

DIGITAL ACCESS TO SCHOLARSHIP AT HARVARD
DASH.HARVARD.EDU

HARVARD LIBRARY


Latin Literature and Frankish Culture in the Crusader States (1098–1187)

Citation

Yolles, Julian Jay Theodore. 2015. Latin Literature and Frankish Culture in the Crusader States (1098–1187). Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, Graduate School of Arts & Sciences.

Link

http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:17467480

Terms of use

This article was downloaded from Harvard University's DASH repository, and is made available under the terms and conditions applicable to Other Posted Material (LAA), as set forth at
https://harvardwiki.atlassian.net/wiki/external/NGY5NDE4ZjgzNTc5NDQzMGIzZWZhMGFlOWI2M2EwYTg

Accessibility

https://accessibility.huit.harvard.edu/digital-accessibility-policy

Share Your Story

The Harvard community has made this article openly available.
Please share how this access benefits you. Submit a story

Latin literature and Frankish culture in the Crusader States (1098–1187)

A dissertation presented

by

Julian Jay Theodore Yolles

to

The Department of the Classics

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in the subject of

Medieval Latin Philology

Harvard University

Cambridge, Massachusetts

April 2015

© 2015 Julian Jay Theodore Yolles

All rights reserved.

Dissertation Advisor: Jan Ziolkowski Julian Jay Theodore Yolles

Latin literature and Frankish culture in the Crusader States (1098–1187)

Abstract

The so-called Crusader States established by European settlers in the Levant at the end of the eleventh century gave rise to a variety of Latin literary works, including historiography, sermons, pilgrim guides, monastic literature, and poetry. The first part of this study (Chapter 1) critically reevaluates the Latin literary texts and combines the evidence, including unpublished materials, to chart the development of genres over the course of the twelfth century.

The second half of the study (Chapters 2–4) subjects this evidence to a cultural-rhetorical analysis, and asks how Latin literary works, as products by and for a cultural elite, appropriated preexisting materials and developed strategies of their own to construct a Frankish cultural identity of the Levant. Proceeding on three thematically different, but closely interrelated, lines of inquiry, it is argued that authors in the Latin East made cultural claims by drawing on the classical tradition, on the Bible, and on ideas of a Carolingian golden age.

Chapter 2 demonstrates that Latin historians drew upon classical traditions to fit the Latin East within established frameworks of history and geography, in which the figures Vespasian and Titus are particularly prevalent. Chapter 3 traces the development of the conception of the Franks in the East as a "People of God" and the use of biblical texts to support this claim, especially the Books of the Maccabees. Chapter 4 explores the extent to which authors drew on the legend of Charlemagne as a bridge between East and West.

Although the appearance of similar motifs signals a degree of cultural unity among the authors writing in the Latin East, there is an abundant variety in the way they are utilized, inasmuch as they are dynamic rhetorical strategies open to adaptation to differing exigencies.

New monastic and ecclesiastical institutions produced Latin writings that demonstrate an urge to establish political and religious authority. While these struggles for power resemble to some extent those between secular and ecclesiastical authorities and institutions in Western Europe, the literary topoi the authors draw upon are specific to their new locale, and represent the creation of a new cultural-literary tradition.

Table of contents

Part I: Latin literature from the Crusader States
Introduction 2
1. Latin literature from the Crusader States: a survey 9
1. Rationale for the organization of this survey 9
2. Historiography 11
3. Poetry 89
4. Pilgrim guides 129
5. Sermons 138
6. Monastic literature 149
7. Non-literary Latin texts 162
8. Coda: Latin orientalism and writings of problematic provenance 165
Part II: Latin literature and Frankish culture in the East
Introduction: The problem of cultural identity in the Latin East 171
2. Classical antiquity and the Latin East 181
1. Introduction: medieval Latin literature and the classics 181
2. A survey of classical literature in the Latin East 184
3. Excursus I: Stephen of Antioch and the copying of rhetorical texts 189
4. Modernity vs. antiquity in the Latin East 191
5. Excursus II: Monuments of antiquity in the Levant 196
6. Mapping classical myth onto the Holy Land 200
7. Excursus III: classical heroism in Ralph of Caen 209
8. Roman history in the Latin East 212
9. The crusade of Titus and Vespasian 220
10. Conclusion 230
3. The Bible and the Latin East 233
1. *Langue chrétienne*? Medieval Latin as a Christian language 233
2. Cultural memory in the Holy Land: biblical imagery as a form of cultural expression 236
3. The crusaders: *Populus Dei*? 237
4. The First Crusade as Exodus 247
5. Excursus I: Lamentations of the Fall of Jerusalem 254
6. The kingdom of David: Biblical kings in Frankish Jerusalem 256

7. Excursus II: Gideon's paradox in William of Tyre 267
8. "New Maccabees" in the Latin East 269
9. Conclusion 294
4. In the footsteps of Charlemagne? Latin authors between East and West 299
1. Introduction 299
2. Charlemagne in the Latin East 303
3. Excursus I: An Antiochene song of Roland 318
4. Contesting Frankish identity 321
5. Marvels in the East: Between Paradise and the court of al-ʿĀḍid 331
6. Excursus II: Arabic philosophy and Latin intellectual authority 343
7. Conclusion 348
5. Conclusion 350
Appendix: list of manuscripts cited 360
Bibliography 367

Acknowledgements

Over the course of writing this dissertation, I have benefited from the intellectual and emotional support of innumerable friends, relatives, and colleagues, only a few of whom I will be able to mention here. Firstly, I owe an enormous debt of gratitude to the warm intellectual community of the Classics Department at the University of Amsterdam, where I learned the value of thorough philological investigation. Likewise, the Department of the Classics at Harvard University has proven to be supportive, stimulating, and remarkably generous. My advisor at Utrecht University, Babette Hellemans, continues to be of immense support, whose dedication I will never be able to repay.

I am profoundly grateful for the generosity afforded to me by the Dumbarton Oaks Research Library, where I profited from the wealth of research materials and knowledgeable staff and fellows. I must mention here Margaret Mullett, who tirelessly advocated an atmosphere of intellectual exchange, Deb Stewart, who intuited all of my bibliographical needs, and the fellows Deniz Turker Cerda, Nawa Sugiyama, and Saskia Dirkse, whose friendship helped me retain my sanity during some of the more frantic periods. Throughout the writing process, I have benefited immensely from the insightful remarks of my committee: Marcus G. Bull, Benjamin Z. Kedar, Richard J. Tarrant, and above all my advisor Jan M. Ziolkowski, from whose guidance I have profited immeasurably on both a personal and professional level. Whatever insights I am able to offer would not have been possible without Jan's continuous encouragement and development of my ideas, while any shortcomings are my own.

Finally, I am profoundly grateful to Coleman Connelly, whose friendship sustained me through graduate school, and to the Rife family, whom I will always consider my own family,

and who have been there for me through all the hardships life has to offer, as have been the Bos family, whom I love dearly. Lastly, I wish to dedicate this dissertation to my sister Bernadette Yolles, who has always stood by me and means everything to me.

Part I: Latin literature from the Crusader States

Introduction

1. Latin literature in crusader scholarship

On July 15 of the year 1099, an unlikely army, largely consisting of participants from Lower Lorraine, Normandy, central France, and Provence, conquered Jerusalem. When this heterogeneous army disbanded, some returned home to resume their daily lives while others stayed behind to administer the newly-founded Crusader States. In the vast body of scholarship on the crusades, the Crusader States have largely been studied in terms of their relation to Western Europe. Those who remained in the East after the First Crusade, however, quickly began to identify themselves separately from the West, as is evinced by the famous words of Fulcher of Chartres, writing shortly after 1120:

> Considera, quaeso, et mente recogita, quomodo tempore in nostro transvertit Deus Occidentem in Orientem. Nam qui fuimus occidentales, nunc facti sumus orientales. Qui fuit Romanus aut Francus, hac in terra factus est Galilaeus, aut Palaestinus. Qui fuit Remensis aut Carnotensis, nunc efficitur Tyrius vel Antiochenus. Iam obliti sumus nativitatis nostrae loca; iam nobis pluribus vel sunt ignota, vel etiam inaudita. Hic iam possidet domos proprias et familias quasi iure paterno et haereditario, ille vero iam duxit uxorem non tantum compatriotam, sed et Syram aut Armenam et interdum Sarracenam, baptismi autem gratiam adeptam . . . Diversarum linguarum coutitur alternatim eloquio et obsequio alteruter.Lingua diversa iam communis facta utrique nationi fit nota, et iungit fides quibus est ignota progenies . . . Qui erat alienigena, nunc est indigena, et qui inquilinus,[1] est utique incola factus.[2]

> Consider, I ask, and reflect, how in our age God has transformed the West into the East. For we who were Westerners have now been turned into Easterners. He who was a Roman or Frank has become a Galilean in this land, or a Palestinian. He who was from Reims or Chartres has now become a citizen of Tyre or Antioch. We have already forgotten the places of our birth; already they have become unknown to many of us, and even unheard of. Some already own their own homes and households as if by hereditary right, while others have already married—and not just women of their own people, but even Syrian and Armenian women, and sometimes even Saracens, after they have received the grace of baptism . . . Each uses the idioms and expressions of various languages in conversing. A mixed language has become a common

[1] I have altered the punctuation here from that of Hagenmeyer, as it makes better sense in the Latin and preserves the parallelism.

[2] Fulcher of Chartres, *Historia Hierosolymitana*, ed. H. Hagenmeyer (Heidelberg, 1913), 3.37. This edition will hereafter be referred to as FC. All translations are my own.

> tongue known to each nationality, and faith unites those who are of unknown descent . . . He who was born a stranger has now become a native, and he who was a foreigner has become indigenous.

With this new identity a new culture arose: legal, religious, and literary forms of expression offer a glimpse into a small, but not inconsiderable community that struggled to survive at the crossroads of East and West. When the Latin written sources from the Crusader States have been studied, it has largely been in an effort to glean from them such military and political information so as to reconstruct the historical events that took place, rather than to consider these texts as cultural artifacts in their own right. To study the Latin literature composed in the Crusader States until the Fall of Jerusalem in 1187, in an effort to answer how a new Latin culture was forged, will be the aim of the current project.

This dissertation will provide the first comprehensive study of the extant corpus of Latin literature from the Crusader States, including those sources that have not yet been edited. Using the tools of philology, by taking into account manuscript evidence, source criticism, and the study of literary, rhetorical, and poetic techniques, this dissertation will work toward a cultural history of the Latin Crusader States. One of the main lacunae that this dissertation will seek to fill is to analyze these texts as literature. It is a great shame, for instance, that William of Tyre, possibly the greatest literary stylist of the Middle Ages, has not received a proper treatment by scholars. By assessing works like those of William, but also of the likes of Ralph of Caen and Walter the Chancellor, and by taking seriously their literary aspirations, the notion can be challenged that the cultural contributions of the Latin East are slight and negligible.

The nineteenth century witnessed a true flourishing in the study of the Latin sources on the crusades: not only was the *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades* established, which sought to make foundational texts on the crusades in a variety of languages available in scholarly editions, but also the *Archives de l'Orient latin* and its successor, the *Revue de l'Orient latin*, in which

scholars such as Melchior de Vogüé, Paul Riant, and Charles Kohler greatly added to the known number of primary texts from the Latin East. Moreover, the concurrent publication of Hans Prutz's *Kulturgeschichte der Kreuzzüge* and Emmanuel Rey's *Les colonies franques de Syrie aux XIIe et XIIIe siècles* in 1883 provided the first extensive studies of the cultural dimensions of the Latin East.[3] Since then, there has been slow but steady interest in the cultural life of the Latin East, though its value and contribution has been assessed in widely different terms. In 1940 John LaMonte, for instance, rather optimistically concluded:

> The civilization of these states founded in the East as a result of the crusades was, I believe, more highly developed than that of the western states at the same period; only in Sicily and Spain did Europe produce an equally advanced culture and society.[4]

A more commonly held sentiment, however, is disappointment, as most clearly expressed in Steven Runciman's seminal history of the Crusades:

> The intellectual life of Outremer was, in fact, that of a Frankish colony. The courts of the kings and princes had a certain cosmopolitan glamour; but the number of resident scholars in Outremer was small; and wars and financial difficulties prevented the institution of real centres of study where native and neighbouring learning could have been absorbed. It was the absence of these centres that made the cultural contribution of the Crusades to Western Europe so disappointingly small.[5]

[3] H. Prutz, *Kulturgeschichte der Kreuzzüge* (Berlin, 1883); E. Rey, *Les colonies franques en Syrie aux XIIe et XIIIe siècles* (Genève, 1883).

[4] J. LaMonte, "The significance of the Crusaders' States in Medieval history," *Byzantion* 15 (1940–1), pp. 300–315, at p. 300.

[5] S. Runciman, *A History of the Crusades*, vol. 3, *The Kingdom of Acre and the later Crusades* (Cambridge, 1954), pp. 328–333.

The latter view predominated in much of the first half of the twentieth century, so that consequently the cultural dimensions of the Crusader States were largely neglected.[6] As a result, even today—despite the contributions of nineteenth-century philology—no comprehensive listing of all of the Latin works written in the Latin East can be found anywhere, and some texts have either not yet been edited or appear only in outdated and deficient editions.

New ground was broken by Robert Huygens, a classically-trained philologist who gave in 1964 his inaugural lecture at Leiden University, titled "Latijn in Outremer: een blik op de Latijnse letterkunde der kruisvaarderstaten in het Nabije Oosten" ("Latin in Outremer: a look at the Latin literature of the Crusader States in the Near East"), in which he provided a brief but important overview of the extant Latin literature from the Crusader States, and laid out a number of key lines of research, to which the current project is in many ways indebted.[7]

Huygens was followed by the consistent efforts of historians Rudolf Hiestand and Benjamin Kedar, who strove to present a fuller picture of the intellectual culture of the Crusader States, most importantly by bringing to light long-neglected or even completely unknown primary sources. In more recent years, they have been joined by Italian scholars Laura Minervini and Edoardo D'Angelo, who placed a renewed emphasis on manuscript study and scribal culture, and provided much-needed overviews of the extant primary sources produced in the ambit of the Latin East.[8]

---

[6] Mention should be made here of the short but valuable discussion of scientific writings from the Latin East in C.H. Haskins, *Studies in the history of mediaeval science* (Cambridge, Mass., 1927), pp. 130–140, as well as the important study of the cultural aspects of crusader Syria in C. Cahen, *La Syrie du nord à l'époque des croisades et la principauté franque d'Antioche* (Paris, 1940), pp. 3–18.

[7] R.B.C. Huygens, *Latijn in Outremer: Een blik op de Latijnse letterkunde der kruisvaarderstaten in het Nabije Oosten* (Leiden, 1964).

[8] L. Minervini, "Tradizioni linguistiche et culturali negli Stati Latini d'Oriente," in a. Pioletti and F. Rizzo Nervo (eds.), *Medioevo romanzo e orientale. Oralità, scrittura, modelli narrativi* (Messina, 1995), pp. 155–192; L. Minervini, "Produzione e circolazione di manoscritti negli stati crociati: biblioteche e 'scriptoria' latini," in A.

Mainstream crusader histories of recent years, unfortunately, have largely neglected these developments and continued to present a severely limited picture of the cultural aspects of the Latin East.[9] Thomas Asbridge's 2010 history of the Crusades devotes a mere two-and-a-half out of nearly seven-hundred pages to knowledge and culture in the Latin East, and only focuses on Antioch as a conduit to the West of Arabic science and medicine, an observation already dealt with extensively in Prutz's nineteenth-century study.[10] Malcolm Barber's expansive new book on the Crusader States, which promises to give a complete overview of the Latin East in all of its aspects, devotes less than a page-and-a-half to an incomplete summary of the literary works composed in the Latin East and to its intellectual climate.[11]

While recent histories of the crusades and the Crusader States can be faulted for tending to devote extremely limited attention to the literary and cultural aspects, the overviews of Minervini and D'Angelo present their own set of problems, inasmuch as they make no attempt at systematization or to distinguish between works that were produced in the Latin East or only loosely associated with it. This results in an eclectic and somewhat impressionistic picture that would be difficult at best to use as a tool by historians. The first objective of this study, therefore, is to establish a corpus of Latin literary texts produced in the Crusader States in the twelfth century; only then will it be possible to study the literature of the East, which will form the

---

Pioleti, F. Rizzo Nervo (eds.), *Il viaggio dei testi. Medioevo romanzo e orientale III* (Venice, 1999), pp. 79–96; L. Minervini, "Outremer," in P. Boitani, M. Mancini, A. Varvaro (eds.), *Lo spazio letterario del Medioevo. 2. Il Medioevo volgare*, vol. 1, *La produzione del testo* (Rome, 2001), II, pp. 611–648; L. Minervini, "Modelli culturali e attività letteraria nell'Oriente latino," *Studi medievali* 43:1 (2002), pp. 337–348; *Tancredus*, ed. E. D'Angelo, *CCCM* 231 (Turnhout, 2011), pp. lxxxv–xciv.

[9] Notable exceptions here being the overviews of crusader Latin provided in M. Balard, *Les Latins en Orient, Xe-XVe siècle* (Paris, 2006), pp. 149–167, and P. Edbury, "Crusader sources from the Near East (1099–1204)," in M. Whitby (ed.), *Byzantines and crusaders in non-Greek sources, 1025-1204* (Oxford, 2007), pp. 23–38.

[10] T. Asbridge, *The Crusades: The authoritative history of the war for the Holy Land* (New York, 2010), p. 184.

[11] M. Barber, *The Crusader States* (New Haven, 2012), pp. 207–208.

second part of this dissertation, where the aim will be to offer a cultural history of the Crusader States on the basis of the extant Latin literature by a series of discussions of the common themes and motifs that unite these texts.

2. Geographical and chronological delimitation

The focus of this dissertation will be the twelfth century, roughly extending from the establishment of the County of Edessa as the first Crusader State in 1098 to the Fall of Jerusalem in 1187. This scope is chosen for the reason that after the Fall of Jerusalem in 1187, when the only remaining center of crusader activities was Acre, the political and cultural circumstances in the Latin East changed to such an extent as to warrant independent study.

This chronological delimitation also provides a geographical one, for it was only after 1187 that the kingdom of Cyprus (1191) and the principality of Morea (1204) were founded, thereby limiting this study to the Crusader States in the Levant: the kingdom of Jerusalem and its lordships, the county of Tripoli, the principality of Antioch, and the county of Edessa.

3. Terminology

A brief note on terminology: I use the terms "Latin East," "Outremer," and "Crusader States" interchangeably, although each has its own set of drawbacks. "Latin East" is geographically vague and does not do justice to the cultural diversity that existed in the Levant under crusader rule, as it primarily indicates those of the "Latin" Christian denomination, as opposed to the many other religious groups that lived there: from Greek-speaking orthodox Christians, to Arabic-speaking orthodox Christians, Syrian Christians (also known as Jacobites),[12] Jews, and

[12] On these terms, see J. Pahlitzsch, *Graeci und Suriani im Palästina der Kreuzfahrerzeit. Beiträge und Quellen zur Geschichte des griechisch-orthodoxen Patriarchats von Jerusalem* (Berlin, 2001).

Muslims (both Sunni and Shi'a). Moreover, it privileges the perspective of Western Europe over that of the geographical area under discussion, as does "Outremer," which comes from the Old French meaning "[the land] beyond the sea." "Crusader States," on the other hand, carries with it connotations of modern political organization rather than a collection of loosely-organized lordships, while also being inaccurate to the extent that, after 1130, few inhabitants of the Crusader States had taken a vow of crusading.[13]

[13] See for this discussion of terminology A.V. Murray, "Outremer" in A.V. Murray (ed.), *The Crusades: an encyclopedia* (Santa Barbara, Calif., 2006), vol. 3, pp. 910–912, as well as his more recent comments in "Franks and indigenous communities in Palestine and Syria (1099–1187): A hierarchical model of social interaction in the principalities of Outremer," in A. Classen (ed.), *East meets West in the Middle Ages and Early Modern times: Transcultural experiences in the Premodern world* (Berlin, 2013), pp. 291–309, at 291–292.

1. Latin literature from the Crusader States: a survey

1. Rationale for the organization of this survey

Although historians who surveyed Latin works from the Crusader States have generally based their surveys on the places of composition, my study situates these texts primarily as literary works within their generic contexts. This approach has the advantage of allowing us to view the Latin East as a cultural unity, for although the individual Crusader States functioned more or less independently on political and administrative levels,[1] the mobility of many of our authors (e.g., Fulcher of Chartres, Ralph of Caen, Rorgo Fretellus, Gerard of Nazareth, William of Tyre), as well as many shared themes and motifs would indicate that the Latin East constituted, at least to some extent, a cultural unity.[2]

The subdivision here is not intended to suggest that these works necessarily existed separately from one another or did not share the same sources and often the same audience. Indeed, manuscript context alone often suggests otherwise, where pilgrim guides, historical narrative, sermon, and poetry feature side by side. This phenomenon should challenge scholarly notions about what it means for a text to be literary: in many ways, this is more a problem of modern terminology and approach than anything else.[3] For the purpose of a richer analysis, I have decided to cast a wide net, using as my criterion texts that include a narrative of some kind,

[1] M.W. Baldwin, "Ecclesiastical developments in the twelfth century Crusaders' State of Tripolis," *The Catholic Historical Review* 22:2 (1936), pp. 149–171, at p. 149.

[2] Further evidence of this can be found in the quotation from Fulcher of Chartres in the Introduction, in which inhabitants of Tyre, Galilee, and Antioch are all treated as part of the same cultural unity.

[3] For a similar discussion, framed in terms of scholarly definitions of "fiction," see M. Gabriele, *An empire of memory: the legend of Charlemagne, the Franks, and Jerusalem before the First Crusade* (Oxford, 2011), p. 7.

or, as literary theorists term it, a plot.[4] Medieval sermons, for instance, which a current reader might not classify as literature, often contain narrative elements. The sermons which survive from the Latin East, in particular, borrow elements (and sometimes insert verbatim quotations) from historiography to represent the past.

The focus on literary texts produced in the Latin East has also meant that some genres, such as legal and liturgical texts, will not be included, although they may enter into the discussion where appropriate.[5] Similarly, it will not be possible within the scope of this study to discuss in depth such disparate semi-literary compositions as letters and epigraphy.[6] Scientific texts and translations of Greek and Arabic works into Latin that were produced in Antioch are a special case. Since they hold importance for the general cultural development of the Latin East, I have included a short note on them, but I refer those interested in a more detailed discussion of these works to studies elsewhere.

Finally, numerous writings were produced in the West either by those who traveled to the East or received second-hand information from those who did. Most of these works give accounts of events of the First Crusade (Robert the Monk, Guibert of Nogent, Baudri of Bourgueil, Albert of Aachen, Ekkehard of Aura) and some of the Second Crusade (Odo of Deuil), while other accounts were written by pilgrims who later returned to Europe (e.g.,

[4] See, for instance, H. White, "The value of narrativity in the representation of reality," *Critical inquiry* 7 (1980), pp. 5–27.

[5] I direct those interested in liturgy to C. Dondi, *The liturgy of the Canons regular of the Holy Sepulchre of Jerusalem: a study and a catalogue of the manuscript sources* (Turnhout, 2004); see also the forthcoming dissertation of Cara Aspesi, focusing on the interplay between Frankish identity and liturgy at the Church of the Holy Sepulcher.

[6] For some of the problems posed by epigraphy in particular, where it is difficult to establish author, date, and audience, see recently P.-V. Claverie, "Les difficultés de l'épigraphie franque de Terre sainte aux XIIe et XIIIe siècles," *Crusades* 12 (2013), pp. 67–89.

Saewulf, John of Würzburg, Theoderich).[7] These texts may enter into consideration as source materials for other writings or as useful parallels, but our study will focus on those works that were produced, disseminated, and consumed in the Crusader States, and can therefore be said to reflect the culture of the Latin East.

The purpose, then, of the following account is to present synoptically all literary works composed in Latin by authors writing in the Crusaders States in the period 1098–1187, and to offer discussions on the available prosopographical and manuscript evidence and the scholarship thus far, as well as to situate each work within its generic context.

2. HISTORIOGRAPHY

It may be surprising to the modern reader to begin a survey of literature from the Latin East with a genre broadly classed as "historiography." This is because of the problematic notions of both the terms "literature" and "historiography," the medieval dimensions of which overlap only partially with our current understanding of these terms.[8] Instead of subscribing to diametrically opposed notions of history and fiction, medieval audiences expected historical writing to be a narrative conforming to a set of rhetorical rules. These narratives, which intended both to inform and to entertain, often display varying degrees of fluidity in their truth claims, transitioning between (what we would consider) more or less fictional elements. The dual aspects of historical

[7] For a recent overview of all of the major Latin accounts of the First Crusade, see A.V. Murray, "The siege and capture of Jerusalem in Western narrative sources of the First Crusade," in S.B. Edgington and L. García-Guijarro (eds.), *Jerusalem the golden: the origins and impact of the First Crusade* (Turnhout, 2014), pp. 191–215.

[8] See the limpid discussion in M. Otter, "Functions of fiction in historical writing," in N. Partner (ed.), *Writing medieval history* (Oxford, 2005), pp. 109–130.

truth and entertainment value are still present in the modern French ambiguity of the term *histoire*, which can mean both "story" and "history."[9]

As pointed out by Charles Homer Haskins, historical writing in the Middle Ages generally looked toward classical historiography as little more than a stylistic model, turning instead to Christian traditions of Late Antiquity as models of methodology, genre, and form.[10] Perhaps the earliest medieval theoretical discussion of history and historiography is the treatment of Isidore of Seville, who considers *historia* to be a part of *grammatica*, and defines it as follows: *Historia est narratio rei gestae, per quam ea, quae in praeterito facta sunt, dinoscuntur* ("*Historia* is the recounting of a past deed, through which the things that occurred in the past are learned").[11] Part of Isidore's legacy to the later Middle Ages is the concept of historiography as a narrative with an implied audience, as well as a view of the past as a collection of "deeds."

It has long been acknowledged that the twelfth century is the age when western medieval historiography came into its own.[12] A substantial impetus was given to this genre by the crusades, and the need to establish a (decidedly Christian) historical framework within which to interpret these events and to point out their relevance to a western audience. With such novel

---

[9] See C.S. Lewis, *The discarded image* (Cambridge, 1964), p. 179; B. Smalley, *Historians in the Middle Ages* (London, 1974), p. 7.

[10] C.H. Haskins, *The renaissance of the twelfth century* (Cambridge, Mass., 1927), pp. 224–277. See also F.-J. Schmale, *Funktion und Formen mittelalterlicher Geschichtsschreibung: eine Einführung* (Darmstadt, 1985), p. 108, and more recently the excellent discussion in H.-W. Goetz, *Geschichtsschreibung und Geschichtsbewusstsein im hohen Mittelalter* (Berlin, 1999), pp. 91–97, 112–114.

[11] Isid., *Etym.* 1.41. *Grammatica* is a concept that went beyond our current notion of grammar to include literature and the study and interpretation of literature more generally.

[12] See Haskins 1927, *ibid*., as well as the useful introduction in R. Ray, "Historiography," in F.A.C. Mantello and A.G. Rigg (eds.), *Medieval Latin: an introduction and bibliographical guide* (Washington, DC, 1996), pp. 639–649, and the overview in P. Classen, "*Res gestae*, universal history, apocalypse: visions of past and future," in R.L. Benson, G. Constable, and C.D. Lanham (eds.), *Renaissance and renewal in the twelfth century* (Oxford, 1982), pp. 387–417. For the role of the crusades in stimulating the genre of historiography in the twelfth century, see Reynolds 1990, pp. 47–57 and P. Damian-Grint, *The new historians of the twelfth-century Renaissance: inventing vernacular authority* (Woodbridge, 1999), p. 72.

subject matter, historiographers required new forms of expression. Previously, medieval historiography had taken as its subject either national history (for instance, Gregory of Tours' *Historia Francorum*, Bede's *Historia Anglorum*, and Paul the Deacon's *Historia Langobardorum*), the reign of individual rulers (e.g., Liudprand of Cremona's *Historia Ottonis*), or institutional history, usually focusing on monastic or episcopal activities (such as the *Liber pontificalis*, various *Gesta abbatum* and *Gesta episcoporum*, as well as individual *historiae eccelesiarum*), for which subject the annalistic form or chronicle was particularly well-suited.[13] Often the lines between historiography and related genres such as biography and hagiography were blurred, with Einhard's *Vita Karoli Magni* as prime example.

Early medieval historiography had evolved to incorporate various forms, ranging between all prose, all poetry (for example, Hrotsvita's *Gesta Ottonis*, the anonymous *Gesta Berengarii*), or a mixture of both, called a "prosimetrum"—although this latter form was still unusual in the early Middle Ages (mainly limited to Liudprand of Cremona's *Antapodosis* and Dudo of St. Quentin's *Gesta Normannorum*).[14]

The First Crusade posed two major problems for medieval historiographers.[15] First, it featured both secular and ecclesiastical actors and institutions: the events encompassed the deeds of both individual secular rulers and members of the clergy and the papal curia (notably Adhémar of Le Puy). Second, it involved heterogeneous armies from a wide range of western

[13] See M. Sot, "*Gestae*," in *Lexikon des Mittelalters* (Munich, 1980–1999), vol. 4, cols 1404–1406.

[14] For an overview of the prosimetrum in the medieval period, see J.M. Ziolkowski, "The prosimetrum in the classical tradition," in J. Harris and K. Reichl (eds.), *Prosimetrum: crosscultural perspectives on narrative in prose and verse* (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 45–65, as well as the in-depth study of B. Pabst, *Prosimetrum: Tradition und Wandel einer Literaturform zwischen Spätantike und Spätmittelalter* (Cologne, 1994), 2 vols., especially vol. 2, pp. 841–865 (on crusader prosimetra). In this study, I will follow Pabst by not defining the prosimetrum *a priori*, but rather by analyzing on a case-by-case basis what the precise relationship is between prose and poetry.

[15] Ironically, the medieval historical accounts of the crusades present no less of a difficulty for modern scholars, given the general neglect of the crusades in studies of medieval historiography. See for this the remarks in *The Historia Iherosolimitana of Robert the Monk*, ed. D. Kempf and M.G. Bull (Woodbridge, 2013), p. x.

Christendom. Many sources may appear to emphasize the French participation in the First Crusade, most of all in titles such as *Gesta Francorum*, *Dei Gesta per Francos*, but often the term *Francus* was employed inclusively to encompass crusaders of various nationalities.[16]

The earliest histories of the First Crusade were written from the perspective of persons who were intimately involved in the expedition. The genre developed quickly from such eyewitness reports with little attempt at complex narrative structures (*Gesta Francorum*, Peter Tudebode, Raymond of Aguilers) to more sophisticated compositions that endeavored to situate the events of the First Crusade within a larger scope of history (in particular, William of Tyre).

This transition is most visible in the work of Fulcher of Chartres, who, as we will discuss below, redacted his earlier eyewitness account, supplemented it with that of the *Gesta Francorum* and Raymond of Aguilers, and placed it within a larger history structured around the reigns of the first three rulers of Jerusalem. Unlike the author of the *Gesta Francorum*, Peter Tudebode, or Raymond of Aguilers, Fulcher inserted at key places within his narrative short commemorative poems, usually dactylic hexameters featuring internal or leonine rhyme. Although Ralph of Caen also produced a prosimetric history, his *Tancredus* must be considered separately from the work of Fulcher. Instead it stands in the tradition of Dudo of St. Quentin's *Gesta Normannorum*, in which a national history focused on the deeds of a specific ruler (in this case Rollo) is interspersed with lengthy poetic interludes. Walter the Chancellor, in contrast,

[16] See the discussions in J. Prawer, "The Franks: social stratification," in K.M. Setton (ed.), *A history of the crusades*, vol. 5, *The impact of the crusades on the Near East* (Madison, Wis., 1985), pp. 117–192; A.V. Murray, "Ethnic identity in the Crusader States: The Frankish race and the settlement of Outremer," in S. Forde, L. Johnson, and A.V. Murray (eds.), *Concepts of National Identity in the Middle Ages* (Leeds, 1995), pp. 59–73; M. Balard, "Gesta Dei per Francos: L'usage du mot 'Francs' dans les chroniques de la première Croisade," in M. Rouche (ed.), *Clovis - histoire & mémoire. Le baptême de Clovis, son écho à travers l'histoire: Actes du Colloque international d'histoire de Reims* (Paris, 1997), pp. 473–484; M. Bull, "Overlapping and competing identities in the Frankish First Crusade," in *Le concile de Clermont de 1095 et l'appel à la croisade* (Rome, 1997), pp. 195–211; A.V. Murray, "National identity, language and conflict in the crusades to the Holy Land, 1096–1192," in C. Kostick (ed.), *The crusades and the Near East* (New York, 2011), pp. 107–130.

chose to include short lyric poems commemorating the major historical events described in his work, and so expands on the model of Fulcher.

The work of William of Tyre represents the final development of Fulcher: like Fulcher, he integrates eyewitness reports within an overarching narrative, which he structures as a chronicle divided by the reigns of the rulers (kings or regents) of Jerusalem. In the process, William incorporates elements from the genre of imperial biography (notably Einhard and, through him, Suetonius).[17] William's greatest innovation is to frame the entire work within a general history of the Holy Land since the rise of Islam; this allows him to present a more sophisticated narrative explaining the events of the First Crusade.

In conclusion, the subgenre of crusader historiography was very much in flux since its appearance shortly after the First Crusade. It was highly unstable in form, structure, and register, largely depending on the author and purpose, the intended audience, and the general cultural milieu. We will explore each of these aspects below.

2.1 The earliest accounts of the First Crusade: *Gesta Francorum*, Peter Tudebode, and Raymond of Aguilers

Shortly after the conclusion of the First Crusade in 1099, the first accounts began to circulate. They are written from the perspective of eyewitnesses and draw from information assembled over the course of the crusade. Although they are of great historical importance, their value for the study of the culture of the Latin East is limited, precisely because of their early dating, and lies chiefly in the extent that they were drawn upon by later authors (including those writing in the Latin East). For the purposes of the present discussion, we will highlight briefly what we

[17] See on this P.F. Ainsworth, "Contemporary and 'eyewitness' history," in D.M. Deliyannis (ed.), *Historiography in the Middle Ages* (Leiden, 2003), pp. 249–276, at 260, and the discussion in Chapter 4 below.

know about the texts and their authors, and touch upon the debates that centered on these questions.

The first work to be discussed was written by an anonymous author, and hence it is known by its conventional title: *Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum* ("The deeds of the Franks and other Jerusalem-bound pilgrims"), or simply *Gesta Francorum*. It is perhaps the earliest of the historical works on the First Crusade and represents an eyewitness account of a participant, covering the events from the Council of Clermont in November of 1095 through the Battle of Ascalon in August of 1099.

When the first modern critical edition of the *Gesta Francorum* appeared in the *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades* in 1866, the text was deemed to be an abbreviation of the work of Peter Tudebode and consequently titled *Tudebodus abbreviatus*.[18] In his edition of 1890, Heinrich Hagenmeyer revived Heinrich von Sybel's argument for the primacy of the *Gesta Francorum*, with copious (though at times dubious) evidence drawn from the text to argue that, far from being an unoriginal abbreviator, the author was an eyewitness to and participant in the events he described, and that his narrative should be considered the source for later accounts.[19] Moreover, the author was a layman—probably a knight—from Southern Italy in the service of Bohemond. This position was subsequently challenged by Louis Bréhier, who put forth the thesis that the text of the *Gesta Francorum* as we now have it was compiled by a member of the clergy, who combined at least two different accounts into a single narrative.[20] Bréhier's complex view of

[18] *Tudebodus abbreviatus*, ed. P. Le Bas, *RHC Oc*, vol. 3, pp. 121–163. The *editio princeps* of the text appeared earlier in *Gesta Dei per Francos*, ed. J. Bongars (Hanau, 1611), vol. 1, pp. 1–29.

[19] H. von Sybel, *Geschichte des ersten Kreuzzuges* (Düsseldorf, 1841), pp. 22–33; *Anonymi Gesta Francorum*, ed. H. Hagenmeyer (Heidelberg, 1890).

[20] *Histoire Anonyme de la première Croisade*, ed. L. Bréhier (Paris, 1924). This view was followed in A.C. Krey, "A neglected passage in the *Gesta*," in L.J. Paetow (ed.), *The Crusades and other historical essays presented to Dana C. Munro* (New York, 1928), pp. 57–76; H. Oehler, "Studien zu den *Gesta Francorum*," *Mittellateinisches*

the nature of the text did not gain wide acceptance; instead, Hagenmeyer's position as restated by Rosalind Hill was to become the common view.[21]

Since the relationship of dependency between the *Gesta Francorum* and Peter Tudebode was by now considered to be the reverse from that presented in the *Recueil*, John and Laurita Hill tried to salvage the reputation of Peter Tudebode by proposing that both the author of the *Gesta Francorum* and Peter Tudebode had access to a now lost common narrative.[22] This position was followed more recently by Jean Flori and Jay Rubenstein, the latter of whom strove to upset the common view that the *Gesta Francorum* was the source for both Tudebode and Raymond of Aguilers by highlighting inconsistencies and unexplained omissions, and posited that the *Gesta Francorum* represents a later draft of an earlier compilation of various "camp-fire tales" as well as sermons.[23] According to this view, different versions of this "Ur-Gesta" circulated, one of

---

Jahrbuch 6 (1970), pp. 58–97; C. Morris, "The *Gesta Francorum* as narrative history," *Reading Medieval Studies* 19 (1993), pp. 55–71.

[21] *Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum*, ed. R. Hill (Oxford, 1962). This edition will henceforth be abbreviated as *GF*. This position still holds much sway—see especially the work of John France: "The Anonymous 'Gesta Francorum' and the 'Historia Francorum qui ceperunt Iherusalem' of Raymond of Aguilers and the 'Historia de Hierosolymitano itinere' of Peter Tudebode: an analysis of the textual relationship between primary sources for the First Crusades," in J. France and W.G. Zajac (eds.), *The crusades and their sources. Essays presented to Bernard Hamilton* (Aldershot, 1998), pp. 39–69; "The use of the anonymous *Gesta Francorum* in the early twelfth-century sources for the First Crusade," in A.V. Murry (ed.), *From Clermont to Jerusalem. The crusades and crusader societies 1095–1500* (Turnhout, 1998), pp. 29–42; "*Gesta Francorum*," in *CE*, vol. 3, pp. 529–530. See also Conor Kostick's summary of the state of the question: C. Kostick "A further discussion on the authorship of the 'Gesta Francorum,'" *Reading Medieval Studies* 35 (2009), pp. 1–14.

[22] *Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere*, ed. J. Hill and L. Hill (Paris, 1977) and *Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere*, tr. *idem* (Philadelphia, 1974).

[23] Flori's reformulation of the Hill's thesis is argued most extensively in his recent book *Chroniqueurs et propagandistes: introduction critique aux sources de la première croisade* (Geneva, 2010); see also his earlier piece, "De l'anonyme normand à Tudebode et aux Gesta Francorum: l'impact de la propagande de Bohémond sur la critique textuelle des sources de la première croisade," *Revue de l'histoire ecclésiastique* 102 (2007), pp. 717–746, as well as Edoardo's D'Angelo's similar approach in his edition of the Monte Cassino chronicle, earlier known as the *Historia Belli Sacri*: *Hystoria de via et recuperatione Antiochiae atque Ierusolymarum (olim Tudebodus imitatus et continuatus): i Normanni d'Italia alla prima crociata in una cronaca cassinese*, ed. E. D'Angelo (Florence, 2009), pp. 12–59. For Jay Rubenstein, see "What is the *Gesta Francorum*, and who was Peter Tudebode?" *Revue Mabillon* 16, 2nd series (2005), pp. 179–204.

which was utilized by Peter Tudebode, who added a few personal anecdotes to a preexisting account.

The final word on the issue of the relation between the *Gesta Francorum* and Peter Tudebode has not yet been said—and there may never be a satisfactory answer—but it is clear that these texts represent the earliest extant accounts of the First Crusade, and which, given their use in later accounts, circulated in the Latin East in the early days of the twelfth century.[24] We do not know precisely when the *Gesta Francorum* was written, but it has been suggested that the *libellus* ("booklet") that Ekkehard of Aura claims to have seen upon coming to Jerusalem in 1101 was in fact the *Gesta Francorum*.[25] More cogent evidence for its circulation in Jerusalem is its use in the histories of Raymond of Aguilers and Fulcher of Chartres: Raymond probably wrote his account before 1105, while Fulcher must have written an early version of his history by 1106 (see below).

The account ascribed to one Peter Tudebode largely corresponds to that of the *Gesta Francorum*, with many passages being nearly identical.[26] There are a few passages unique to Peter Tudebode, and if we accept Jay Rubenstein's hypothesis, some of these may represent personal anecdotes on the part of the author-compiler.[27] What little information we know about

[24] I await the forthcoming new edition of the *Gesta Francorum* by Marcus Bull, which may shed more light on the matter.

[25] E.g., Runciman 1951, pp. 329–330; *GF*, p. ix. For the passage in Ekkehard, see See *Ekkehardi Uruagensis Hierosolymita: De oppressione liberatione ac restauratione Jerosolymitanae Ecclesiae*, *RHC Oc*, vol. 5, pp. 1–40, at 21.

[26] The first printed edition was made on the basis of a manuscript discovered by Jean Besly in 1641, to be replaced by the appearance of the first critical edition of Henri Wallon and Adolphe Régnier for the *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades* in 1866: *Historia de Hierosolymitano itinere*, ed, J. Besly in A. Duchesne (ed.), *Historiae Francorum scriptores*, vol. 4 (Paris, 1641), pp. 773–815, repr. in *PL*, vol. 155, cols. 757–822, and based on Paris, BnF, MS Lat. 4892; *Historia de Hierosolymitano itinere*, ed. H. Wallon and A. Régnier, in: *RHC Oc*, vol. 3 (Paris, 1866), pp. 1–117. The most recent critical edition is that of John and Laurita Hill in 1977, which follows the reading of perhaps the oldest manuscript: *Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere*, ed. J. Hill and L. Hill (Paris, 1977).

[27] See *Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere*, ed. J. Hill and L. Hill (Paris, 1977), pp. 16–18, for a list of passages that receive a fuller treatment in Peter Tudebode than in the *Gesta Francorum*, as well as passages unique to Peter

the author comes from these anecdotes, the most important of which occurs during the narrative of the siege of Jerusalem. After a description of a procession led by Arnulf (soon to become first Latin patriarch of Jerusalem) from the Mount of Olives to the Valley of Jehoshaphat and back during the siege of Jerusalem, we find the following comment:

> Credendus est qui primus hoc scripsit, quia in processione fuit, et oculis carnalibus vidit, videlicet Petrus sacerdos Tudebovis Sivracensis.[28]

> Credence should be given to the one who first recorded this, since he took part in the procession and witnessed it with his bodily eyes—that is to say, Peter Tudebode, priest of Civray.[29]

Usually this note is taken as an autobiographical remark, although the use of the third person could also mean that the compiler here was referring to his source for the account of the procession. In either case, there is an earlier passage during the narrative of the battle of Antioch that represents a personal anecdote:

> In sexta vero feria, similiter preliaverunt per totum diem, occideruntque multos ex nostris. In illo die fuit sauciatus quidam probissimus miles, videlicet nomine Arvedus Tudebovis, quem detulerunt socii eius usque deorsum in civitatem. Ibique fuit vivus in sabbato, et inter nonam et sextam horam migravit a seculo, vivens in Christo. Corpus eius sepelivit quidam sacerdos frater eius ante occidentalem portam beati Petri apostoli, habens maximum timorem sicuti amittendi caput, et omnes alii qui in civitate ernat. Omnes legentes et audientes deprecamur ut dent elemosinas et orationes dicant pro anima eius et pro omnium defunctorum animabus qui in Ierosolimitana via mortui fuerunt.[30]

Tudebode. This edition will henceforth be abbreviated to PT. See also the introduction to the translation: *Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere*, tr. J. Hill and L. Hill (Philadelphia, 1974), pp. 6–8.

[28] PT, p. 138. I have adopted here the reading of the three manuscripts designated as BCD. Manuscript A, which has been arbitrarily preferred to the other manuscripts, only reads here: *Petrus Tudebodus*.

[29] It is unclear whether it is meant that Peter was born in Civray or was a priest at Civray. On this matter, see also Rubenstein 2005, p. 189, and more generally B.Z. Kedar, "Toponymic surnames as evidence of origin: some medieval views," *Viator* 4 (1973), pp. 123–129, and more recently I. Shagrir, "The medieval evolution of by-naming: notions from the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem," in I. Shagrir, R. Ellenblum, J. Riley-Smith (eds.), *In Laudem Hierosolymitani: studies in Crusades and medieval culture in honour of Benjamin Z. Kedar* (Aldershot, 2007), pp. 49–59.

[30] PT, p. 97.

> On Friday, they fought similarly for the entire day, and many of our men fell. On that day was wounded one most valiant knight by the name of Arvedus Tudebodus, whom his companions carried down to the city. There he remained alive until Saturday, when he passed from this world between the ninth and the sixth hour to live in Christ. A priest, who was his brother, buried him in front of the West gate of St. Peter the Apostle, although he feared greatly as though he would suffer death by decapitation—and so did all others in the city. I beseech those reading and listening to offer alms and prayer for his soul and for all souls of those who died on the way to Jerusalem.

If we may assume that the priest mentioned here, who was a brother to Arvedus Tudebodus, can be identified with Peter Tudebode, then it becomes clear that the author has adopted the third person as a stylistic device, one that breaks down when the author addresses his audience on behalf of his deceased brother. One final passage can be classified as a personal reminiscence among those passages which are not in the *Gesta Francorum*, in which Peter recounts the death of yet another brother by the name of Arnaldus at the battle of Antioch.[31] Unlike Raymond of Aguilers, it is not precisely clear in whose entourage Peter participated in the crusade. Jay Rubenstein pointed out that there is frequent emphasis on the deeds of Gaston of Béarn, a follower of William of Aquitaine (who, however, did not participate in the First Crusade), unlike the *Gesta Francorum*, which is more squarely focused on Bohemond of Taranto.[32]

Like the anonymous author of the *Gesta Francorum* and Peter Tudebode, Raymond of Aguilers is shrouded in mystery.[33] All that is known about him is what can be gathered from his own writing, in which he states that he was a canon of Le Puy (modern-day Le Puy-en-Velay in

[31] PT, p. 116: *Ibique, cum multis aliis qui Deo feliciter animas reddiderunt, pro cuius amore illic congregati fuerant, quidam obtimus miles, Arnaldus scilicet Tudabovis, interfectus fuit.*

[32] Rubenstein 2005, p. 189.

[33] Uncertainty even surrounds the spelling of his place of origin, which is variously written in the manuscripts as *Agilers*, *Agiles*, *Aguilers*, and *Aguillers.* The most recent editors Hill and Hill 1969 tentatively suggest (p. 10, n. 2) that the toponym refers to the church of l'Aiguille of Le Puy, and offer as alternatives the commune of d'Aiguilhe in the canton of Le Puy Nord-Ouest or Aiguilhes in the commune of Laussonne, in the canton of Monastier. See *Le "Liber" de Raymond d'Aguilers*, ed. J.H. Hill and L.L. Hill (Paris, 1969), p. 10 n. 2. All references to Raymond's text will be to this edition, which will henceforth be abbreviated as RA.

the Haute-Loire in south central France) before accompanying Count Raymond IV of Toulouse as chaplain on the First Crusade.[34] We know nothing more of him, whether he returned to France after the conquest of Jerusalem, stayed behind in Jerusalem, or remained part of Raymond IV's retinue.

Several arguments can be adduced in favor of placing the composition of Raymond of Aguilers' work in the East rather than the West. At the end of his work, Raymond still belongs to the retinue of the Count of Toulouse, recording his own eyewitness account of the Battle of Ascalon on the twelfth of August in 1099. The work may be incomplete, however, given the abrupt ending—a description of an otherwise unknown Turk by the name of Bohemond—and so we may be missing important information regarding Raymond's later fortunes. Yet we do know that Raymond IV never returned to his homeland: Fulcher tells us that after the Battle of Ascalon he went to Laodicea, leaving his wife there before seeking assistance from Alexios Komnenos in Constantinople, and after some unsuccessful ventures over the next few years, eventually died during the siege of Tripoli in 1105.[35] Raymond's account, moreover, was used by Fulcher of Chartres as early as 1106 (see below), so the text must have been accessible in some form in Jerusalem, which strongly suggests that the work was composed in the Latin East.

Raymond's work covers the First Crusade, including events immediately subsequent to the capture of Jerusalem in 1099 (such as the Battle of Ascalon), and since the author does not mention the death of Raymond IV in 1105, he likely wrote in the early years of the twelfth century.[36]

---

[34] See Raymond's salutation: *Raimundus canonicus Podiensis*.

[35] See FC, 1.32.1, 1.34.7.

[36] A.C. Krey, *The first crusade: the accounts of eye-witnesses and participants* (Princeton, 1921), p. 9 n. 15; RA, p. 7.

The salutation indicates that Raymond had a co-author in writing his history, one otherwise unknown Pons of Balazuc (*Pontius de Baladuno*), a knight in the retinue of Raymond IV who died during the siege of ʻArqa in the winter of 1099 in present-day Lebanon, but it is generally assumed that Raymond is the one chiefly responsible for the work.[37] The authorial first person singular does occur, but authorship is made explicit only after the death of Pons of Balazuc.[38] This event marks a key moment in the narrative:

> Interfectus est ibi Pontius de Baladuno cum lapide de petraria, cuius ago precibus ad omnes ortodoxos, et maxime ad transalpinos, et ad te reverende presul Vivariensis, hoc opus cui scribere curavi. Nunc autem quod reliquum est, Deo inspirante, qui hęc omnia fecit, eadem caritate qua incepi perficere curabo. Oro igitur et obsecro omnes qui hęc audituri sunt, ut credant hęc ita fuisse. Quod si quicquam ego preter credita et visa studio, vel odio alicuius aposui, aponat michi Deus omnes plagas inferni, et deleat me de libro vitę. Etenim licet ut plurima ignorem, hoc unum scio quia cum promotus ad sacerdotium in itinere Dei sim, magis debeo obedire Deo testificando veritatem, quam in texendo mendatia, alicuius muneris captare dispendia.[39]

> Pons of Balazuc was killed there by a rock hurled from a siege engine, on whose behalf I pray to all Catholics, and especially to those across the Alps, and to you, reverend bishop of Viviers, to whom I have directed this work. Now I will try to finish the remainder with the same loving dedication as I have begun it—provided that God, who has created all of these things, will inspire me. I pray, therefore, and beg all who will hear this, that they believe that these things have been so. However, if I have added anything out of envy or hate to anyone that is not believed, may God set the torments of Hell before me, and may he strike me from the Book of Life. Indeed, though I am ignorant of much, I know this: namely that I, when I was promoted to the priesthood during God's expedition, ought rather to obey God by bearing testimony to his truth rather than to seek the rewards of some gift by weaving lies.

[37] The knight is usually referred to by scholars as Pons of Baladun, but as Jean Flori pointed out, the toponym likely refers to Balazuc in the *département* of Ardèche. See Flori 2010, p. 173 n. 2. For the death of Pons, see RA, pp. 107–108.

[38] Compare, for instance, *Et ego qui scripsi hęc cum solus mucro adhuc appareret super terram, osculatus sum eam* (RA, p. 75) with *Aliquando namque cum profiscisci ab Antiochia vellemus, venit sacerdos iste ad me, Raimundum, et dixit michi* . . . (RA, p. 131). When dealing with the death of Adhémar of Le Puy, there is an important instance of such a statement using the first person plural rather than the singular: *Tantusque luctus omnium christianorum in morte eius fuit, ut nos qui vidimus cum pro magnitudine rerum scribere curavimus, comprehendere aliquatenus nequivimus* (RA, p. 84). This could merely be a use of the "majestic plural," but it may also point to a joint compositional activity. For other authorial statements, see RA, p. 84, pp. 107–108, pp. 120–121, p. 132, p. 133.

[39] RA, pp. 107–108. The event is also reported by Peter Tudebode (PT, p. 131).

This single, information-packed passage functions almost as a programmatic statement: Raymond restates his audience, his purpose in writing, and his credentials. Let us address these in order.

The work is addressed to the bishop of Viviers, probably Leger (d. 1119), which had close ties with the abbey of Chaise-Dieu, apparently much frequented by Raymond IV.[40] His audience therefore primarily consisted of clergy members of the Languedoc, not far from his own diocese. Raymond specifies that within the broader Catholic community (*ad omnes ortodoxos*), he writes specifically to those "across the Alps" (*transalpinos*), reflecting a perspective of writing far from his homeland.[41] Raymond envisions this audience as listeners (*omnes qui hęc audituri sunt*), and elsewhere he describes his activity in terms of an oral performance.[42]

Raymond's stated purpose is to write a careful and reliable account of the truth (*testificando veritatem*), and at the start of his work he had proposed to rectify rumors and lies—possibly rumors concerning his patron Raymond IV spread by deserters. His credentials for doing so derive from his close observation of the events he describes in his capacity as chaplain of Count Raymond IV, which he became in the course of the crusade (*promotus ad sacerdotium in itinere Dei sim*). Moreover, such a purpose makes sense only in hindsight, implying a kind of editorial activity that reveals something about the way that the authors worked: presumably notes were kept along the way (indicating that some kind of travel narrative had been planned from the

[40] RA, p. 6 (and see n. 20).

[41] A similar usage can be found in William of Tyre's *ultra-* and *transmontanus*, for which see the discussion below. Compare also Gerard of Nazareth, *De conv.* 26: *Hugo transalpinus*.

[42] See e.g., RA, p. 82: *Vidi ego hęc quę loquor, et dominicam lanceam ibi ferebam*.

outset), which were then redacted by Raymond of Aguilers.[43] The redaction likely occurred after the conquest of Jerusalem, but may not have coincided with the end of the narrative as we have it, as Raymond may well have continued his narrative at a later point. As we will see below, Fulcher of Chartres resorts to a similar *modus operandi*.

Given the fact that Raymond's text appears conjointly with those of Fulcher of Chartres and Walter the Chancellor (always appearing last in the sequence) in early manuscripts, these texts are very likely to have circulated together since the early days of twelfth-century Jerusalem.[44]

Raymond's account was read and employed in the Latin East not long after it was written: it was used extensively by Fulcher of Chartres, as well as by Fulcher's abbreviator Bartolf of Nangis, and still later by William of Tyre for his account of the First Crusade.

