15, 526; GF, pp.7, 20; E.M. Jamison, 'Some Notes on the *Anonymi Gesta Francorum*, with Special Reference to the Norman Contingent from South Italy and Sicily in the First Crusade', in *Studies in French Language and Medieval Literature Presented to Professor M.K. Pope* (Manchester, 1939), pp.202–3.
58. AA, pp.316, 526; GF, p.36; Baldric of Dol, *Historia Jerosolimitana*, *RHC Occ.*, Vol. 3, 47; Guibert of Nogent, *Gesta Dei*, p.178; Jamison, 'Notes on the *Anonymi Gesta Francorum*', pp.201–2.
59. AA, p.531; Orderic Vitalis, *The Ecclesiastical History*, ed. and trans. M.E. Chibnall, 6 vols (Oxford, 1969–80), Vol. 3, pp.164–7.
60. AA, p.696; Tafel-Thomas, Vol. 1, No. 41 (*RRH*, No. 105); *C. Sep.*, Nos. 34 (*RRH*, No. 174), 33 (*RRH*, No. 181; incorrectly cited in *C. Sep.* as No. 180); WT, pp.631–4.
61. Kohler, No. 1 (*RRH*, No. 52); L.C. Loyd, *The Origins of Some Anglo-Norman Families* (Leeds, 1951), pp.14–15.
62. William of Malmesbury, *De gestis*, pp.309–10, 449.
63. AA, pp.653, 668, 682; Kohler, No. 1 (*RRH*, No. 52); Hermann of Tournai, *De restauratione Sancti Martini Tornacensis*, MGH SS, XIV, 284; Orderic Vitalis, *Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. 5, p.282.
64. *Cod. Gen.*, No. 15 (*RRH*, No. 43); M. Prou, *Recueil des actes de Philippe Ier, roi de France* (Paris, 1908), Nos. 24, 30, 50, 116.
65. AA, p.593; Richard, *Royaume latin*, p.19.
66. Kohler, Nos. 1, 7 (*RRH*, Nos. 52, 76b); Delaborde, Nos., 6, 7, 15 (*RRH*, Nos. 80, 87, 120); Tafel-Thomas, Vol. 1, No. 41 (*RRH*, No. 105); AA, p.410; Radulph of Caen, *Gesta Tancredi in expeditione Hierosolymitana*, *RHC*, Vol. 3, 662; Baldric of Dol, *Historia Jerosolimitana*, p.65; WT, pp.473–4.
67. Kohler, No. 1 (*RRH*, No. 52); Delaborde, No. 6 (*RRH*, No. 80); Suger, *Vie de Louis le Gros et l'histoire du roi Louis VII*, ed. A. Molinier (Paris, 1887), p.66; Bur, *Comté de Champagne*, p.431.
68. *C. Hosp.*, Vol. 1, No. 20 (*RRH*, No. 57); WT, pp.627–8; A. de Dion, 'Le Puiset au XI^e et XII^e siècles', *Mémoires de la Société Archéologique d'Eure-et-Loir*, 9 (1889), 20–21; J.L. La Monte, 'The Lords of Le Puiset on the Crusades', *Speculum*, 17 (1942), 3.
69. WT, pp.437–8; AA, pp.615, 648–49; 710; *Ex continuatione historii Aimonii monachi Floriacensis*, *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France XI* (Paris, 1876), p.276.
70. Delaborde, Nos. 5, 6, 7 (*RRH*, Nos. 79, 80, 87); AA, pp.710–12; H. Pirie-Gordon, 'The Reigning Princes of Galilee', *English Historical Review*, 27 (1912), 450–51; J. Lair, 'Histoire de la seigneurie de Bures', *Mémoires de la Société de l'Histoire de Paris et l'Île de France*, 2 (1876), 187–97.

