

The crusading Furnivals

Doherty, James

DOI:

[10.1177/03631990221124801](https://doi.org/10.1177/03631990221124801)

License:

Creative Commons: Attribution (CC BY)

Document Version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Citation for published version (Harvard):

Doherty, J 2022, 'The crusading Furnivals: family tradition, political expediency and social pressure in crusade motivation', *Journal of Family History*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03631990221124801>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

The Crusading Furnivals: Family Tradition, Political Expediency and Social Pressure in Crusade Motivation

James Doherty¹ 

Journal of Family History
1-17

© 2022 The Author(s)



Article reuse guidelines:

sagepub.com/journals-permissions

DOI: 10.1177/03631990221124801

journals.sagepub.com/home/jfh



Abstract

By the mid-thirteenth century, many aristocratic families across Europe could lay claim to crusading ancestors, and scholarship has revealed the importance of family tradition in maintaining the momentum of the crusading movement. This study focuses on one family – the Furnivals – who produced five crusaders over three generations. It argues that, even though family tradition likely played a part in motivating some crusading Furnivals, in-depth scrutiny of three generations demonstrates that social and political concerns are at least as convincing in explaining the crusade motivation of each family member.

Keywords

Third Crusade, Fifth Crusade, Barons' Crusade, crusading tradition, Furnival family

Family history has been a significant and influential strand of crusade scholarship. For several decades, publications have demonstrated that family tradition was fundamental to maintaining the momentum of crusading throughout the Middle Ages, and several aristocratic kin groups have been identified as fonts of crusade enthusiasm. The crusading activities of the earls of Warwick and lords of Craon, the counts of Nevers and lords of Montlhéry, the earls of Derby and lords of Perche – among many others – have been the focus of dedicated studies, all of them reinforcing the view that tradition was a successful recruiter for the wars of the cross.¹

The work of Nicholas L. Paul, in particular, has done much to place family heritage and memory at the forefront of crusader studies. Paul has demonstrated that families deployed a number of tactics to retain memories of their own crusaders, such as commissioning texts that celebrated kin who had participated in an expedition, venerating materials brought back from a venture and even seeking out marriage unions with other crusading families.² Moreover, Lars Kjær has argued convincingly that many first crusaders were drawn to Pope Urban II's call-to-arms at the Council of Clermont in November 1095 as a result of familial associations with the renowned wars of the eleventh

¹Department of History, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK

Corresponding Author:

James Doherty, Department of History, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, B15 2TT, UK.

Email: j.doherty@bham.ac.uk

century, such as the Norman Conquests of Sicily (1061–91) and England (1066).³ Crusading was, then, at least in part, a family matter from its inception; and, as Nicholas Paul and others have demonstrated, it remained so throughout its existence.⁴

One kin group that produced a number of crusaders over multiple generations was the Furnival family, which had its origin in the Beauvais region of France.⁵ Owing to an advantageous marriage c.1199, a branch of the Furnivals established a significant presence in the area straddling north Nottinghamshire and south Yorkshire in England. Various members of the family went on to participate in some of the well-recorded and best-known events that punctuated the history of the British Isles in the period, including large-scale crusading ventures to the eastern Mediterranean. In fact, like many within their aristocratic milieu across Europe, the Furnivals could look back on an eminent crusading heritage by the middle of the thirteenth century.⁶ From Gerard de Furnival I's Third Crusade (1189–92) experiences until the deaths of two of his grandsons during the Barons' Crusade (1239–41), this family made a significant contribution to the movement set in motion by Pope Urban. But it paid a high price for such commitment: of five known crusaders in this period, four perished overseas.

There seems little reason to doubt that family tradition motivated some Furnival crusaders, but it is important to keep in mind that no one factor can explain what drew medieval people to the crusading movement. For Simon Lloyd,

“The maddening problem with crusader motivation, yet equally a key perhaps to the crusade's appeal, is that it is possible to postulate an almost limitless number of motives, most of them incapable of empirical proof or disproof, or dangerously dependent upon inference.”⁷

Tradition, social concerns and political matters, among other issues not addressed here – especially genuine piety – all play their part in explaining why Latin Christians participated in crusades.⁸ It is the social and political matters, however, that must be foregrounded when explaining Furnival participation in the crusading movement.

It is my intention to scrutinize the motivations of three consecutive generations of Furnival crusaders. I suggest that, even when a family crusading tradition appears to have existed, analysis of the context in which each individual member of that family decided to crusade can reveal that tradition was sometimes only a minor element in the entangled cluster of motivations that acted upon a kin group's potential *crucesignati*. As the corpus of studies cited above indicates, crusaders were mindful of legacy; and the presence of three Furnival brothers on the Barons' Crusade indicates that the ghosts of crusading ancestors whispered in the ears of their descendants, stirring new generations to take the cross.⁹ For the Furnivals, though, the weight of tradition was a force that influenced rather than drove their participation in the crusading movement. As far as the evidence reveals, crusading heritage – for the Furnivals, at least – was a facet of family identity that did not in itself trigger action but was the tinder ignited by more immediate concerns, such as political expediency and social ambition.

Gerard I

It is not known whether the Furnivals were connected to the crusading movement before the Third Crusade. Nobody bearing the title de Furnival appears in the familiar chronicles, charters or letters of the First or Second Crusades, nor the sources related to the multitude of independent ventures between these large-scale expeditions.¹⁰ As several historians have commented, the Furnivals engaged enthusiastically with the movement in the half-century after the Third Crusade, but nothing is forthcoming from surviving evidence about their participation in crusading ventures before the 1190s.¹¹ In a 2013 article, Wout Van Voornveld suggested that a Baldwin de Furnival

may have been a second crusader; however, while it would be unsurprising to discover that a member of the Furnival family took part in the Second Crusade, he concedes that this claim is conjecture.¹² We move away from the realm of speculation when Gerard I comes into view, and what is known about him before he set out on the Third Crusade offers important context to his experiences on that expedition.

Gerard de Furnival I becomes visible in the retinue of Duke Geoffrey of Brittany (d. 1186), son of King Henry II of England. Gerard appears as a witness in charters issued at Angers in 1181, Winchester in 1184 and finally in Paris during the summer of 1186.¹³ Based on this wide geographic spread, as well as his acquisition of the manor of Munden (Hertfordshire) as a gift from Duke Geoffrey at some point between the years 1183 and 1186, it is safe to assume that Gerard was one of the duke's knights, traversing France and England in his service.¹⁴ Gerard's loyalties were not resolutely to the Angevin dynasty, however. On Geoffrey's death, Gerard aligned himself with King Philip II of France, for whom he acted as an ambassador (*nuntius*) to the court of King Henry in 1186 on the matter of the wardship of the duke's daughter. Four years later, in 1190, Gerard was still in the orbit of King Philip's influence when he witnessed a charter for the French king while in Paris.¹⁵ It was also during this period, according to William the Breton, that Gerard and his brother fought against the forces of Henry II in the wars of the late 1180s.¹⁶ Given the Angevin internecine conflicts of the era, the chronicler's comments do not indicate an unyielding allegiance to the French crown, but they are convincing evidence of dedicated service to the Capetians at this time.

Judith Everard has suggested that Gerard may always have considered himself one of King Philip's men, comfortably owing allegiance to his "natural lord" alongside Duke Geoffrey of Brittany.¹⁷ This interpretation certainly fits the description of multiple lordship described over three decades earlier by Odo of Deuil, who reported that men could switch service between lords while always remaining faithful to the king of France.¹⁸ As Hannah Boston has recently demonstrated, multiple lordship is an understudied aspect of medieval society, but Odo's status as a royal chaplain during the Second Crusade cannot be overlooked.¹⁹ Furthermore, he later became abbot of St Denis, a monastery with strong and enduring Capetian ties, so he can hardly be considered an impartial witness. In fact, there is no evidence that ties Gerard de Furnival to King Philip prior to Duke Geoffrey's death.

Regardless of Gerard's loyalties before 1186, he had been in direct service to the French crown for almost four years when he set out to the Holy Land in 1190, and this pre-crusade relationship has implications for our understanding of his early crusade experiences. Historians of the Third Crusade have sometimes referred to Gerard de Furnival I as one of King Richard of England's men.²⁰ By the summer of 1192, he was indeed advantageously situated within the *mouvance* of the English monarch, but the label of "Richard's man" obfuscates a transfer of allegiance during the expedition. In addition to his above-mentioned four-year service with King Philip, this shift can be discerned from comparison of several contemporary sources. For instance, Gerard first appears late in two of the best-known, and likely related, accounts of the Third Crusade: the *Itinerarium peregrinorum et gesta Regis Ricardi* and Ambroise's *Estoire de la guerre sainte*. Given the pro-Angevin leanings of both texts, this late appearance suggests that he aligned himself with Richard after Philip's departure from the crusade in August 1191. Furthermore, Gerard's complete absence from the Third Crusade section of Roger of Howden's *Chronica* is strongly indicative of a transfer to Richard's service late in the campaign. Roger returned to Europe at the same time as King Philip, so the chronicler's earlier attachment to King Richard made it impossible for him to comment from first-hand experience on Gerard's actions in the service of either monarch.²¹

It was in fact Roger of Howden who reported that transfers of allegiance from one lord to another were agreed upon while the kings were at Messina on their journeys east. An agreement was struck prohibiting mariners and men at arms from transferring masters during the crusade but allowing for

the free transfer of knights and clerics.²² No doubt it was with this arrangement in mind, and aware of the allure of monetary reward in spite of the crusade's spiritual purpose, that King Richard proactively attempted to recruit men from Philip's service during the expedition. It is reported that he offered four gold coins a month to all willing to serve him, regardless of origin, whereas Philip paid his men only three.²³ It may be the case, therefore, that Gerard was attracted to the higher wages offered by Richard, or perhaps he wished to remain in the East to fight. Whatever his reasons, Gerard appears to have been one of several French knights who stayed in the Holy Land on Philip's departure, aligning themselves with the king of the English.²⁴

Unlike many of his contemporaries who made such a decision, this political realignment was more than a temporary situation for Gerard de Furnival. There is no evidence of him in Philip's service after this time, and he is regularly attested alongside King Richard over the next seven years.²⁵ He was entrusted with important responsibilities, such as the tutoring of Richard's nephew, Otto of Brunswick (later Emperor Otto IV), and his son was matched with the heir to the Lovetot inheritance.²⁶ Particularly significant is the fact that Gerard is one of the few men who can be placed with Richard at the monarch's death in 1199, and he continued in King John's service until returning to the Holy Land in 1204.²⁷ So far as the evidence reveals, Gerard spent his final years in the East. If so, he was the first known Furnival to die overseas in the cause of the Holy Land.²⁸

The Third Crusade was a profitable experience for Gerard I, and a comparison of commentary on his social standing before and after the crusade reveals a significant rise in status. Discussing Gerard's actions as an ambassador on behalf of King Philip in 1186, Ralph of Diceto, who, it should be noted, was writing into the early thirteenth century, described him as one of "two knights of middle rank" sent on the mission.²⁹ Ralph was ideally placed to be well informed about such matters. His role as dean of St Paul's between 1181 and 1201 put him in a position to report on the visits of numerous important delegates.³⁰ However, when Ambroise wrote his *Estoire* of the Third Crusade, Gerard was the "valiant and wise" knight, who was a close associate of King Richard.³¹ Ambroise was also well informed. He is known to have participated in the Third Crusade, to have started work on his vernacular account of the expedition before the turn of the thirteenth century, and it seems likely that he was a clerk in the service of both King Richard and King John.³² Even taking into account Ambroise's passion for tales of adventure and heroic deeds, as well as Ralph's pro-Angevin partisanship when commenting on men who were in the service of King Philip at the time, this contrast is a noteworthy difference in status.³³ It most likely reflects Ambroise's desire to elevate a man whom he had spent time with during the Third Crusade, but it is notable that the charter record also indicates that Gerard was closer to Richard than he had ever been to Philip.³⁴

The Third Crusade clearly played its part in this ascent, as it did for others such as William de Ferrers, earl of Derby, whose death on campaign appears to have rescued the flagging fortunes of his family.³⁵ This is not to suggest that Gerard I's participation in the venture was a calculated attempt at social climbing and personal gain from the outset; rather, a crusade expedition produced an atmosphere conducive to the formation of new bonds, and it offered an opportunity for skillful individuals to come to the attention of the highest echelons of society.³⁶ Calculated ambition and opportunistic ambition are different characteristics.

It is palpably clear why an aristocrat of "middle rank", to use the words of Ralph of Diceto, might wish to take advantage of an opportunity to align himself with the English crown at the height of Angevin power. What is less obvious is why Richard was so willing to form a close bond with Gerard. The answer, I suggest, is that Gerard possessed a very useful skillset that distinguished him from his contemporaries and brought him to Richard's attention in the pressurized environment of the Third Crusade.³⁷

First, much evidence exists to indicate that Gerard was recognized as an able ambassador. It has already been noted that King Philip put him to use as one of two *nuntii* in deliberations with King Henry II over the wardship of Duke Geoffrey of Brittany's daughter, and Philip made use of him

in this capacity on other occasions.³⁸ Then, while in the Holy Land in 1192, Gerard was given the task of traveling to al-Adil, Sultan Saladin's brother, charged with the duty of negotiating safe passage for pilgrims who wished to visit Jerusalem.³⁹ This mission was far from a success, but that Gerard's skills were put to use demonstrates recognition of his ambassadorial acumen. Furthermore, after his return to the East during the period of the Fourth Crusade, Gerard was considered by Pope Innocent III as a person capable of deliberating over important matters in the Latin states of the eastern Mediterranean. In 1205, his services were requested, alongside those of Count Berthold of Katzenelnbogen, to intervene in the succession crisis in Antioch.⁴⁰ The specific reasons for Innocent's attempt to recruit Gerard for this intervention are not entirely clear. Berthold had established himself in the nascent Latin Empire, which came into being after the Fourth Crusade, but no obvious connection between Gerard and this dispute is forthcoming from surviving sources. Whatever the reason for this request, it is incontestable evidence of Pope Innocent III's trust in Gerard as an able negotiator.

A second attribute possessed by Gerard was his considerable military prowess. As noted above, he and his brother Baldwin made such an impact fighting against the English and Normans in the late 1180s that William the Breton reported on their actions in his account of King Philip's reign.⁴¹ Gerard was able to put these skills to use during the Third Crusade, and he received glowing reports.⁴² On his return home, he continued to fight on behalf of the Angevin monarchs. Gerard stood firm alongside Richard during large parts of the campaign to recapture the French lands of the English crown, and he was with the king in 1199 when the Lionheart was fatally struck by a bolt while besieging Châlus. His military service continued into the early reign of King John, and when Gerard captured Conan, son of the viscount of Leon, at the Battle of Mirebeau in 1202, he was able to secure 400 marks from the king in return for handing over Conan as a prisoner.⁴³ The picture that emerges is one of a man with a talent for martial affairs. For King Richard, therefore, association with Gerard de Furnival brought into his inner circle a skilled warrior and a highly competent negotiator.

Gerard returned to the eastern Mediterranean in 1204, and Gregory Lippiatt has raised the possibility that his second crusading venture was politically motivated. As Lippiatt notes, the first mention of Gerard wishing to set out to Jerusalem for a second time occurred only a matter of days after King John inflicted a defeat on Arthur of Brittany in early August 1202 at the battle of Mirebeau.⁴⁴ As noted above, Gerard had served Arthur's father, Duke Geoffrey, until his death in 1186, and he had been involved in discussions over the wardship of Arthur's sister in the same year.⁴⁵ It is entirely conceivable that a distaste for John's actions, which can only have been exacerbated by Arthur's disappearance while held captive, may have encouraged Gerard to complete a second journey to Jerusalem. Furthermore, as Lippiatt has also noted, Gerard's appearance in the witness list of a charter alongside Simon de Montfort while in Acre during 1204 places him in the company of other prominent cross-Channel aristocrats. For such people, a crusading expedition in the early thirteenth century offered an opportunity to delay the difficult decision of whether to side with John or Philip in the contest for Normandy.⁴⁶ Most pertinent to the current study, there are several reasons to believe that Gerard's actions on crusade, and even his motivation to crusade, can be explained by political and social concerns. There is nothing to suggest, though, that he was following a family tradition when he set out on either of his crusading ventures. The context would be different when his son took part in the Fifth Crusade.

Gerard II

As the son of a man who made his family's reputation alongside Richard the Lionheart during the Third Crusade, it might be assumed that Gerard de Furnival II would be an eager participant in the crusading movement. His advantageous marriage to Matilda de Lovetot (*c.*1199) never would

have occurred but for the close connection that developed between his father and King Richard, and Gerard II was mindful of his inheritance. After taking the reins of rule within his own domains, he was keen to articulate his agnatic descent, as demonstrated by a charter recorded in Kirkstead Priory's cartulary. When granting to Kirkstead part of the mill at Woodhouse (south Yorkshire) for the provision of mass-lights at some point between 1200 and 1204, he was described as Gerard, son of Gerard de Furnival, and his father appeared in the witness list of the donation as "Gerard, my father".⁴⁷ Then, when handing over an acre of land and the stream adjacent to it in Blackburn Valley (south Yorkshire) to the monks of Kirkstead in return for the remittance of a debt owed by his father-in-law, Gerard was noted as the "son of Gerard de Furnival."⁴⁸

Gerard II did not, however, rush to follow in his father's footsteps and volunteer for the first great crusading expedition of his adult life, the Fourth Crusade (1202–04). Nor did he venture east with Gerard I in 1204, and his absence from the Albigensian Crusade (1209–29) indicates that the benefits of crusader status were not enough to entice him to take up arms against the threat of heresy in the south of France. Gerard II eventually perished at Damietta (Egypt) in 1219 while participating in the Fifth Crusade (1217–21). His death was noted in the records of the Chancery and can be inferred from a charter issued in the name of his wife, who was described as a widow when confirming an earlier grant which had been made alongside Gerard to Kirkstead Priory.⁴⁹

There were very good reasons for Gerard II to abstain from all the crusading endeavors that might have attracted him in the early years of the thirteenth century. For one thing, English involvement in the Fourth Crusade was insignificant, verging on non-existent.⁵⁰ In addition, Gerard's ascent to joint control over his wife's Lovetot lands was a relatively recent development. It was not until 1201 that Gerard I was asked to pay King John 400 marks so that the monarch would take the homage of Gerard II for these holdings, and the couple's right to this inheritance was challenged.⁵¹ A Nigel de Lovetot contested their right to these lands, and the matter was only settled in 1207 when Gerard secured them for the price of £1000, 15 palfreys and the quitclaim of Newport (Essex), all of which went to an increasingly grasping King John.⁵² Even if the prospect of participation in the Fourth Crusade or his father's journey had seemed appealing to Gerard II, the very real danger posed to his possessions can have served only to reduce the likelihood of his involvement. In spite of the Church's long-standing promise to protect the lands, families and possessions of all absentee crusaders, Nigel de Lovetot's challenge posed significant difficulties.⁵³ The physical protection of crusader properties was often enforced by family members rather than ecclesiastical authorities, but Matilda de Lovetot, it seems, would have faced a contest from within her family during Gerard's absence.⁵⁴

These obstacles to participation were resolved by the time that Pope Innocent III launched the Albigensian Crusade in 1209, yet Gerard did not take part in this expedition. It may of course have been the case that the south of France simply lacked appeal as a theater of crusade warfare when compared to a spiritually and culturally prestigious expedition to the Holy Land. Again, though, the situation in England at the time was not conducive to producing recruits for crusading operations. As has been demonstrated by Christopher Tyerman, Nicholas Vincent and Claire Taylor, English participation in the Albigensian Crusade was highly politicized. Between 1208 and 1213, England was under papal interdict; and King John was the brother-in-law of the count of Toulouse, who spent a period of exile in England during the crusade and was one of the primary targets of the expedition.⁵⁵ Men like Gerard II, who remained loyal to the English crown for much of the period before 1215, appear to have been disinclined to risk the political fallout that might have followed a period of service against the Albigensians.⁵⁶

Had Gerard II taken part in any of these campaigns, therefore, he would have been unusual for a loyalist with lands based predominantly in England. Other men with crusading heritage, such as William de Ferrers and Philip d'Aubigny, remained close to the crown throughout the period, and they, like Gerard de Furnival II, found it impractical to participate in either the Fourth or Albigensian Crusades but then traveled to Damietta.⁵⁷ For Gerard, as for several of his

contemporaries, the wider political situation took precedence over the power of family tradition when deciding whether to engage with the crusading movement. It was only when some degree of order had been restored in England in 1217 that Gerard took the cross and participated in the Fifth Crusade. It seems clear, therefore, that political expediency and opportunity are at least as important as crusading ancestry in explaining his decision to set out.

One issue was the political situation in which Gerard II found himself after the 1217 Battle of Lincoln, an engagement that is considered a pivotal moment in bringing an end to the hostilities of the First Barons' War. He spent more time loyal to the crown than many of his contemporaries during the civil strife that racked England in the early thirteenth century, but he had rebelled for a second time by September 1216;⁵⁸ and in what William Stubbs categorized in the Rolls series as the "D" version of Roger of Howden's chronicle, Gerard is included in a short continuation that lists men captured at Lincoln.⁵⁹ Gerard made the decision to set out on crusade on his release from captivity, and, while a desire to atone for his sins on a penitential venture should not be overlooked, the political context suggests that this action was informed by political matters. Indeed, Gerard likely harbored legitimate concerns about his standing. On news of his death reaching England in 1219, Munden (Hertfordshire), which had been gifted to Gerard I by Duke Geoffrey of Brittany in the 1180s, was taken from the family and entrusted to Nicola de la Haye as a reward for her support at the Battle of Lincoln two years earlier.⁶⁰ The award of this holding to someone who had been so important in Lincoln's defence must be viewed as an attempt to make an example of Gerard's family for his actions. It was back in Furnival hands by the early 1240s, but weighing up the state of affairs in 1217, Gerard may well have concluded that the situation was looking bleak for him on his release from captivity and that crusader status would protect these holdings.⁶¹ Unlike in the early 1200s, the challenge posed by his wife's family does not appear to have been an issue at this point in time.⁶²

If his rebel standing was important in this decision-making process, Gerard was in good company. Saer de Quincy, earl of Winchester, was captured alongside Gerard at Lincoln, and he too traveled to Damietta. Like Gerard, it is where he met his end.⁶³ They were joined by several men who took up arms against the crown. Robert Fitzwalter, at the forefront of action against King John during the First Barons' War, was captured alongside Gerard. Robert returned from the Fifth Crusade, but he came back in poor health.⁶⁴ Likewise, John de Lacy, constable of Chester, who managed to evade capture at Lincoln, went east in 1218.⁶⁵

Acting like a political safety valve, crusading offered *personae non gratae* time away from the kingdom for a period of penance, whether spiritual or political. As Christopher Tyerman has noted, taking the cross after siding with the unsuccessful candidate in a period of conflict could be "a prudent act of self-preservation in the face of political disaster."⁶⁶ And the same historian has commented that some individuals who can be counted among the baronial faction of 1215–17 may well have been particularly keen to take advantage of the protections offered by crusader status and a reprieve from English politics.⁶⁷

The Fifth Crusade can hardly be considered a campaign that attracted only rebels, though.⁶⁸ The most prominent participant from England was Earl Ranulf of Chester, who had led the king's forces alongside other important figures such as William Marshal.⁶⁹ Among other crusaders who remained faithful to Kings John and Henry III throughout the tumultuous early decades of the thirteenth century were William de Ferrers and two illegitimate sons of King John.⁷⁰ In addition to a timely exile, therefore, Gerard II may have seen in the Fifth Crusade an opportunity to repair the damage done by civil war and to rebuild social bonds. As Maurice Powicke suggested, a crusade could focus the attention of a community and enact a healing effect on a polity in turmoil.⁷¹

It is worth considering one further way in which Gerard II's motivation to crusade was politically informed, as evidence suggests that the Fifth Crusade facilitated opportunities for him to seek out new alliances with French allies in a manoeuvre that was not dissimilar to his father's realignment

during the Third Crusade. The version of the Old French continuation of William of Tyre's chronicle known as Colbert-Fontainebleau contains lists of some prominent participants on the Fifth Crusade, and it notes the circular nature of their arrivals at and departures from Damietta. In a list of those arriving in 1219, the author made the decision to arrange the names according to kingdom, first the English and then the French. Notably, Gerard is placed within the French contingent.⁷² This may have been due to his place of birth, as Gerard almost certainly was born in France during or before his father was in the retinue of Duke Geoffrey of Brittany. However, Peter Edbury has argued that the author of Colbert-Fontainebleau wrote in the Latin East in the 1240s, making it most unlikely that the chronicler was able to draw on a detailed knowledge of Gerard's biography.⁷³

Well-informed English annalists and chroniclers who recorded information about prominent participants in the Fifth Crusade neglect any mention of Gerard. The Dunstable Annals state that the earls of Chester and Ferrers set out in 1218 alongside Brian d'Isle and John, constable of Chester.⁷⁴ They also record another group that departed England the following year, among them Saer de Quincy, earl of Winchester, and Baldwin de Vere, both of whom are noted as having perished on campaign. But there is no mention of either the participation or death of Gerard II.⁷⁵ Likewise, the Annals of Waverley record the participation of Earl Ranulf of Chester and Earl William de Ferrers in 1218, and then another group including Saer de Quincy in 1219, but there is no mention of Gerard II.⁷⁶ It must be said that both annals discuss the involvement of many other nameless crusaders, and it might be the case that Gerard II was not considered of high enough standing to merit mention. However, when reviewed in conjunction with the Colbert-Fontainebleau continuation of William of Tyre, it is a noticeable absence. Roger of Wendover, who felt Gerard a significant enough figure to list him among the barons who were still loyal to the crown in 1215, did not include him in his list of English fifth crusaders.⁷⁷

There is limited evidence on which to base an assessment of Gerard II's pre-Fifth Crusade relationships and networks, which might of course have influenced his decision to crusade. He held lands in Yorkshire as well as Munden in Hertfordshire, which formed part of the Honour of Brittany, from the king.⁷⁸ He also owed knights fees for tenancy in the honor of Tickhill, which was in the king's possession until 1214, at which point it passed to Count Ralph of Eu. Gerard was in fact a significant tenant in Tickhill, but the foremost tenant in the honor was Constable John of Chester.⁷⁹ This ties Gerard II to one participant in the Fifth Crusade, one who had also taken part in the Battle of Lincoln and traveled to Egypt with Earl Ranulf of Chester. A further, albeit later, connection to the earldom of Chester can be found in a charter issued by Earl John in the mid 1230s in which two of Gerard II's sons were named in the witness list.⁸⁰ These Chester links would be meagre evidence on which to base an argument for Gerard's participation in the retinue of Earl Ranulf, though. In fact, there is little reason to believe that Gerard II would have been expected to accompany any of the leading figures from the kingdom of England on crusade. Moreover, his direct affiliation with the crown, which confiscated his holding of Munden on his death, is further evidence that Gerard had good reason to fear his prospects in England after the Battle of Lincoln, and the Fifth Crusade was an unrivaled occasion for him to forge new bonds. Few people could have been better placed to understand the outstanding opportunities for social realignment provided by a crusading expedition.

Whichever political concern is brought to the fore – evasion of a difficult situation in England, an attempt to rebuild relationships between rebels and royalists, or an effort to build new ties across the English Channel – there can be no doubt that Gerard II's participation in the Fifth Crusade was politically driven. Unfortunately, no evidence survives on which to gauge the prominence of family tradition within the combination of motives that led to Gerard's decision to set out to Egypt. His father had been to the eastern Mediterranean twice, and this must have been on his mind when he took the cross. Short of new evidence coming to light that explicitly links Gerard I's crusade experiences to Gerard II's desire to head to Damietta, though, political and social context must be given prominence in any discussion of his decision to become a crusader.

Thomas, Gerard III and William

By the time of his death in 1219, Gerard II had produced at least three sons with Matilda de Lovetot: Thomas, Gerard III and William (the marriage may also have produced three daughters, but this is far from certain).⁸¹ All three men participated in the Barons' Crusade, and it is likely that this was the first crusade experience for each of them. Several contingents departed England for the Holy Land between the end of the Fifth Crusade and the beginning of the Barons' Crusade. The bishop of Winchester, Peter des Roches, led a force alongside the bishop of Exeter in 1227 as part of Emperor Frederick II's campaign. Roger of Wendover reports that more than 40,000 people from England joined them.⁸² This is of course an inflated figure, but prominent people, such as Gilbert Marshal, took part in this venture, as did the recurrent crusader Philip d'Aubigny.⁸³ No evidence survives of Furnival involvement in these endeavors, and it is possible that all three brothers were relatively young until the 1230s, perhaps explaining their lack of engagement with crusading enterprises. The eldest two, Thomas and Gerard, did not begin to occur regularly in the kingdom of England's administrative records until the mid-1230s, when both were recorded in the Fine Rolls for taking part in tournaments: Thomas in Yorkshire and Gerard in Northamptonshire.⁸⁴ The earliest evidence for the existence of any of the brothers comes from 1230. It was in that year that Gerard III was listed in a charter issued by King Henry III when a force gathered at Portsmouth in April to invade France. While there is no detailed record of Gerard's actions at this time, he was noted as present "with the Earl of Chester," who led a contingent in France until the summer of 1231.⁸⁵ The assumption must be that Gerard III accompanied Earl Ranulf in the army of King Henry and was with the earl until his return to England. It is also evidence, as is the above-mentioned appearance of Gerard III and his brother Thomas in a charter of the earl of Chester, that his father's service on the Fifth Crusade may have aided in healing rifts after the period of the First Barons' War.

Using the likely date of their parents' union (1199) and the year of their father's death in Egypt (1219), it is possible to deduce that the youngest of the brothers, almost certainly William, must have been at least 21 when he set out on crusade in 1240. His eldest brother, and it is not clear whether it was Gerard or Thomas, could have been anywhere up to his late thirties, although it seems unlikely he was almost forty given the silence on the actions of this generation of Furnivals in any records prior to 1230. An age of somewhere in the region of thirty for the eldest brother at the start of the Barons' Crusade seems far more reflective of the evidence.

As with their ages, it is only possible to offer a very wide window of time during which the Furnivals could have taken the cross. Pope Gregory IX's crusade encyclical *Rachel suum videns* (November 1234) was followed by a successful recruitment campaign in England, yet no contingents set out from the British Isles prior to 1240.⁸⁶ Matthew Paris reports that Earl Richard of Cornwall took the cross in June 1236 and that William de Furnival was in his contingent, but there is no guarantee that everyone who followed Richard vowed themselves to the conflict on the same occasion.⁸⁷ Simon de Montfort, who was joined by both Gerard and Thomas de Furnival, may also have taken his crusade vow as early as 1236.⁸⁸ As is the case with Richard, this does not mean that everyone who would ultimately travel alongside Simon made the decision to do so on the same occasion as the earl. It is only possible to say, therefore, that the Furnival brothers took what were most likely their first crusade vows at some point between early 1235 (although more likely the summer of 1236) and prior to their departure in 1240, at which time their ages fell in the range of somewhere between early twenties and late thirties, but more likely somewhere between 20 and 30.

The presence of three members of the same family on a crusading venture, and a third generation at that, points to family tradition as a factor that motivated these men to crusade. With both their father and grandfather having died while crusading or in the service of the Holy Land, there can be little doubt that the brothers were acquainted with their crusading ancestry, and it seems highly

likely that this was on their minds when they made the decision to react favorably to a call to crusade.⁸⁹ Once again, though, we should not ignore other factors that likely motivated these men to engage with the crusading movement and then influenced their actions while on campaign.

What little can be said about the experiences of the Furnivals on the Barons' Crusade has been dealt with elsewhere, but it is worth setting out two matters pertinent to the current investigation.⁹⁰ First, only William returned to England: both Gerard and Thomas died in the East. A fifteenth-century rhyming history, which includes information about Furnival involvement in the campaign, has misled a number of historians into believing that Gerard survived, but thirteenth-century evidence makes clear that neither Gerard nor Thomas made it home alive.⁹¹ Second, it is worth re-emphasising the point that the Furnivals did not travel together. A list of crusaders that appeared in Matthew Paris's *Chronica majora* divided the participants into two contingents.⁹² One was led by Earl Richard of Cornwall, brother of King Henry III, and the other by Simon de Montfort, earl of Leicester and brother-in-law of the king.⁹³ As noted above, both Gerard and Thomas traveled with Simon de Montfort, while William accompanied the earl of Cornwall.⁹⁴ Given the state of the known evidence, it is impossible to explain this division with certainty, and the possibility that it can be rationalized by an arbitrary division of manpower should not be overlooked, but evidence does indicate that the influence of social links was at work.

As has been shown, the Furnival brothers' grandfather appeared with Simon de Montfort V in a charter issued at Acre in 1204, providing us with a, by that point, remote family connection.⁹⁵ There is, though, no reason to believe that either Gerard III or Thomas de Furnival had any obligation to Simon de Montfort VI. Thomas appears to have been active in Yorkshire and Nottinghamshire, and he had influence in the Peak (Derbyshire), where he did castle service.⁹⁶ Of Gerard III's known rights and lands, several appear to have been held directly of the king, but none of them of Simon de Montfort.⁹⁷ Thomas and Simon were known to one another, though. Both men witnessed the 1237 Treaty of York, revealing a political, if not social, link that can at least partially explain Thomas's decision to join Simon's crusade.⁹⁸ A fraternal connection to Thomas explains Gerard III's presence in this force, and, as Sophie Ambler has pointed out, family connections most likely explain why Guichard Ledet, Gerard's stepson, went east alongside Earl Simon. Ambler has also noted a pre-existing connection between the two elder Furnivals and another of Simon's crusaders, Hugh Wake. All three appeared together as pledges to a debt in 1239, and it is noticeable that Hugh's lands, based in Lincolnshire, Nottinghamshire and Yorkshire, neighbored those of Thomas and Gerard.⁹⁹ Social connections, although not ones involving bonds of service, are the most likely explanation for a Furnival presence in Simon de Montfort's force.

William de Furnival's presence in the army of Earl Richard of Cornwall is even more difficult to explain. He does not begin to appear in records produced in England with any regularity until the 1240s, and no evidence survives to tie him to the earl prior to his presence in Richard's crusading host.¹⁰⁰ Michael Lower has cautioned against interpreting Matthew Paris's description of Richard's contingent as his *familia* as indicative of a pre-existing household, and the absence of any link between William and Richard before 1240 supports Lower's claim that Matthew Paris was referring only to Richard's crusade force.¹⁰¹ Factors other than obligation must, therefore, have been at work.

It is noteworthy that when the above-mentioned Treaty of York was drawn up in 1237, three leading figures who vowed to head east with Richard of Cornwall – William Longespée, Gilbert Marshal and the earl of Lincoln – appeared in the witness list alongside Simon de Montfort and Thomas de Furnival.¹⁰² Given that William, Gilbert and Earl John had made their crusade vows at Winchester while with Earl Richard the previous year, it is not stretching the evidence to assume that the upcoming venture would have been a topic of conversation among the leading figures and bannerets of England.¹⁰³ Indeed, it would have been an environment heady with crusade enthusiasm and conducive to the recruitment of more warriors through social pressure. This is more than just conjecture. There is evidence from the Third Crusade to indicate that men

who did not take the cross in an environment of such zeal left themselves open to emasculating and gendered insults. Old Norse crusade sources also evidence the impact of peer-pressure in motivating new crusaders.¹⁰⁴ Fear of the opprobrium of peers may well have been a driving force here, and the witness list of the Treaty of York ties the Furnivals to both Simon de Montfort and Richard of Cornwall in an atmosphere of crusade enthusiasm. Again, it is not stretching the evidence to suggest that the youngest Furnival, William, would have been just as vulnerable as his elder brothers – if not more so – to that pressurized environment and eager to prove himself on campaign.

It is also worth noting that there was a strong royalist component in both of the first two contingents to depart England.¹⁰⁵ King Henry III did not take part in this expedition, but his brother (Richard of Cornwall) and his brother-in-law (Simon de Montfort) led the two earliest armies to set out with significant English participation. Perhaps with their grandfather's social ascent during the Third Crusade in mind, therefore, the Furnivals saw an opportunity in serving as bannerets in the armies of figures with such close connections to the throne.

There is also evidence of some fluidity between the two contingents while in the Holy Land, pointing once again to crusading as a vehicle for social realignment. Next to nothing is known of Earl Simon's actions while in the Latin East. No account suggests that he marched down to Ascalon to meet up with Richard's contingent, which had arrived several months before his own. However, while he was at Acre in spring 1241, a group of magnates wrote to Emperor Frederick II, who at that moment was protector of the kingdom of Jerusalem for his son Conrad, to request Simon's appointment as regent of the kingdom.¹⁰⁶ This request to award Simon an office in the Latin East was ineffective, as he was back in France in 1242.¹⁰⁷ And while it does not reveal anything about the movements of Simon's retinue, it indicates that he spent at least some of his time in Acre with family members, such as Philip de Montfort, lord of Toron, who was one of the letter's authors.¹⁰⁸

It is surprising, therefore, to find epigraphical evidence revealing that at least one of the men who set out with Simon, Hugh Wake, was with Earl Richard at Ascalon at some point during the crusade. A slab bearing Hugh's coat of arms was discovered at Ascalon in 1993. It was engraved over an Arabic inscription that had been created in 1150 to commemorate Fatimid building works, but in 1241 Hugh saw fit to carve his heraldry over the commemorative writing.¹⁰⁹ It cannot be ascertained based on the current evidence whether Hugh Wake was there because Earl Simon caught up with Richard of Cornwall or because Hugh swapped contingents; however, it does suggest some fluidity between the two forces. It may also explain why Matthew Paris listed Hugh Wake and Gerard de Furnival among the nobles who died while serving with Richard – rather than Simon – in the Holy Land. Potentially, Gerard and Thomas traveled to Ascalon to follow in the footsteps of their grandfather, who almost certainly spent time there with Richard the Lionheart during the Third Crusade, but this is conjecture. There is evidence, though, to argue that, unlike Hugh Wake's heraldry, the armies of the Barons' Crusade were not set in stone. A third generation of Furnival crusaders, no doubt inspired by the example of their forebears, but also sensitive to social expectations and possibilities, may well have viewed their time on crusade as an opportunity to build new political bonds, in this case with the brother of the king of England.

Conclusion

The Furnivals lost four family members to the cause of the Holy Land, and it is unlikely to be a coincidence that a break in their crusading tradition coincided with the deaths of two brothers during the Barons' Crusade. There is no evidence to indicate that any of the sons of Gerard III or Thomas (William is known to have had a daughter but no sons) fought in the crusade of the Lord Edward in 1270–72. When a William de Furnival went on crusade to Prussia in 1367 with five knights, it had been more than a century since the Barons' Crusade.¹¹⁰

Evidence indicates, though, that during the moments when the Furnivals chose to engage with the crusading movement in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, they did so for a range of interconnected

reasons. Historians have shown time and again that family tradition played an important role in motivating aristocrats to venture to theaters of crusade warfare, but a study of the Furnivals reveals that this family's political concerns could overpower tradition. Likewise, issues such as social pressure appear to have exerted a profound influence on the decision-making process of some Furnival crusaders and may have been a more significant motivation to crusade than an awareness of past crusading kin. However, after Gerard I's successful period of service with Richard the Lionheart during the Third Crusade, he stood as an example of how crusade participation could lead to social ascent and realignment, and it seems unthinkable that the next two generations took the cross without this in mind.

Placing emphasis on political and social concerns in explaining why several members of the same family took the cross – and at times abstained from taking the cross – does not undermine the importance of family tradition in explaining widespread involvement in crusading endeavors. In fact, the example of the Furnivals provides evidence that several interrelated factors were at work in motivating aristocrats to set out on crusade, but it also indicates that some family crusading traditions were more politically informed than others. For the Furnivals, crusading heritage appears to have been kindling that could fuel action but never the spark that ignited it.

Acknowledgments

An early version of this paper was presented at the Institute for Historical Research's Crusades and the Latin East Seminar Series. The questions that followed helped to shape it into its current form. I owe a special thanks to Gregory Lippiatt, who was kind enough to provide me with access to a draft of a recent article ahead of publication. I am also grateful to Andrew D. Buck, Nicholas L. Paul, Francesca Petrizzo, Fraser McNair, Thomas W. Smith, Benjamin Pohl, Luke Foddy and Hannah Boston for valuable discussions about various aspects of the topic under scrutiny here.


Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

ORCID iD

James Doherty  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6749-0794>

Notes

1. Emma Mason, "Fact and Fiction in the English Crusading Tradition: the Earls of Warwick in the Twelfth Century," *Journal of Medieval History* 14, no. 2 (1988): 81–95; Elizabeth Siberry, "The Crusading Counts of Nevers," *Nottingham Medieval Studies* 34 (1990): 64–70; Jonathan Riley-Smith, "Family Traditions and Participation in the Second Crusade," in *The Second Crusade and the Cistercians*, ed. Michael Gervers (New York: St Martin's Press, 1992), 101–8; idem, *The First Crusaders, 1095–1131* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 169–88; Kathleen Thompson, "Family Tradition and the Crusading Impulse: The Rotrou Counts of the Perche," *Medieval Prosopography* 19, no. 1 (1998): 1–33; Jonathan Phillips, "The Murder of Charles the Good and the Second Crusade: Household, Nobility, and Traditions of Crusading in Medieval Flanders," *Medieval Prosopography* 19, no. 1 (1998): 55–75; Michael Evans, "The Ferrers Earls of Derby and the Crusades," *Nottingham Medieval Studies* 44 (2000): 69–81; Penelope Adair, "Flemish Comital Family and the Crusades," in *The Crusades: Other Experiences, Alternate Perspectives*, ed. Khalil I. Semaan (Binghamton: Global Academic Publishing, 2003), 101–12; Nicholas L. Paul, "Crusade, Memory, and Regional Politics in Twelfth-Century Amboise," *Journal of Medieval History* 31, no. 2 (2005): 127–41; Scott Jessee,

- “Crusaders and Templars: Robert the Burgundian Lord of Craon and Sablé and his Descendants, 1095–1192,” *Medieval Prosopography* 30 (2015): 31–58; Andrew Abram, “The Pilgrimage and Crusading Activities of the Anglo-Norman Earls of Chester,” in *Crusading and Pilgrimage in the Norman World*, ed. Kathryn Hurlock and Paul Oldfield (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2015), 125–38; Andrew D. Buck, “Dynasty and Diaspora in the Latin East: the Case of the Sourdevals,” *Journal of Medieval History* 44, no. 2 (2018): 151–69; Ciarán McDonnell, “From the Boyne Valley to the Holy Land: the Crusading Tradition of Geoffrey de Geneville and Jean de Joinville,” in *Ireland and the Crusades*, ed. Edward Coleman, Paul Duffy and Tadhg O’Keeffe (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2022), 91–106.
2. Nicholas L. Paul, *To Follow in Their Footsteps: The Crusades and Family Memory in the High Middle Ages* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2012).
 3. Lars Kjær, “Conquests, Family Traditions and the First Crusade,” *Journal of Medieval History* 45, no. 5 (2019): 553–79.
 4. Paul, *To Follow in Their Footsteps*, 1.
 5. J. A. Everard, *Brittany and the Angevins: Province and Empire, 1158–1203* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 102 n. 31; Daniel Power, *The Norman Frontier in the Twelfth and Early Thirteenth Centuries* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 358 and 604; Wout van Voornveld, “Shifting Loyalties: The Twelfth-Century Fournivals,” *Foundations* 5 (2013): 81–101, at 86; G. E. M. Lippiatt, “The Zaran Company in the Holy Land: An Unknown Fourth Crusade Charter from Acre,” *Historical Research* 94, no. 266 (2021): 869–85, at 874.
 6. William Farrer, ed., *Early Yorkshire Charters*, Vol. 3 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013; first published 1916) [hereafter *EYC*], 6. On Gerard I’s holding of Munden, see n. 14 of this article. Simon Lloyd has calculated that the Furnival family was one of twelve with significant holdings in the kingdom of England who produced four or more crusaders in the thirteenth century: Simon Lloyd, *English Society and the Crusade, 1216–1307* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988), 103.
 7. For a thorough investigation of the intersecting influences affecting crusader motivation in thirteenth-century England, see Lloyd, *English Society*, 93–112, at 103.
 8. For detailed examination of the place of piety in crusade recruitment, see Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading* (2nd ed., Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009).
 9. In his crusade encyclical *Quantum praedecessores*, originally issued in December 1145, Pope Eugenius III challenged the knighthood of Christendom to demonstrate the same fortitude as had their fathers when capturing Jerusalem almost fifty years earlier. Pope Eugenius III, *Epistolae et privilegia*, *Patrologiae cursus completus*, series Latina 180, ed. Jacques-Paul Migne (Paris: J-P Migne, 1855), 1064–6 no. 48. Jonathan Phillips has argued that these were the “most powerful words” of the document, in his *The Second Crusade: Extending the Frontiers of Christendom* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007), 54.
 10. James Doherty, *The Creation of a Crusading Culture* (forthcoming).
 11. Christopher Tyerman, *England and the Crusades 1095–1588* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1988), 180; Lloyd, *English Society*, 102; Michael Lower, *The Barons’ Crusade: A Call to Arms and Its Consequences* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005), 45–8; Kathryn Hurlock, “Norman Influence on Crusading from England and Wales,” in Hurlock and Oldfield, *Crusading and Pilgrimage*, 71. Only Wout van Voornveld (see n. 5) has dedicated significant space to examining the Furnivals in the period before the 1180s.
 12. Van Voornveld, “Shifting Loyalties,” 88.
 13. Judith Everard and Michael Jones, eds., *The Charters of Duchess Constance of Brittany, 1171–1221* (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 1999), 13 Ge4, 17 Ge8 and 32 Ge30.
 14. Liber feodorum: *The Book of Fees, Commonly Called Testa de Nevill, Reformed from the Earliest MSS*, 3 Vols. (London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1920–31), i [hereafter *Liber feodorum*], 124: “Gerardus de Furnivall’ tenet Munden’ de domino rege de honore Britannie de dono comitis Galfridi.” It is reproduced in Everard and Jones, *Charters of Duchess Constance*, 20 Ge17.
 15. For accounts of Geoffrey’s death and the embassy to Henry II, see Rigord, *Gesta Philippi Augusti*, in *Oeuvres de Rigord et de Guillaume le Breton*, ed. H. François Delaborde, vol. 1 (Paris: Renouard, 1882), 68–9; Ralph of Diceto, *Opera historica*, Rolls Series 68, vol. 2, ed. William Stubbs (London: Longman, 1876), 43. For analysis of this episode, see Everard, *Brittany and the Angevins*, 140 and

- John W. Baldwin, *The Government of Philip Augustus: Foundations of French Royal Power in the Middle Ages* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986), 34. In addition to Eleanor, it is likely that Geoffrey had a second daughter, Matilda, who was not mentioned in the negotiations and had passed away by 1189: Malcolm A. Craig, "A Second Daughter of Geoffrey of Brittany," *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 50 (1977): 112–5. For Gerard in the household of Philip, see Joseph Roux, ed., *Cartulaire du chapitre de la cathédrale d'Amiens*, Vol. 1 (Amiens: Yvert et Tellier, 1905), 103 no. 76.
16. William the Breton, *Philippide*, in *Oeuvres de Rigord et de Guillaume le Breton*, ed. H. François Delaborde, Vol. 2 (Paris: Renouard, 1885), 82.
 17. Everard, *Brittany and the Angevins*, 140.
 18. Odo of Deuil, De profectioe Ludovici VII in orientem: *The Journey of Louis VII to the East*, ed. and trans. Virginia G. Berry (New York: Norton, 1948), 78–9.
 19. Hannah Boston, "Multiple Allegiance and Its Impact: England and Normandy, 1066–c.1204," *Haskins Society Journal* 32 (2021): 115–31.
 20. J. Horace Round, "Some English Crusaders of Richard I," *English Historical Review* 18, no. 71 (1903): 476; Lloyd, *English Society*, 102; Van Voornveld, "Shifting Loyalties," 81. Stephen Bennett places Gerard in King Richard's crusade contingent during the period 1189–1192, but he does not specify the date that Gerard joined Richard: Stephen Bennett, *Elite Participation in the Third Crusade* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2021), 376.
 21. John Gillingham, *Richard Coeur de Lion: Kingship, Chivalry and War in the Twelfth Century* (London: Hambledon Press, 1994), 148–9.
 22. Roger of Howden, *Chronica magistri Rogeri de Houedene*, Rolls Series 51, 4 Vols, ed. William Stubbs (London: Longman, 1868–71) [hereafter RH], iii, 59–60. This report undermines the argument put forward by Everard, although it does not of course disprove it (see n. 17).
 23. *Itinerarium peregrinorum et gesta regis Ricardi*, in *Chronicles and Memorials of the Reign of Richard I*, Rolls Series 38, vol. 1, ed. William Stubbs (London: Longman, 1864), 213–4; Ambroise, *The History of the Holy War: Ambroise's Estoire de la guerre sainte*, ed. Marianne Ailes and Malcolm Barber, and trans. Marianne Ailes, 2 Vols. (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2003), i, 74 and ii, 95.
 24. John Gillingham, *Richard I* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999), 164–5.
 25. Lionel Landon, ed., *The Itinerary of King Richard I with Studies on Certain Matters of Interest Connected with His Reign* (London: Pipe Roll Society, 1935), 99, 113, 118, 130, 132, 143, 145.
 26. Ralph V. Turner and Richard R. Heiser, *The Reign of Richard Lionheart: Ruler of the Angevin Empire, 1189–1199* (New York: Pearson Education, 2000), 204. For the Lovetot inheritance, see n. 6.
 27. Landon, *The Itinerary of King Richard I*, 145; Maurice Powicke, *The Loss of Normandy 1189–1204* (2nd ed., Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1960), 245–6.
 28. The last known reference to Gerard is in 1205 when Pope Innocent III requested his intervention in Antioch's succession crisis. Innocent III, *Regestorum sive epistolarum*, Patrologiae cursus completus, series Latina 215, ed. Jacques-Paul Migne (Paris: J-P Migne, 1855), 555–7 no. 1; trans as *The Deeds of Pope Innocent III*, ed. James Powell (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2004), 226–8. On the crisis, see Jochen Burgdorf, "The Antiochene War of Succession," in *The Crusader World*, ed. Adrian Boas (Abingdon: Routledge, 2016), 196–211.
 29. Ralph of Diceto, *Opera*, ii, 43: "duos milites mediae manus homines."
 30. Antonia Gransden, *Historical Writing in England c.550 to c.1307* (London: Routledge, 1996), 196; Michael Staunton, *The Historians of Angevin England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), 67–81.
 31. Ambroise, *History of the Holy War*, i, 192 and ii, 188.
 32. *Ibid.*, ii, 1–3.
 33. Marianne J. Ailes, "Heroes of War: Ambroise's Heroes of the Third Crusade," in *Writing War: Medieval Literary Responses to Warfare*, ed. Corinne Saunders, Françoise Le Saux and Neil Thomas (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2004), 29–48.
 34. See n. 25.
 35. Evans, "The Ferrers Earls of Derby and the Crusades," 73.

36. Theodore Evergates has demonstrated that the Second Crusade was a formative experience for the aristocracy of the county of Champagne, referring to those who participated as “the generation of ’47”: *Henry the Liberal: Count of Champagne, 1127–1181* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016), 21.
37. Bennett has also noted that warriors with useful skills could progress in Richard’s household: Bennett, *Elite Participation*, 211.
38. Voornveld, “Shifting Loyalties,” 89.
39. Stubbs, *Itinerarium*, 432–3; Ambroise, *History of the Holy War*, i, 192 and ii, 188; Thomas Asbridge, “Talking to the Enemy: the Role and Purpose of Negotiations between Saladin and Richard the Lionheart during the Third Crusade,” *Journal of Medieval History* 39, no. 3 (2013): 275–96.
40. See n. 28.
41. See n. 16.
42. Stubbs, *Itinerarium*, 415–16; Ambroise, *History of the Holy War*, i, 184 and ii, 182–3. See also, R. C. Smail, *Crusading Warfare (1097–1193)* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956), 188–9.
43. Powicke, *The Loss of Normandy*, 245–6.
44. Lippiatt, “The Zaran Company,” 883–4; *Rotuli litterarum patentium in turri Londinensi, 1201–1216*, ed. Thomas D. Hardy, Vol. 1 (London: Record Commission, 1835), 15.
45. See n. 15.
46. Lippiatt, “The Zaran Company,” 883.
47. *EYC*, 23 no. 1296. This charter is dated 1200–1218, but it can be narrowed to the period before 1205 due to Gerard I’s presence in the witness list. He cannot have been in England after this time. As demonstrated in Lippiatt (see n. 46), Gerard I can be placed in Acre in 1204.
48. *EYC*, 23–4 no. 1297.
49. *Rotuli litterarum clausarum in Turri Londonensi asservati, 1204–24*, ed. Thomas D. Hardy, Vol. 1 (London: Record Commission, 1833), 390 (the record reports that Gerard died at Jerusalem, but this is likely shorthand for a crusading venture to the East); James M. Powell, *Anatomy of a Crusade, 1213–1221* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986), 222; *EYC*, 24–25 no. 1298.
50. Iain Dyson is currently working on a PhD thesis at the University of Leeds about crusaders with significant holdings in Yorkshire in the period 1095–1300 in which he discusses a member of the Le Puiset family as a Yorkshire fourth crusader.
51. *Rotuli de oblatiis et finibus in Turri londinensi asservati, tempore regis Johannis*, ed. Thomas D. Hardy (London: Record Commission, 1835), 103.
52. *The Great Roll of Pipe for the Ninth Year of the Reign of King John Michaelmas 1207 (Pipe Roll 53)*, ed. A.M. Kirkus (London: Pipe Roll Society, 1946), 74; *EYC*, 6.
53. For the most thorough study of the crusader protection privilege, see Danielle Park, *Papal Protection and the Crusader: Flanders, Champagne, and the Kingdom of France, 1095–1222* (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2018).
54. On protection of lands in thirteenth-century England, see Lloyd, *English Society*, 154–97.
55. Tyerman, *England and the Crusades*, 90; Claire Taylor, “Pope Innocent III, John of England and the Albigensian Crusade (1209–1216),” in *Pope Innocent III and His World*, ed. J.C. Moore (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999), 205–28; Nicholas Vincent, “England and the Albigensian Crusade,” in *England and Europe in the Reign of Henry III (1216–1272)*, ed. Bjorn K.U. Weiler and I.W. Rowlands (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002), 67–97.
56. By August 1216, Gerard had sided with the rebels twice, but he appears to have been loyal to the crown into 1215: J.C. Holt, *The Northerners: A Study in the Reign of King John* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961), 29, 50 and 138.
57. Evans, “The Ferrers Earls of Derby and the Crusades,” 74–5; Tyerman, *England and the Crusades*, 97–9.
58. See n. 56.
59. RH, iv, 189–90 n. 4. Stubbs notes that the continuation is written in the same hand as that of the scribe who copied the *Chronica*.
60. *Rotuli litterarum clausarum in Turri Londonensi asservati, 1204–27*, 390.
61. *Calendar of the Charter Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office*, Vol. 1 (London: H. M. Stationery Office, 1903), 265.

62. The threat did, however, re-emerge in the 1230s. On this, see James Doherty, "Commemorating the Crusading Past in Late Medieval England: The Workshop Priory *Tabula*," *English Historical Review* 136, no. 581 (2021): 809–35, at 829.
63. RH, iv, 190; "Annales prioratus de Dunstaplia," in *Annales Monastici*, ed. H. R. Luard, 5 Vols. (London: Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts and Green, 1864–69) [hereafter *AM*], iii, 56.
64. RH, iv, 190; *AM*, iii, 56.
65. RH, iv, 190; *AM*, iii, 54.
66. Christopher Tyerman, "Were There Any Crusades in the Twelfth Century?," *English Historical Review* 110, no. 437 (1995): 553–77, at 569.
67. Tyerman, *England and the Crusades*, 98.
68. *Ibid.*, 97: "a most disparate group".
69. *Recueil des historiens des croisades: historiens occidentaux*, 5 Vols. (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1844–95) [hereafter *RHC Occ*], ii, 342–3; David Crouch, *William Marshal* (3rd ed., Abingdon: Routledge, 2016), 159–67.
70. *RHC Occ.*, ii, 343; Tyerman, *England and the Crusades*, 97.
71. Maurice Powicke, *The Thirteenth Century, 1216–1307* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962), 223–4.
72. *RHC Occ.*, ii, 343. The editor incorrectly identifies Gerard II as Gerard I.
73. Peter Edbury, "Ernoul, *Eracles* and the Fifth Crusade," in *The Fifth Crusade in Context: The Crusading Movement in the Early Thirteenth Century*, ed. E.J. Mylod, Guy Perry, Thomas W. Smith and Jan Vandeburie (London: Routledge, 2017), 163–74, at 169 and 172.
74. *AM*, iii, 54.
75. *Ibid.*, 56
76. *AM*, ii, 289 and 292.
77. Roger of Wendover, *Flores historiarum*, ed. Henry O. Coxe, 5 Vols. (London: English Historical Society, 1841–44), iii, 301 and iv, 44. As Simon Lloyd recognised, Wendover's list is a conflation of both the 1218 and 1219 expeditions from England: Lloyd, *English Society*, 82 n. 60.
78. *The Red Book of the Exchequer*, ed. Hubert Hall, 3 Vols. (London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1896), ii, 491, 504 and 592.
79. Holt, *Northerners*, 47.
80. *The Charters of the Anglo-Norman Earls of Chester, c. 1071–1237*, ed. Geoffrey Barraclough (Chester: Record Society of Lancashire and Cheshire, 1988), 456 no. 454.
81. Joseph Hunter, *Hallamshire: The History and Topography of the Parish of Sheffield in the County of York* (London: Lackington, 1819), 31–2. Hunter's genealogical description must be approached with the utmost caution, although the evidence he cites suggests that there was at the very least one daughter.
82. Roger of Wendover, *Flores historiarum*, iv, 144.
83. Lloyd, *English Society*, 83.
84. *Calendar of the Fine Rolls of the Reign of Henry III*, November 1235, nos. 21 and 22 [https://finerollshenry3.org.uk/content/calendar/roll_035.html#it003_018].
85. *Patent Rolls of the Reign of Henry III Preserved in the Public Record Office, 1225–1232* (London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1903), 361; David Carpenter, *Henry III: The Rise to Power and Personal Rule 1207–1258* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2020), 85–97.
86. *Epistolae saeculi XIII e regestis pontificum Romanorum selectae per G. H. Pertz*, Vol. 1, ed. Carl Rodenberg (Berlin: Weidmann, 1883), 491–5 no. 605; Matthew Paris, *Chronica majora*, ed. H. Richards Luard, *Rolls Series* 57, 7 Vols. (London: Longman, 1872–83), iv, 44.
87. Matthew Paris, *Chronica majora*, iii, 368–9 and iv, 43–4.
88. Sophie Ambler, *The Song of Simon de Montfort: England's First Revolutionary and the Death of Chivalry* (London: Picador, 2019), 76–8.
89. Paul, *To Follow in Their Footsteps*, 134–70.
90. Doherty, "Commemorating the Crusading Past," 814–21.
91. *Ibid.*, 820.

92. A third contingent would later set out under William de Forz: Ralph V. Turner, "William de Forz, Count of Aumale: An Early Thirteenth-Century English Baron", *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 115, no. 3 (1971): 221–49, at 248–9.
93. An image of the folio was published recently in Ambler, *Song of Simon de Montfort*, Plate 14.
94. Matthew Paris, *Chronica majora*, iv, 44.
95. See n. 46.
96. *Calendar of the Liberate Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office, Henry III, I: A. D. 1226–1240* (London: H. M. Stationery Office, 1916), 387.
97. On lands held of the king and further connections, see n. 14 and *Close Rolls of the Reign of Henry III Preserved in the Public Record Office, 1237–1242* (London: H. M. Stationery Office, 1911), 66.
98. *Foedera, conventiones, literae et cujuscunq[ue] generis acta publica*, ed. Thomas Rymer et al., new edition, Vol 1 Part 1 (London: Eyre and Strahan, 1816), 233–4.
99. Ambler, *Song of Simon de Montfort*, 86.
100. Doherty, "Commemorating the Crusading Past," 819–21.
101. Lower, *Barons' Crusade*, 48–9.
102. See n. 98.
103. Lower, *Barons' Crusade*, 45.
104. Sarah Lambert, "Crusading or Spinning," in *Gendering the Crusades*, ed. Susan B. Edgington and Sarah Lambert (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2001), 3; James Doherty, "The Presentation of Crusader Masculinities in Old Norse Sagas," in *Crusading and Masculinities*, ed. Natasha R. Hodgson, Katherine J. Lewis and Matthew M. Mesley (Abingdon: Routledge, 2019), 129–46.
105. A point also raised in Lower, *The Barons' Crusade*, 45.
106. Reinhold Röhrich, "Acte de soumission des barons du royaume de Jérusalem à Frédéric II," *Archives de l'Orient Latin* 1 (1881): 402–3; Ambler, *Song of Simon de Montfort*, 89–90 and Plate 15.
107. Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort*, 32.
108. Björn K. U. Weiler, *Henry III of England and the Staufien Empire, 1216–1272* (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2006), 103.
109. Adrian J. Boas, *Crusader Archaeology: The Material Culture of the Latin East* (Abingdon: Routledge, 1999), 166; Moshe Sharon, *Corpus Inscriptionum Arabicarum Palaestinae*, Vol. 1 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 178–83. An image is available online on the Met Museum website [<https://www.metmuseum.org/art/collection/search/479713>]. My thanks to Nicholas L. Paul for bringing this evidence to my attention.
110. Lloyd, *English Society*, 113–53; Timothy Guard, *Chivalry, Kingship and Crusade: The English Experience in the Fourteenth Century* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2013), 227.

Author Biography

James Doherty is a Teaching Fellow in Medieval History at the University of Birmingham. His research focuses on the impact of the crusading movement on medieval Europe.