

History of the Crusades.
Episode 5.
The First Crusade I.

Hello again. Last week we heard about the unmitigated disaster, which was the Peasants' Crusade. This week we move on to the main event, the First Crusade, also known as the Princes' Crusade.

The First Crusade differed from the Peasants' Crusade in a number of aspects. First and foremost though, was planning. The Pope had overall control of the First Crusade and was able to exercise some degree of authority over the preparations for the event. To start with, he set out a number of restrictions on who should participate in the Crusade. Whereas Peter was happy to take anyone who answered his rallying call, Pope Urban II had something altogether different in mind. He wanted to muster an army. That meant encouraging knights and foot soldiers to sign up, while discouraging hangers-on. He decreed that newly-wed husbands were not to embark on the Crusade without their wives permission. He restricted the participation of monks and clerics and said that unaccompanied women, the elderly, the sick, and the poor should not participate, unless they were under the patronage of someone wealthy.

The Church also decreed that each Crusader was to wear a cross made out of red fabric, which should be sewn onto the shoulder of his surcoat. The wearing of the cross symbolized a solemn vow made by the wearer that he would go to Jerusalem. If he deserted during the journey, or failed to set out, he could be excommunicated.

As we learned last week, Pope Urban also set the starting date for the Princes' Crusade at August 1096, which left plenty of time for Crusaders to get their affairs in order and wisely it meant the vast armies departed Europe just after harvest time, when stores would be full and there would be plenty of food to be had on the way.

Pope Urban ensured that the Church remained central to the Crusade by placing his man in overall charge of the expedition. As we have discussed previously, Bishop Adhemar of Puy was an excellent horseman and respected cleric, but did he have the experience necessary to coordinate vast armies and lead them into battle? Nope. But to be fair to Bishop Adhemar, pretty much no one else had the hands-on experience of the type required to lead armies across Europe and into hostile territory in the Holy Land.

The last major military campaign by a European army was the Norman invasion of England, some 30 years ago, but that only involved around 14,000 men. More recently, some knights would have been involved in driving Muslim and Byzantine forces out of Southern Italy and Spain, but the military experience of the vast number of participants was limited to minor raids and skirmishes. One of the favorite pastimes of knights and aristocrats at this time was raiding and attacking each other's castles and fortifications, and this is where their battle skills were honed.

So, hands up anyone who has demonstrated experience coordinating armies numbering a total of perhaps 60,000 to 100,000 people, and marching said armies around 2,000 miles, and then taking and holding large swathes of hostile territory in a desert environment. Anyone? Anyone? No, the truth was no-one had the necessary experience. Bishop Adhemar was just going to have to do the best he could.

And let's not forget the challenges he would face. Even in today's terms, with our extensive and instantaneous communications network, satellite positioning and the use of powered vehicles such as tanks, trucks, cargo planes and helicopters, trying to attempt an invasion on the scale of the First Crusade would be a big ask. But back then, with widespread illiteracy and with a rider on horseback being both your fastest method of communication and transport, the challenges were immense. But plans were made, despite the difficulties, and in the end it was decided that four main armies would leave from different regions in Europe, and would take separate routes across Christendom to Constantinople, where they would meet up and plan the next phase of the campaign. This was sensible both from a recruitment and resource point of view. Armies would be easier to administer if largely comprised of people from the same area, and directing the four armies to take different routes to Constantinople increased opportunities for recruitment, as people could join the various armies as they marched past, while also reducing pressure on local supplies.

Right, so much for planning on the macro level, what about planning on the micro level? If you wanted to join the First Crusade, what would you need to take with you? And how would you ensure that your family lands or estate didn't fall into ruin while you were away? Basically, if you were joining the Crusade, you needed to equip yourself with the absolute best possessions you could afford. Your life would depend on it. It was made clear to participants that this was no mere armed pilgrimage. This was a military campaign, and you would need to take the best offensive and defensive equipment you could afford. The Crusading army comprised two types of warrior: the knight and the foot soldier or infantryman.

Knights in this era wore armor of the type depicted in the Bayeux Tapestry, which showed the Battle of Hastings back in 1066. Conical helmets were worn over a mail hood, and a thigh-length coat of mail was worn over a padded jerkin. A large wooden shield completed the defensive armament. Offensive weapons included a spear, one handed sword, and perhaps a mace or club.

Just a word here about the chain-mail coat. This was the single most expensive item most knights owned. In an age where the smelting process was laboriously slow, iron was an expensive and sought after commodity. Ploughs, at this stage, the farm implement upon which many people's very existence relied, were still made of wood, or at most only tipped with iron, due to its exorbitant cost. Yet here were men clothed in the stuff. The full armor of a knight contained around 50 pounds of iron and represented a staggering investment.

The next most expensive item a knight would need would be a horse. A horse capable of carrying a fully armored knight in battle needed to be specifically bred for the purpose. These heavy war horses or "destriers", were not like the horses we are familiar with today. Barrel-chested, thick-necked, stocky, and bred for strength not elegance, they were the tanks of the Middle Ages. Unfortunately, they have all but died out. Now there are a couple of specialist horse breeders in Europe keeping obscure lines alive, such as the Ardennes Heavy horse, but since the demise of cavalry and the use of mechanical farm equipment, their popularity declined in favor of the more elegant horses of today, which are bred for speed and beauty.

One thing to note about the heavy warhorse is that they were terribly uncomfortable to ride, so uncomfortable, in fact, that you would only ride them in battle. The rest of the time you would ride a palfrey, or a lighter traveling mount. You would need to take at least two

of these lighter horses, as horses have a habit of taking sick or becoming lame, and you don't want to have to walk to Jerusalem, or perhaps even worse, have to ride your war horse there, so every knight would need at least three horses.

Then of course, you needed someone to look after your horses and your armor, so each knight would need a support crew of perhaps four or five men, who could also act as infantrymen during a battle. The very wealthy knights took half their households with them. They might take their hunting hounds or birds of prey, with their associated attendants. You might have a cook and servants to look after your well-being and equipment. Your wife might also come, along with her attendants. As you can imagine, this was going to be an expensive exercise.

At the other end of the scale were foot soldiers. Again each Crusading foot soldier would equip himself with the best he could afford. Pack animals such as mules were useful to carry your equipment, and you would arm yourself, as you saw fit, with a spear, sword, dagger, club or axe. Both knights and infantrymen could also train as archers.

The longbow was the most common weapon of the archer at the time of the Crusades. Cheap to make, easy to maintain, and useful for hunting, a longbow was around two meters long and could shoot an arrow a distance of around 300 meters.

The high-powered military weapon of the age was the crossbow. They were still being developed, and loading them was laborious and time consuming. You basically had to sit down on the ground and draw the bow by bracing both your feet against it, which must have looked comical in battle. By the time you sat down to draw your crossbow, you could have let fly three arrows from a longbow. But these primitive crossbows were still highly sought after, due to the devastating force they exhibited. A crossbow quarrel could penetrate seven centimetres into solid wood at close quarters, and could easily pierce the armour of a knight. Their effectiveness was such that in the 12th century the Church tried to ban them under an early arms treaty. But as I have mentioned at the time of the First Crusade, there was still being developed, and most archers would have employed long bows, not crossbows.

In addition to your armor and weaponry, you would also need supplies for the journey, and items of value to trade. The logistics of establishing a line of supply all the way to Jerusalem were too difficult, so the plan was to trade for food, clothing and footwear in friendly territory, and to pillage what you needed in hostile lands. The coins of the day in Latin Christendom were heavy and limited to small denominations, so it was impractical to carry large quantities of them. Most Crusaders instead carried precious stones, gold and silverware to trade.

If all this sounds expensive to you, you're right, it was. It has been estimated that the cost of financing a place on the First Crusade amounted to around four times the annual income of a knight. For foot soldiers, the cost would also have been exorbitant in relation to their income.

For the vast majority of those setting out on the First Crusade, participation meant selling assets, taking out loans, or mortgaging property, and this is where the Church came in. Pope Urban decreed that the worldly possessions of the Crusaders should be placed under the protection of the Church for the duration of the military campaign. Monasteries were also the main financiers of the Crusade. Would-be Crusaders loaned money from

clerics, and sold or mortgaged property and other assets to monasteries. Records from the Great Abbey at Cluny show, for example, that on the 12th of April 1096 Achard of Montmerle, a young castellan pledged property to the monastery in return for 2,000 shillings and four mules, so that he could join the journey to Jerusalem to fight for God against pagans and Saracens. This scenario was repeated many thousands of times over throughout Latin Christendom.

And of course, when everyone starts selling something like property, prices fall dramatically, and the prices of commodities that people are buying, such as pack animals, armor, weaponry and precious items to trade, skyrocket. To put it simply, the Church made a killing. It brought vast amounts of property at fire-sale prices while getting a premium for items it sold to the Crusaders.

And this brings us to a related point. In our modern, secular society, where a good deal of importance is placed upon the accumulation of personal wealth, it's easy to impose our values onto the Crusaders, and assume intentions upon them which they may not have possessed. You might assume that most people signed up for the First Crusade for reasons of material gain, and for the booty or land they might acquire for themselves. But I'm not sure this would be right. To be sure, there were tens of thousands of individuals participating in the First Crusade, and each would have had his own reasons for embarking on the mission. But so many of those who set out for Jerusalem had all but bankrupted themselves to finance their journey, and the sheer number of people setting out on the Crusade must have made them realize that their share of any booty gained was probably going to be small. In an age where religion was at the very core of society, where unusual occurrences were seen as signs from God, where relics from saints assumed miraculous qualities, and where religious messages about the perils of sin were unrelenting, the embarking on a journey for the redemption of your soul and not for material gain would make quite a bit of sense.

Right, I think that's enough on the planning and preparation for the First Crusade. Now, unfortunately we must turn our minds to something more unpleasant: the Jewish pogroms of 1096. Jewish people had immigrated to Europe in the 10th century, settling mostly in urban areas, promoting trade, and banking. Up until now, they were a religious minority who had been tolerated by the Christians, and had generally been left alone to get on with their lives. But the religious fervor whipped up by Pope Urban's speech at Clermont, and the anti-Islamic sentiment being encouraged in all quarters, seems to have also resulted in anti-Semitism. Further adding fuel to the fire was the fact that the Jewish banking community was a source of financing for the Crusade. Whatever the reason, anti-Semitism started to boil over in parts of France and Germany, with riots, blackmail, forced conversions to Christianity and murder.

Who were the perpetrators? It varied. Some of Peter the Hermit's followers were involved, some aristocrats were guilty as well, and also there were some other rogue elements. The worst of the bunch was a petty noble called Count Emich of Leisingen, who had a reputation for lawlessness and brutality. He decided to lead an army to Jerusalem, and attracted a small number of German aristocrats plus a contingent of peasants, some of whom had been following a goose which they believed had been inspired by God. Count Emich decided to start his Crusade with an attack on the Jewish community in the nearby town of Speyer. Despite the intervention of a local Bishop, 12 Jewish people were slain after they refused to convert to Christianity, while one woman chose suicide over forced conversion. And it got worse.

Emich and his small army moved on to the town of Worms, where they massacred some 500 Jews who had attempted to take sanctuary in the palace of the local Bishop. Further down the road in Mainz, the local Jewish community offered money to Count Emich in an attempt to maintain the peace. It didn't work. Count Emich continued his murderous forced conversions, and around 1,000 Jewish people were killed.

Count Emich, and his army continued their rampage through the Rhineland and eventually made their way to Hungary, where they attempted to lay siege to the town of Wieselburg. The town garrison fell upon Emich's men and were victorious. Count Emich's army was destroyed, and only a handful of survivors, Count Emich among them, managed to escape and return to Germany.

In contrast with its stance against the Islamic faith, the Catholic Church neither encouraged nor condoned violence against the Jews of Europe, but they were powerless to prevent thousands of murders undertaken in the name of Christianity. It certainly showed the dark side of the Crusading movement it had created.

Right, now we will proceed to the final segment of today's episode, a description of the central characters of the First Crusade, just so you know who they are, before we follow the armies on the road to Constantinople.

The obvious person to start with is Bishop Adhemar of Puy. Appointed by Pope Urban to lead the First Crusade, Bishop Adhemar was born into a noble French family. At the time of the First Crusade he was middle-aged and was an accomplished horseman. He had completed a pilgrimage to Jerusalem some nine years ago, so he knew what he was in for, so far as distance and terrain was concerned. In some respects, he seems a good choice, for leader. His skills as a peacemaker and diplomat would be sought after to resolve conflict and disputes during the journey. Kindly and well-liked, he tended to persuade rather than command.

Now we're going to move over to the Byzantine Empire and take a closer look at the Emperor Alexius. We know an awful lot about Alexius, mainly due to his daughter Anna. Brought up amongst the intrigues of the Byzantine court, educated in the Greek classics, and possessing a running knowledge of geometry and medicine, whilst in her forties, Anna found herself banished to a nunnery, after moving against her brother John, Alexius' rightful heir, and trying to elevate her husband to the Imperial purple. In the nunnery, the days were long and empty, and Anna needed a project to fill her time. Did she: A, decide to start a tapestry; B, study the Bible in order to engage the monks down the road in theological debate; or C, none of the above. The answer is C, none of the above. Anna decided instead to compose a comprehensive history of the reign of her father Alexius, thus becoming possibly the first woman ever to attempt a narrative history. She called it "The Alexiad", and you can still buy a copy today, nearly 1,000 years after she wrote it. I've got one right here. So a big thumbs up to Anna, good work.

Right, back to Alexius. Using Anna's work, plus other contemporary sources, we can say this about the Emperor Alexius. He was born into a noble family, although not the Imperial family. Trained as a soldier, he quickly rose through the ranks to become a respected and highly skilled general, who never lost a battle. The Byzantine Empire at this stage in its history, had fallen on hard times. Ten years previously, it had suffered perhaps its worst ever defeat at the hands of the Seljuk Turks. The Emperor himself had been captured, and

over time some 30,000 square miles of Imperial territory in Anatolia had been taken by the Turks, affecting the food supply and placing Constantinople on shaky ground.

At the time, the young Alexius was winning campaigns and prestige on the battlefield, Constantinople was ruled by an elderly and largely ineffectual Emperor. Riots and insurrections were occurring. The Turks, taking advantage of Imperial weakness, were advancing, and Alexius began to position himself to challenge for the purple. In doing so, he proved himself an astute player of the game of thrones. Forming alliances with key players, taking setbacks in his stride, he eventually made his move, mustering his army in rebellion against the Emperor. He succeeded, and on Easter Sunday in 1081, in the Great Church of Saint Sofia in Constantinople, the 24 year old general Alexius Comnenus formally became Emperor.

Energetic, short and stocky with broad shoulders, Alexius had bushy eyebrows and a full thick beard. His eyes were said to be curiously penetrating. His daughter Anna writes that he possessed a generally heroic appearance, and from his whole person emanated beauty and grace and dignity and an unapproachable majesty. Although she might have been a little biased in her description.

Upon being raised to the throne, Alexius went straight to work, imposing discipline on the army, soothing tensions within the Imperial court and generally trying to bring the Byzantine Empire back from the brink of disaster. Alexius had his work cut out for him. The fifteen years of his reign before the start of the First Crusade saw him busily defending Byzantine territory, against aggression from the Turks in the eastern part of the Empire, and from the Normans in the Western part.

The relationship between the Emperor Alexius and Latin Christendom had been somewhat tetchy. He wasn't exactly a fan of the Latin Christians, believing them to be unreliable and unstable characters, unsophisticated, and always intent on monetary gain. However, things changed when Pope Urban gained the Papacy. Pope Urban extended the hand of diplomacy to Alexius, and Alexius responded in kind, by reopening all the Latin Christian Churches in Constantinople and eventually cordial relations were restored.

Then Alexius spotted an opportunity which could be gained from his new alliance. He had always intended to push the Seljuk Turks out of Anatolia, and even better, it would be great if the Christian Byzantine Empire could regain its lost territory throughout the Holy Land all the way to Jerusalem. Alexius knew, however, that his Imperial Army and his mercenaries could not achieve this alone. Perhaps his new mate, Pope Urban, might be able to help out and send a few forces his way? And so, here we all are.

Right, now let's return to Latin Christendom. Five knights are going to shape the course of the First Crusade: three are obviously major players right from the start, and the other two are less obvious. I think it might be an idea to meet them now, so you have some understanding of these characters before we embark on the journey itself.

Knight number one is Raymond IV, Count of Toulouse. A wealthy and very powerful man who owned most of what is now southern France, Raymond was the senior statesman of the expedition. An elderly man of perhaps 60 years of age, Raymond apparently only had one eye. Rumor had it that Raymond had his eye pulled out of his head in Jerusalem, as punishment for failing to pay a Muslim tax on pilgrims. Even more astonishing was the fact that Raymond then kept his eyeball in his pocket during the return journey back to France,

as a testament to his suffering. This, of course, may be a total fabrication. We'll never know.

Being a veteran of a number of campaigns against the Muslims in Spain, and being one of the most powerful men in Latin Christendom, Raymond was the obvious choice for leader of the First Crusade. But while it is likely that Pope Urban met with Raymond to secure his support prior to the speech at Clermont, and while Raymond was one of the first knights to take up the Cross after the speech, Pope Urban was determined to place Bishop Adhemar in overall charge of the campaign. Personality-wise, Raymond was proud, ambitious, vain and stubborn, although he was also possessed with courteous manners, which impressed the Byzantines, who found him more civilized than his colleagues. Due to his age (60 was an advanced age in medieval times) he was prone to bouts of illness and frailty. Raymond sold or pledged land to finance his expedition, and was accompanied on his journey by his wife and his son and heir, Alfonso, as well as his friend and nominal leader of the Crusade, Bishop Adhemar.

Knight number two is Bohemond of Taranto, and he is a Norman from southern Italy. The Normans prided themselves on being skilled and ambitious military commanders who were more than happy to take risks to secure themselves more territory. Crusading was right up their alley. Upon announcing that he would take up the Cross, Bohemond apparently, in an act of high drama, called for his most expensive and lavish scarlet cloak to be brought to him. In front of his entranced army, he ripped the cloak into strips to fashion it into crosses for himself and his captains. His army ended up consisting of the cream of the Norman military class. It was disciplined, well organized and well equipped. The son of that most Norman of Normans, Robert Guiscard, Bohemond himself was a gifted and experienced military commander. Around 40 years of age at the time of the First Crusade, Bohemond had honed his skills in the struggle to secure Norman control of southern Italy against the Byzantines. He was also involved in Norman attacks on Byzantine territory in the Balkans along the eastern shore of the Adriatic Sea, where he gained experience in generalship, military tactics, and logistics.

Ah, yes, you heard right. Bohemond gained his military experience from attacks on the Byzantine Empire under the Emperor Alexius, the same Emperor Alexius who he had now pledged to assist by taking up the Cross. Awkward. In fact, that was one disadvantage in having Bohemond involved in the Crusade. Yes, he was an experienced battle commander, bringing an army of similarly experienced, disciplined troops to the cause, but his involvement was going to do nothing for diplomatic relations between Latin Christendom and Constantinople. Nothing at all.

Anna Comnena provides a great description of Bohemond in "The Alexiad", which is worth repeating. "The sight of him inspired admiration, the mention of his name, terror. His stature was such that he towered almost a full cubit over the tallest men. He was slender of waist and flanks, with broad shoulders and chest, strong in the arms. The skin all over his body was very white, except for his face, which was both white and red. His hair was lightish brown, and not as long as that of other barbarians, that is, it did not hang on his shoulders. His eyes were light blue, and gave some hint of the man's spirit and dignity. There was a certain charm about him, but also a hard, savage quality in his whole aspect, due, I suppose, to his great stature and his eyes. Even his laugh sounded like a threat to others." Her description of course, is probably colored by the fact that the man she was describing was a traditional enemy of her father.

Now we come to knight number three, who was a bit of a wild card: Tancred of Hauteville. A southern Italian Norman and nephew of Bohemond, Tancred is only 20 years old at the time of the First Crusade. But ambitious, energetic, tall, blond and powerfully built Tancred is one to watch. And apparently he spoke Arabic, which was a rare and particularly useful talent for a Crusader. He is given the role of second-in-command in Bohemond's army. Watch this space.

You know, in movies where there's a good looking actor and you just know that by the end of the movie, he's going to emerge triumphant as the hero of the whole thing. Well, there's one of those in the First Crusade. Enter knight number four, Duke Godfrey de Bouillon. Godfrey was the second son of an aristocratic French family, who could trace their lineage back to Charlemagne. His mother was a deeply religious woman who was a generous supporter of the Church. From her, Godfrey likely inherited a degree of piety. Godfrey's father had fought in the Battle of Hastings. Unfortunately, things didn't turn out so well for him. During a crucial stage of the battle, he took fright and fled, and was left with an arrow wound in his back for his trouble. Although Godfrey was only six years old at the time, no doubt he was influenced by the event. So from his father, he likely inherited a desire to redeem the family name in battle.

At the time of the First Crusade, Godfrey was in his mid-thirties, was tall with blonde hair and a blond beard, and was reputedly pleasing to the eye. But, like everyone from this era, we don't know exactly what he looked like. Paintings of people undertaken at the time of the Crusade did not attempt to show exactly what a person looked like. They were symbolic and not very detailed. See that picture of a person in a long robe with a crown on his head? That's the King. See the figure standing next to him, who looks exactly the same only is wearing a dress? That's the Queen. That was the extent of portraiture in those days. There was no real effort made to show the likeness of a person in paintings, so we only know what Godfrey and the other principal players of the Crusades looked like from contemporary descriptions of them.

There have been quite a few paintings made of Godfrey over the ages, but most of them were painted a long while after his death, and any resemblance in them to the actual Godfrey would be pure luck and coincidence. The icon for the History of the Crusades podcast is actually a painting entitled Godfrey de Bouillon French Crusader, painted by Karl Mucke in the 19th century. If you want to see the original, it's in the Bridgeman Art Gallery in London. It's a pretty picture, skillfully rendered, but with all due respect to Karl Mucke, it depicts a highly romanticized version of Crusading Godfrey, complete with an angel flying overhead, and you can be pretty sure that's not what things looked like back in the day.

Prior to the First Crusade, Godfrey had experience in warfare but none in command. He reportedly had pleasant manners, was gracious, chaste, and he made sure he did the right thing by obtaining the permission of his overlord King Henry IV of Germany before embarking on the Crusade. However, his kindly disposition didn't stop him from raising part of the enormous cost of his expedition by blackmailing Jewish communities in the Rhineland into giving him money in exchange for guaranteeing the safety of Jewish citizens in Germany. Godfrey raised the rest of his funds by selling his entire Duchy to the Church. The most impressive part of his estate was Castle Bouillon, which sat atop a rocky outcrop on a bend of the Semois river in the Ardennes. He sold it to the Bishop of Liege, and the castle ended up staying in the possession of the Church for six centuries. And you can visit it today. It's well preserved and is now located in Belgium. And apparently you

can buy chocolate of a very high quality from the town of Bouillon, below the castle. So, really, what's not to like? Anyway, that's about it for Godfrey. He will be leading his army down the old pilgrimage route, following the same path as the peasants Crusade, and we'll join him on that journey next week.

That brings us to the final knight, knight number five. Baldwin of Boulogne. Baldwin was Godfrey's younger brother. Originally destined for the Church, Baldwin had no lands of his own. He found the Church not to his liking and eventually took service under his brother, Godfrey. Godfrey and Baldwin were polar opposites, both in looks and personality. Where Godfrey was fair-haired, Baldwin had dark hair, but very pale skin. Where Godfrey was gracious and polite, Baldwin was haughty and cold. Godfrey's tastes were simple, while Baldwin enjoyed luxury and excess. Baldwin was also very, very ambitious. With no lands and no real future in Latin Christendom, he saw in the Crusading movement an opportunity to advance his interests, an opportunity he was going to seize with both hands. He was married to an Englishwoman of Norman descent, Godehilde, who would accompany him on the expedition along with their young children.

And there we have it. Planning is done, preparations are underway, and we are all ready to embark on the First Crusade. I hope you'll join me next week as we follow the armies of the First Crusade, numbering between 60,000 and 100,000 souls, on the first leg of their journey from Latin Christendom, to Constantinople.

Right, further reading. There are two very good books dedicated solely to an analysis of the First Crusade: "The First Crusade", by Stephen Runciman, which is an oldie but a goodie, and a more recent book by Thomas Asbridge, also called "The First Crusade". If you are peachie-keen, you could also track down a copy of "The Alexiad", Anna Comnena. For an understanding of just how far it is from Europe to Jerusalem, and just what a huge toll the journey alone will take on humans and horses, I recommend you read "Crusader, By Horse to Jerusalem". The author Tim Severin, along with a companion and some horses, sets off from Castle Bouillon on during the 1980's, and follows the old Roman roads taken by the Peasants' Crusade and Godfrey of Bouillon's army through Eastern Europe, then Turkey, then through the Holy Lands to Jerusalem. As I said, it really gives you an idea of the immense distance covered. I'm not sure whether it's still in print, but you might be able to find a second-hand copy. As always, I'll post a list of these books on the website at the "HistoryOfTheCrusades.webs.com". Until next week, bye for now.

End