71. Delaborde, No. 5 (*RRH*, No. 79). He is probably identical with the Drogo who appears as a witness for William in 1126 on Delaborde, No. 14 (*RRH*, No. 115).
72. *C. Sep.*, No. 117 (*RRH*, No. 302). Of a grand total of 149 burgesses named, about a third have surnames either derived from a place-name (e.g. *Petrus de Alvernia*) or in the form of an adjective denoting nationality (e.g. *Aimericus Pictavensis*). Some of these names derive from toponyms in Outremer, while others cannot be identified with certainty. The remainder, that is surnames allowing identification of European origin, gives the following sub-totals: Auvergne 2, Provence 4, Burgundy 4, Poitou 4, Gascony 2, Berri 4, Catalonia 2, Lombardy 5, Limousin 1, Touraine 2, Francia 3, Venice 1. For slightly different figures and interpretation, see Prawer, *Crusader Institutions*, pp.126–32, 382–3.
73. AA, pp.507, 521–6, 537–8, 549; Peter Tudebode, *Historia de Hierosolimitano itinere*, *RHC Occ.*, Vol. 3, 103, Raymond of Aguilers, *Historia Francorum qui ceperunt Iherusalem*, *RHC Occ.*, Vol. 3, 307–8; *C. Hosp.*, Vol. 1, Nos. 20, 225 (*RRH*, Nos. 57, 293); G. Desjardins, *Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Conques en Rouergue* (Paris, 1879), No. 506; Richard, *Royaume latin*, p.62.
74. *C. Hosp.*, Vol. 1, Nos. 28,97 (*RRH*, Nos. 68a, 147); Delaborde, No. 5 (*RRH*, No. 79); *C. Sep.*, Nos. 27, 30 (*RRH*, Nos. 91, 121); Tafel-Thomas, Vol. 1, No. 41 (*RRH*, No. 105); Riley-Smith, 'The Motives of the Earliest Crusaders', 729.
75. Richard, *Comte de Tripoli*, pp.78–91.
76. AA, pp.559, 568, 591, 603, 608. *Alaspata* is clearly a nickname rather than a place-name as implied by Riley-Smith (736).
77. Delaborde, Nos. 6, 12, 15 (*RRH*, Nos. 80, 101, 120); Kohler, Nos. 9, 18 (*RRH*, Nos. 102a, 137a); *C. Hosp.*, Vol. 1, No. 74 (*RRH*, No. 112); WT, p.532; J. Richard, 'Guy d'IBelin OP, évêque de Limassol et l'inventaire de ses biens', *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique*, 74 (1950), 98–100. H.E. Mayer, 'Carving Up Crusaders: The Early Ibelins and Ramlas', in *Outremer: Studies in the History of the Crusading Kingdom of Jerusalem Presented to Joshua Prawer*, ed. B.Z. Kedar and H.E. Mayer (Jerusalem, 1982), pp.101–18 corrects the genealogy of the Ibelin family given in W. Rüdte de Collenberg, 'Les premiers Ibelins', *Le Moyen Age*, 71 (1965), 433–74.
78. *Lignages d'Outremer*, p.448; La Monte, pp.113–18.
79. Walter the Chancellor, *Galterii Cancellarii Bella Antiochena*, ed. H. Hagenmeyer (Innsbruck, 1896), pp.98–100.
80. Waldemar: AA, pp.523–4. Gerard: AA, p.516.
81. Joscelin: WT, pp.489–92. William: Kohler, No. 1 (*RRH*, No. 52); AA, p.653. Tancred: Nicholson, *Tancred*, pp.103–21.
82. Hugh: see n. 41 above. Gervase: AA, pp.635, 656–8.
83. Hugh: *Versus de viris...*, p.192; AA, p.621; *Cod. Gen.*, No. 15 (*RRH*, No. 43). Baldwin: AA, p.636; Delaborde, No. 6, 7 (*RRH*, Nos. 80, 87).
84. Fulk: *Versus de viris...*, pp.191–2; Lambert of Ardres, *Historia*, pp.574–5. Eustace: see n. 44 above.
85. *Versus de viris...*, pp.191–2.

II

A NOTE ON THE ORIGIN OF EUSTACE GRENIER

In the early Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem few men rose to such prominence as Eustace Grenier, Lord of Sidon and Caesarea, constable of the kingdom and, for a short period before his death in 1123, regent for the captive Baldwin II. Yet this great accumulation of power stands in apparent contrast to the obscurity of his origins.

On the evidence of his inclusion in the *Versus de viris illustribus diocesis Tarvanensis qui in sacra fuere expeditione* Moeller and La Monte identify Eustace as a Fleming, although neither attempts to clarify his precise place of origin or the meaning of his surname.¹ The name Granarius or Granerius (the forms which commonly appear in documents of the period) may indicate a ministerial origin, namely that of an official in charge of a *granarium* or storehouse. However as this designation appears to have become a hereditary surname also used by his sons Eustace II of Sidon and Walter of Caesarea it does not necessarily reveal anything about Eustace himself.

Most attempts to elucidate Eustace's origins have focused on the two lines devoted to him in the Théroutanne poem, the best text of which reads: