University of Reading

William of Malmebury, historian of crusade

Article

Published Version

Thomson, R. (1997) William of Malmebury, historian of crusade. Reading Medieval Studies, XXIII. pp. 121-134. ISSN 0950-3129 Available at https://centaur.reading.ac.uk/85027/

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. See Guidance on citing.

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the End User Agreement.

www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

CentAUR

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online

William of Malmesbury, Historian of Crusade

Rod Thomson
University of Tasmania

William of Malmesbury (*c.*1096 - *c.*1143), well known as one of the greatest historians of England, is not usually thought of as a historian of crusading.[1] His most famous work, the *Gesta Regum Anglorum*, in five books subdivided into 449 chapters, covers the history of England from the departure of the Romans until the early 1120s.[2] But there are many digressions, most of them into Continental history; William is conscious of them and justifies them in explicit appeals to the reader.[3] Some provide necessary background to the course of English affairs, some are there for their entertainment value, and some because of their intrinsic importance. William's account of the First Crusade comes into the third category. It is the longest of all the diversions, occupying the last 46 of the 84 chapters which make up Book IV, or about 12% of the complete *Gesta Regum*. This is as long as a number of independent crusading chronicles (such as Fulcher's *Gesta Francorum Iherosolimitanum Peregrinantium* in its earliest edition, or the anonymous *Gesta Francorum*) and the story is brilliantly told. It follows the course of the Crusade from the Council of Clermont to the capture of Jerusalem, continuing with the so-called Crusade of 1101, and the deeds of the kings of Jerusalem and other great magnates such as Godfrey of Lorraine, Bohemond of Antioch, Raymond of Toulouse and Robert Curthose. The detailed narrative concludes in 1102; some scattered notices come down to *c.*1124, close to the writing of the *Gesta*, with a very little updating carried out in 1134-5. Separately in bk.V c.410, again as a digression, William briefly recounts the crusading expedition of King Sigurd of Norway (1107-11), although in that instance he is more concerned with the extraordinary events which accompanied the king's outward and homeward journeys than with what he did in the East.

The digression on crusade was considered and planned; it is to that extent part of the structure of the *Gesta Regum*. The prologue to Book IV announces that its subject will be the reign of William II and

> certain events of his time, whether disasters in this country or great doings overseas...; in particular the Christians' pilgrimage to Jerusalem, for to hear of such a famous enterprise in our own time is worthwhile in itself, and an inspiration to brave deeds. Not that I am confident of telling the story in more fitting language than others who have set it down; my purpose is to make the work of many writers accessible to many readers.

And when William comes to begin this account (at c. 343), he prefaces it with further explanation:

> I will now recount the journey to Jerusalem, reporting what other men saw and felt in my own words. Next, as opportunity offers, I will subjoin selections from the work of ancient authors on the position and the riches of Constantinople, Antioch and Jerusalem, so that anyone ignorant of those writings who may happen on my work may have something ready to his hand with which he can enlighten other people. But the telling of this story needs a touch of inspiration, if I am to finish effectively what I so light-heartedly undertake; and so I will call, as the custom is, upon God's help, and thus I will begin.

These very deliberate and formal introductions - William does not invoke God's aid for the writing of the *Gesta Regum* as a whole - suggest that he saw the section on Crusade as almost a separate monograph in its own right, and there is other evidence to support this. For instance, William, always finicky about his style, took even greater care than usual over this section. It contains some of the most elaborately rhetorical passages in the whole of the *Gesta*, and the manuscript tradition shows that, more than any other section, it was subject to later revision and repolishing for purely stylistic purposes.

William's account of the First Crusade has been little noticed by modern historians. This is hardly surprising, given its comparatively late date and heavy dependence upon earlier writings still in existence. And yet it has much to offer, as the following discussion attempts to demonstrate.

We need to begin with the quantity and quality of William's information: what does he add to the other extant accounts, and are his additions and variants likely to be reliable?

It has long been known that William's account is substantially derivative. Its basis is Fulcher of Chartres' *Historia Hierosolymitana* in its first redaction to 1106, as well as its reworking by the author of the version which survives in Hagenmeyer's MS L: Cambridge University Library Kk.6.15 (late twelfth century, from Battle Abbey).[4] William indeed mentions Fulcher by name at one point, but not to reveal the extent of his dependence upon him.[5] Not that Fulcher was his only written source; he supplemented the *Historia* from a variety of other writings, such as the rarely-used *Itinerary* of Bernard the Monk, and the anonymous *Gesta Francorum* which, however, he only used marginally, perhaps because he found its style even more homespun than Fulcher's. He had a version of the canons of the Council of Clermont which he preferred to that offered by Fulcher.[6] He adds his own details of the history and topography of Rome, Constantinople and Jerusalem (cc. 351-2, 355-6, 367-8), from written documents, notably an important sixth-century *Itinerarium Urbis Romae* otherwise lost.[7] Both in general and in some particulars William's account is similar to the extensive digression on Crusade provided by Orderic Vitalis in his *Historia Ecclesiastica*; there is much evidence throughout the later books of the *Gesta* to suggest that the two men discussed their work and perhaps exchanged information, but neither can be shown at any point to be directly dependent upon the other.

William supplemented all this written material, and sometimes replaced it, with almost as much information certainly or probably oral. Most strikingly, he did not use Fulcher's brief report of Urban's speech but gave one of the longest of the extant reports, which he claims to have based on the accounts of eyewitnesses.[8] Throughout, even when following Fulcher for the main lines of the narrative, he inserts a variety of details known to him probably by word of mouth. At cc. 385-9, where he follows the military careers of Godfrey and Baldwin of Bouillon, Raymond of Toulouse and Robert Curthose, he becomes almost entirely independent of any known written source. William's network of knightly acquaintance provided him with abundant opportunities to gather relevant information: people such as his patron Robert earl of Gloucester, an unnamed 'eyewitness' of events in the East, and Godfrey, the mysterious relative of King

Baldwin, whom William says he had known as a young man of promise.[9]

Where William's sources are available for comparison, we can study his handling of them. William was never slavishly dependent upon his written sources, and this is true of his relationship to his main source for the Crusade, Fulcher's *Historia*. First of all, William makes very many omissions, and sometimes one can guess why: all of Fulcher's pious apostrophes, which simply clutter the narrative; his gleeful report of the atrocities committed by the Crusaders in the wake of their capture of Jerusalem, for which William substituted a morally sanitized version;[10] and, most strikingly, the incident of the finding of the Holy Lance. William already knew that King Aethelstan had been given the Holy Lance as a present by Count Hugh of Paris, so he could hardly accept Fulcher's story of its finding outside Antioch.[11] He also reorders and amplifies Fulcher's narrative in a way which heightens the dramatic tension, and clarifies the element of motivation, especially strategic. For instance William gives much more detail of the battle of Dorylaeum; while Fulcher mentions the proximity of a marsh, only William explains that the crusaders were saved from massacre because the Turkish cavalry could not manoeuvre in the reed-beds.[12] Some of this manipulation was an attempt to improve Fulcher's style, which William found deficient: 'Of Baldwin's doings I will append a brief and trustworthy narrative, placing entire confidence in the report of Fulcher of Chartres, who, having been his chaplain, wrote an account of him, in a style not indeed rustic but, as is commonly said, without the polish of a practised writer, and such as might well warn others to take more trouble when they write'.[13] 'Commonly said' refers to a verbatim quotation from Cicero, *De Legibus*, and William, in his own presentation of dramatic moments, makes heavy use of classical borrowings, especially from Virgil and Lucan.[14]

William's treatment of Fulcher results in a better-told story; but what the modern historian will wish to know is whether the information William added or substituted is reliable. Sometimes, it seems, William is doing no more than exercising his historical imagination and his solid grounding in classical rhetoric.[15] And even when it might seem that he had access to an alternative source, one must wonder whether it was an authoritative one. It is possible to imagine any number of 'old soldiers' from near Malmesbury supplying the chronicler with stories which had grown in the telling, already at

several removes and a distance in time from the original events. The fact is that each case has to be examined on its merits. For instance, at c.373 William tells a story of Godfrey of Bouillon's fight with a lion. The animal was a bear according to Guibert of Nogent and Albert of Aachen,[16] and who can say which version if any is correct? Or consider the notorious account of the cannibalism said by William to have been indulged in by starving crusaders at the siege of Antioch.[17] This is not from Fulcher, who says that some crusaders ate flesh from dead Muslims at the siege of nearby Marra, on 11 December 1098, as does Raymond of Aguilers. An anonymous adaptation of Fulcher transfers this to Antioch, and doubtless we have to do with a story that grew more exaggerated with time.[18] But one cannot presume exaggeration or invention for all of William's colourful stories. *Gesta Regum* c. 381 describes the exploits of Baldwin of Edessa. Of his prowess displayed at the battle of Ascalon Fulcher only says that he ran through 'an Arab opposite him', whereas William says that he killed their commander. One might without further ado assume that William is exaggerating to make the same point more strongly. But Ibn-al-Qalanisi (*The Damascus Chronicle*) says that the Egyptian commander was killed in this battle and Albert of Aachen says that his slayer was indeed Baldwin.[19] At c.388 William says that Raymond of Toulouse went on Crusade despite his age and the loss of an eye; indeed he 'bore the marks of this calamity proudly, not only not concealing them, but actually glorying in the display of this evidence of notable service.' No other western chronicler mentions this interesting detail. But it receives at least partial confirmation from an unexpected quarter. Michael the Syrian, Jacobite patriarch of Antioch (d.1199/1200) wrote that Raymond had been hit about the head and his right eye wrenched out when he was at Jerusalem on pilgrimage because he refused to pay the customary tax, that he carried it about with him in his pocket, and that he used it to encourage the Roman citizens to participate in the Crusade.[20] Whatever the degree of truth in this, it at least supports William's statement that Raymond used the loss of his eye to advertise his own fortitude and perhaps the cause of Crusade.

Most importantly of all, there is William's account of Urban's Clermont speech (c.347). One of six extant reports, it is the least noticed and most undervalued of them.[21] Even though it is one of the latest, and one of the most rhetorical, William's description of his sources and of his method of dealing with them should be taken

seriously: 'This I have decided to hand down to posterity, as I received it from those who heard it, preserving intact the sense of what was said; the eloquence and force of the original who can reproduce? We shall be fortunate if, treading an adjacent path, we return by a circuitous route to its meaning.' In other words, William claims to be at only one remove from the occasion; on the other hand, he makes no claim to verbatim reproduction of the pope's words. Parenthetically, we should note the similar neglect by crusading historians of Orderic's report, slightly later again than William's and partly dependent upon Baudri of Bourgeuil, but also making explicit use of eyewitnesses.[22]

William, then, provides a significant quantity of information about the First Crusade independently of other chroniclers, although each detail needs to be assessed critically, and some can hardly be assessed at all. But we can approach his work from another viewpoint with fewer reservations. Whatever the truth or otherwise of its individual constituents, William's account is testimony to the view of crusade held by a highly literate English monk in the early twelfth century. It is an important view to the extent that it was both representative and influential. So what was William's conception of the First Crusade, and why did he write about it in such detail in a work devoted primarily to the history of England?

First of all, we may note the almost complete absence of features usually thought to have been central to the idea of crusade: the motifs of penance and pilgrimage. William does indeed have Urban dilate on the besetting sin of the Franks, their internecine warring, and how the expedition to Jerusalem offered them a righteous alternative. But so did other chroniclers, and doubtless the pope actually said such things. On the whole, William's explicitly Christian sentiments in relation to the Crusade are remarkably scarce and very diluted indeed. For example, he has the pope refer to God's 'sollertia', a thoroughly non-Christian notion apparently derived by William from Cicero.[23] And later on, he praises the courage of the heroic leaders of the Crusade at the expense of the Ancients, 'for [theirs] was spent on the mirage of worldly splendour rather than on the solid aim of some good purpose'.[24] Astonishingly, the criteria used to make the comparison are Stoic rather than Christian. For William, then, the Crusade may have been broadly a western Christian enterprise, but it was not primarily a religious exercise.

In contrast, William stresses the operation of more mundane, even cynical motives. At the earliest opportunity for a comment on

motivation, almost his first sentence about the Crusade, William fastens upon the element of personal ambition. This is what he says of Pope Urban and Bohemond:

> In the year of our Lord 1095, Pope Urban II, who then held the Apostolic See, crossed the Alps and arrived in Gaul. The ostensible and reported purpose of his journey was to seek recognition from the churches this side of the Alps, for he had been driven out of Rome by Wibert's violence. He had however a less immediate aim which was not so widely made known: to arouse almost all Europe, on the advice of Bohemond, for an expedition into Asia, in order that in the great confusion that would ensue in every province, which would make it easy to hire auxiliary troops, Urban might overrun Rome and Bohemond Illyricum and Macedonia.

Interestingly enough, this is very much a typical Byzantine view, prominent for example in the *Alexiad* of William's contemporary Anna Comnena.[25] But as William shows himself elsewhere to have been typically western in his anti-Byzantinism, the similarity can only be coincidental or the result of very indirect influence.[26] Again, as compared with his source Fulcher, William's account of Bohemond's strategy in effecting an entrance into Antioch emphasizes the elements of cunning and greed at the expense of the miraculous.[27]

But in the end the part played by worldly and ignoble motives in William's account is comparatively marginal; it certainly does not provide an overarching interpretation of the Crusade. William does advance such an interpretation, and it consists of two closely-linked elements: the Crusade as a defensive war, and as a knightly exercise. The emphasis on defence surfaces first. William, and he alone, has Urban dilate at length upon the extent of territory lost by Christendom to Islam:

> he must be a real craven and hostile to the reputation of Christianity who can bear to see how "unfair is our division of the world". They dwell in Asia as their ancestral home, the third part of the earth, which our forefathers not without reason regarded, for its wide open spaces and the greatness of its provinces, as the equal of the other two combined. There in old days the branches of our religion sprouted; there all the

> Apostles save two met their holy deaths; and there the Christians of today, those who remain, eke out a starveling livelihood by pitiful tillage of the soil while paying tribute to those rascals, longing even with suppressed sighs for knowledge of our liberty because they have lost their own. They hold Africa, the second part of the world, having won it two hundred and more years ago by force of arms; and this, I maintain, sets the honour of Christendom in peril, because that land of Africa was in old days the nurse of famous men of genius, whose inspired productions will preserve them from any taint of age and decay, as long as anyone remains who can read Latin. Every educated man knows what I mean. There remains Europe, the third division of the world; and how small a part of that do we Christians live in! For all those barbarous peoples who in far-distant islands frequent the ice-bound Ocean, living as they do like beasts, - who could call them Christians? This small part, then, of our world is threatened by Turks and Saracens with war. For three hundred years ago they overran Spain and the Balearic Islands; now they fully expect to devour what remains.

There can be little doubt that this emphasis is really William's. We find it expressed earlier in the *Gesta Regum*, where it follows a quotation from a letter of Alcuin which was probably its source.[28] Alcuin tells how Charlemagne and his generals 'freed a great part of Spain from the Saracens...; but, to our shame be it said, those accursed Saracens...still rule the whole of Africa and a great part of Asia Major.' William comments:

> In these words... the curious reader will be able to notice... how many years have now elapsed since the Saracens invaded Africa and Asia Major. Indeed, had not the Divine Mercy aroused the native might of the Frankish emperors, they would long ago have overrun Europe as well; for they thought little of the emperors of Constantinople and had occupied Sicily, Sardinia and the Balearic Islands, and almost all the sea-girt territories except Crete, Rhodes and Cyprus. In our time, however, they have been forced to abandon Sicily by the Normans, Corsica and Sardinia by the Pisans, and the great part of Asia, with

> Jerusalem itself, by the Franks and European Christians of every kind.

The domination by Islam of previously Christian territory clearly preyed upon William's mind, for we find it referred to once more in a most unexpected place, his *Commentary on Lamentations*, written *c.* 1135-7.[29] Glossing Lamentations 1:14 ('He took note of all my sins...I grew weak beneath the weight'), he comments:

> It was [bad] behaviour such as this that caused the Christian armies more than once to fall in battle before the gentiles, so that for more than two hundred years now the Turks and Saracens have oppressed by their rule the places which had witnessed God's birth and passion. The same behaviour to some extent characterizes us, who were once a people not indeed numerous, yet certainly more advanced than many in our learning and good manners (*affabilitate*).

Here we have the major reason for the inclusion of the First Crusade in the *Gesta Regum*: it was an important element in a process of world significance, by which pan-European military action recovered territory previously occupied by Islam, thus achieving a new balance of power. The action was initiated by Charlemagne in Spain, and continued in William's time with the recovery of Sicily, Corsica, Sardinia, the Balearics and the Holy Places. Of the early stages of Reconquest in Spain William seems to have been only dimly aware.[30]

In fact for William the pope's rousing of Europe to arms gave the Crusade something of the character of a mass-migration. Once again we find him sharing a perspective with the Byzantines.[31] It comes in his description of the response to Urban's sermon:

> as the good news spread over the whole world, it filled the hearts of Christians with a sweet wind that blew in every place, so that there was no nation so remote and well-hidden as not to send some part of itself. The central areas were not alone in feeling the force of this emotion: it affected all who in the remotest islands or among barbarian tribes had heard the call of Christ. The time had come for the Welshman to give up hunting in his forests, the Scotsman forsook his familiar fleas, the Dane broke off his long drawn-out potations, the

> Norwegian left his diet of raw fish. The fields were deserted with none to till them, houses with none to live in them; whole cities were emptied. The ties of kindred lost their warmth, love of one's country was worth nothing; men had God alone before their eyes. All that was stored in granary or hall to answer the prayers, however greedy, of the farmer, or of the miser brooding over his hoard, was left behind; they hungered solely for the journey to Jerusalem. Those who went were full of joy, those who stayed full of sorrow. Yet why do I speak of staying? You might see husband and wife going, with all the family, and smile at the sight of them putting "all their household gods" in wagons to take the road. The path was too narrow as they passed, the way constricted as they journeyed; such was the press of traffic in its long unbroken column. The numbers outstripped all expectation, although it was thought there were six million travellers. Never, beyond all doubt, had so many nations united in one way of thought; never had such a host of barbarians bowed its stubborn neck to one commander, indeed to almost none.[32]

Nonetheless, most of William's story focusses upon the activities of the Crusade's greatest leaders, not the mass of ordinary participants. As he was writing, at least in part, for a courtly audience, it is no surprise to find him emphasizing the knightly aspect of this great defensive war: it was organized as a knightly exercise and conducted in a manner which exemplified knightly prowess. In his Clermont speech Pope Urban is made to dwell on Frankish valour and martial virtues. But again the pope's view turns out to be identical with that of William himself, as we find in a later passage:

> Only Godfrey and Tancred remained [in the Holy Land], leaders of high renown, to whose praises posterity, if it judge aright, will assign no limits; heroes who from the cold of uttermost Europe plunged into the intolerable heat of the East, careless of their own lives, if only they could bring help to Christendom in its hour of trial. Besides the fear of barbarian attacks, exposed to constant apprehension from the rigours of an unfamiliar climate, they made light of the certainty of peace and health in their own country; few as they were, they overwhelmed so many enemy cities by the fame and operation

> of their prowess, setting a noteworthy example of trust in God, in that they were ready to remain without hesitation in a place where either the air they breathed would be loaded with pestilence, or they would be killed by the fury of the Saracens. Let poets with their eulogies now give place, and fabled history no longer laud the heroes of Antiquity. Nothing to be compared with their glory has ever been begotten by any age. Such valour as the Ancients had vanished after their death into dust and ashes in the grave, for it was spent on the mirage of worldly splendour rather than on the solid aim of some good purpose; while of these brave heroes of ours, men will enjoy the benefit and tell the proud story, as long as the round world endures and the holy Church of Christ flourishes.[33]

In this respect it is significant that the Crusading section in the *Gesta Regum* concludes with a series of sketch-biographies of its great leaders, filled with anecdotes exemplifying their heroic deeds.

The comparison between the crusading leaders and the 'heroes of Antiquity' is significant. Whatever the subject and period engaging his attention, the Ancient World was rarely far from William's mind; images and metaphors from it, and comparisons and connections with it, flowed readily from his pen. William is notoriously the most antiquarian of historians, and so it was natural that he should find opportunities for using the Crusade as a reminder of or link with the glorious Roman and Christian past. This is the meaning of his descriptions of the 'Cities of Destiny': Rome (streets, gates, churches and saints), Constantinople (emperors and relics), Jerusalem (and its patriarchs), and Antioch and Cairo (early origins).[34] For all of these places William had access to contemporary description, whether from Fulcher or returned travellers in the East. Instead he chose to retail more recondite information about their antiquities.[35] Thus for Fulcher's eyewitness physical description of Constantinople, William substitutes extracts from the verse of Virgil, Horace and Sidonius, a list of Eastern emperors and an important account of relics in the churches there, based on a Greek original written soon after 1063. A particularly remarkable case of learned antiquarianism occurs in his account of the siege of Jerusalem. There William mentions the crusaders' use of a particular piece of siege-machinery 'which we call a hog (it is the *vinea* of the Ancients)'. And his subsequent description

of it draws, partly verbatim but without acknowledgement, on the Roman military writer Vegetius.[36]

Such a brief sketch as this does only scant justice to the narrative skill and richness of detail of William of Malmesbury's account of the First Crusade. But it will have achieved its object if it encourages historians of crusade to take William's account seriously. I have argued that it is a valuable supplementary source in its own right, if used with care. It is also an important window on ideas about crusading current in the West in the period of optimism between the First and Second Crusades. In a word, William believed that Urban had galvanized the European knighthood of his day in a mighty enterprise by which Latin Christendom had at last partially gained its rightful place in the world.[37]

NOTES

[1] For William in general see R.M.Thomson, *William of Malmesbury*, Woodbridge, 1987. Some useful thoughts on William as a crusading historian are in A.Grabois, 'The Description of Jerusalem by William of Malmesbury: a Mirror of the Holy Land's Presence in the Anglo-Norman Mind', *Anglo-Norman Studies* 13, 1990, 145-56, but the discussion is marred by errors, particularly as to William's sources.

[2] Ed. W.Stubbs, 2 vols., Rolls Series, 1889; new ed. and transl. R.A.B.Mynors, R.M.Thomson and M.Winterbottom, Oxford Medieval Texts, 1998, separate commentary vol. by R.M.Thomsonand M. Winterbottom. Much of what follows is dependent upon this commentary; all translations are taken from vol.1. References to the text of the *Gesta Regum* are by chapter and subsection (the latter used in the Mynors-Thomson-Winterbottom, not the Stubbs edition).

[3] E.g. *Gesta Regum*, ep. iii. 3, cc. 1.6, 67, 167, 172.1, 173.1, 263.1, 267.1, 334.1.

[4] Fulcher of Chartres, *Gesta Francorum Iherosolimitanum Peregrinantium*, ed. H.Hagenmeyer, Heidelberg, 1913, pp.82-3.

[5] *Gesta Regum*, c. 374.1.

[6] Fulcher i. 2. R.Somerville, *The Councils of Urban II: 1. Decreta Claromontensia*, Amsterdam, 1972, pp.83-98; slight modification of his stemma in Thomson, *William of Malmesbury*, p.124 n.30.

[7] Thomson, *William of Malmesbury*, pp.68-9; G. de Rossi, *La Roma Sotteranea Christiana* I, Rome, 1864, p.146; ed. (from William's text)

with commentary by R.Valentini and G.Zucchetti, *Codice Topografico della Citta di Roma* II, *Fonti per la Storia d'Italia* 88, Rome, 1942, pp.133-153, and in *Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina* 174, 1965, 325-8.

[8] *Gesta Regum*, c. 346; Fulcher i. 3.

[9] The anonymous eyewitness (*relator*) of events in the East is mentioned in William's *De Miraculis Beate Virginis*, ed. J.M.Canal, Rome, 1968, c. 49 (p.165); the young Godfrey is mentioned in *Gesta Regum*, c. 385.1. His identity is discussed in the forthcoming commentary.

[10] Fulcher i. 28. 1; *Gesta Regum*, cc. 369.8, 370.1.

[11] *Gesta Regum*, cc. 135.4, 363-4; Fulcher i. 18.

[12] *Gesta Regum*, c. 357.5; Fulcher i. 11. 7.

[13] *Gesta Regum*, c. 374.1. There is fascinating comparison of William and Fulcher in this respect by J.O.Ward, 'Some principles of rhetorical historiography in the twelfth century' in *Rhetoric and Medieval Historiography*, ed. E.Breisach, Kalamazoo, Mich., 1985, pp.118-48.

[14] William's use of classical borrowings in his report of Urban's speech is studied in N.Wright, '"*Industriae Testimonium*": William of Malmesbury and Latin Poetry revisited', *Revue Bénédictine* 103, 1993, 482-531 (510-15).

[15] For instance at c. 353.3, where William's account of the crusaders crossing the 'Devil's Ford', though mainly dependent upon Fulcher i. 8. 6, differs in a number of details. One might conclude that William had additional information, but that his wording is also suspiciously similar to Lucan's description (*Phars*. i. 220-1) of Caesar crossing the Rubicon.

[16] *Gesta Regum*, c. 373.6; Guibert of Nogent vii. 12 (*Recueil des historiens des croisades; Historiens occidentaux*, 5 vols., Paris, 1841-95, iv. 230), Albert of Aachen iii. 4 (ibid., p.341).

[17] *Gesta Regum*, c. 362.2.

[18] Fulcher i. 25. 2; Raymond of Aguilers, c. 14 (*Receuil* iii. 271); *Gesta Francorum Ierosolimam Expugnantium*, c. 12 (ibid., p.498).

[19] *Gesta Regum*, c. 381.2; Fulcher ii. 11. 11; Ibn al-Qalanisi, *The Damascus Chronicle*, ed. H.A.R.Gibb, London, 1932, pp.53-4, Albert of Aachen vii. 68 (*Receuil* iv. 551).

[20] *Gesta Regum*, c. 388.3; Michael the Syrian, *Chronicle*, in *Recueil des historiens des croisades, Documents Arméniens* I, Paris, 1869, p.327.

[21] D.C.Munro, 'The Speech of Pope Urban II at Clermont', *American Historical Review* 11, 1906, 231-42. It is high time that this analysis, still regarded as fundamental, was replaced.

[22] Orderic Vitalis, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, ed. and transl. M.Chibnall, 6 vols., Oxford Medieval Texts, 1968-1980, V, pp.14-15 n.10.

[23] *Gesta Regum*, c. 373.7; cf. Cicero, *Acad.* ii. 120, *De Natura Deorum* i. 53.

[24] See below, n.33.

[25] *Gesta Regum*, c. 344.1-2; Anna Comnena, *Alexiad* x. 5, 7, 9.

[26] e.g. *Gesta Regum*, c. 262.5 on Robert Guiscard's death, allegedly from poisoning arranged by the Byzantine emperor.

[27] *Gesta Regum*, c. 363; Fulcher i. 17. 2-4.

[28] *Gesta Regum*, cc. 91-2.

[29] Thomson, *William of Malmesbury*, pp.181-2.

[30] *Gesta Regum*, c. 282.3

[31] Anna Comnena, *Alexiad* x. 5-11.

[32] *Gesta Regum*, c. 384.

[33] *Gesta Regum*, c. 371.1-2.

[34] *Gesta Regum*, cc. 351-2 (Rome), 355-6 (Constantinople), 359 (Antioch), 367-8 (Jerusalem), 371.1 (Cairo).

[35] But he has a description of the walls of Constantinople, presumably from a contemporary eyewitness, at c. 355.3.

[36] *Gesta Regum*, c. 369.3; Vegetius, *De Arte Militari* iv. 15.

[37] This paper is based upon a version given to a seminar in the Graduate Centre for Medieval Studies at the University of Reading in January 1996. I wish to thank the participants for a number of helpful suggestions. Others who have contributed material or ideas contained in this version are thanked in the forthcoming commentary on the *Gesta Regum*.