2.2 Fulcher of Chartres, *Historia Hierosolymitana*

Fulcher of Chartres wrote a history of the First Crusade that started out like the eyewitness accounts discussed in the previous section. Unlike these texts, Fulcher continued his history, chronicling the first three decades of the Latin kingdom, and therefore wrote one of the earliest works that can be said to reflect Frankish culture in the East. Fulcher provides us with valuable insight into the life of an intellectual interpreting the world, nature, and tumultuous events of his time and locale, casting them within the mold of Christian Latin, and he has long been acknowledged not only as a valuable historical source for the events of the First Crusade and of

[43] See also the comments in Flori 2010, p. 174.

[44] As first suggested by Hagenmeyer (FC, pp. 91–92): ". . . es ist die Annahme naheliegend, wenn auch nicht strikte erweisbar, daß die Sammlung der Schriften, wie sie in diesen Codices sich uns darbietet, in denen nebst Fulcher auch Galter Cancell. und Raimund de Aguilers enthalten sind, in Jerusalem also gefertigt und ins Abendland verbracht worden ist." See more recently the extensive argumentation in J. Rubenstein, "Putting history to use: three crusade chronicles in context," *Viator* 35 (2004), pp. 131–168.

the first three decades of the Crusader States, but also for his breadth of learning and keen perception of the human condition.[45] Before discussing the nature of his work, let us turn to the person of Fulcher.

Fulcher's date of birth can be reconstructed on the basis of two self-referential poems in the third book of the *Historia Hierosolymitana*.[46] In the first of these, Fulcher references Baldwin II's imprisonment at the hands of the emir Balak in 1123, and proclaims never to have seen in his sixty-five years of age a king captured equal to him in stature.[47] In the other poem, Fulcher relates that he is sixty-six years old when Iveta, Baldwin II's daughter, is released from her captivity in 1125.[48] Fulcher must therefore have been born in 1059. As for his place of birth, Fulcher refers to himself as *Carnotensis* ("from Chartres"), and at one point describes his

[45] Fulcher is described by Runciman (1951, vol. 1, p. 329) as the "best educated of the Latin chroniclers and the most reliable." For a similar appraisal, see more recently S.B. Edgington, "Fulcher of Chartres," in *CE*, vol. 2, pp. 489–490, at p. 489. The *editio princeps* of Fulcher appeared in Jacques Bongars' *Gesta Dei per Francos*, who used two manuscripts of the first recension: *Gesta Dei per Francos*, ed. J. Bongars (Hanover, 1611), pp. 381–440. This was followed three decades later by the edition of André Duchesne for the *Historiae Francorum Scriptores*, who used a manuscript of the second recension, supplemented by the text of Bongars: *Historiae Francorum Scriptores*, ed. A. Duchesne, vol. 4 (Paris, 1641), pp. 816–889. In 1717, Edmond Martène and Ursin Durand published for the *Thesaurus novus anecdotorum* for the first time the Prologue of Fulcher's *Historia*, which they found in a manuscript of the second recension, and which was combined with the text of Duchesne in 1854 for the *Patrologia Latina*: *Thesaurus novus anecdotorum*, ed. E. Martène and U. Durand, vol. 3 (Paris, 1717), p. 364; *PL*, vol. 155, pp. 821–942. A much-needed critical edition, based on eleven manuscripts as well as the readings of Bongars and Duchesne, was prepared in 1866 by Henri Wallon for the *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades*, which, however, has since been superseded by the critical edition of Heinrich Hagenmeyer in 1913, which makes use of two additional manuscripts and corrects a number of faulty readings found in the *Recueil*: *RHC*, vol. 3, pp. 311–485; *Historia Hierosolymitana*, ed. H. Hagenmeyer (Heidelberg, 1913), henceforth FC. For English translations, see: M.E. McGinty (tr.), *Chronicle of the first crusade (Fulcheri Carnotensis Historia hierosolymitana)* (Philadelphia, 1941); F.R. Ryan (tr.), *A history of the expedition to Jerusalem, 1095-1127 [by] Fulcher of Chartres* (Knoxville, Tenn., 1969).

[46] A seminal study of the life and work of Fulcher can be found in W. Giese, "Untersuchungen zur Historia Hierosolymitana des Fulcher von Chartres," *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 69 (1987), pp. 62–115. For a brief summary of his life, see A.V. Murray, *The crusader kingdom of Jerusalem: a dynastic history 1099-1125* (Oxford, 2000), no. 40, p. 196.

[47] FC, 3.24.17.

[48] FC, 3.44.4.

longing for Chartres and Orléans—either of which could therefore have been his place of origin.[49]

As for his education, we can conclude from his role as Baldwin I's chaplain that he must have been educated to become a priest in the clergy of Chartres.[50] Fulcher may not have held an office at the chapter of Chartres, however, as he is not mentioned in the chapter's list of dignitaries of the period.[51]

Fulcher was probably present at the Council of Clermont, and may have accompanied Ivo of Chartres there.[52] As he himself informs us, Fulcher left for the Holy Land in the entourage of Stephen of Blois, who was accompanied by Robert of Normandy and Robert of Flanders.[53] Just before the company reached Antioch in mid-October 1097, he left the party to join that of Baldwin of Boulogne, whom he would serve as a chaplain.[54] As part of Baldwin's entourage, Fulcher spent the next year-and-a-half in Edessa and was therefore not present at the sieges of Antioch and Jerusalem. After Jerusalem was taken by the crusaders in the summer of 1099, Fulcher accompanied Baldwin on two pilgrimages to Jerusalem that year, only to return to Jerusalem permanently a year later in the fall of 1100, when Baldwin was summoned from Edessa to be crowned king of Jerusalem after the death of his elder brother Godfrey.[55]

---

[49] FC, 2.2.4.

[50] It is notable that Guibert of Nogent refers to Fulcher as a priest (GN, 7.1641–1642): . . . *Fulcherium quendam Carnotensem presbiterum* . . .

[51] V. Epp, *Fulcher von Chartres: Studien zur Geschichtsschreibung des ersten Kreuzzuges* (Düsseldorf, 1990), p. 25.

[52] Giese 1987, pp. 63–64.

[53] FC, 1.7.1.

[54] FC, 1.14.2; 1.14.15: *Ego vero Fulcherus Carnotensis, capellanus ipsius Balduini eram.* So Epp 1990, p. 26; Runciman dates it to June 1097 (1951, p. 329)

[55] FC, 1.33.

Fulcher may be identified with a *Fulcherius clericus* ("Fulcher the clergyman") who appears as the sixth witness to a charter of donation issued by Baldwin I to the Church of St. Mary of the Valley of Josaphat in 1107/1108.[56] It has been suggested that Fulcher may have become a canon of the Holy Sepulcher: although he could have maintained his position as royal chaplain, the surviving charters from this period do not provide any evidence for this. The logical alternative is that Fulcher had taken up a position among the clergy of one of the religious institutions of Jerusalem, the most prominent being (especially in the early years of the Latin kingdom) the Holy Sepulcher.[57] Fulcher's increasing emphasis on the relic of the True Cross has been adduced as evidence for this association, given that it was safeguarded in the Church of the Holy Sepulcher,[58] while the fact that Fulcher refers in his revised text to the relic as a "treasure" (*thesaurus*) may indicate that he had been appointed its treasurer (*thesaurarius*).[59]

Upon settling in Jerusalem, Fulcher probably began writing between the end of fall 1100 and the fall of 1101, completing an early version of his account up through Baldwin I's expedition in Egypt in 1105.[60] Over the years that followed, Fulcher supplemented his work

---

[56] See *Diplomata*, vol. 1, no. 32. For a discussion, see FC, p. 2; Epp 1990, p. 31; H.E. Mayer, "Die Hofkapelle der Könige von Jerusalem," *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 44 (1988), pp. 489–509, at p. 493.

[57] As suggested by Mayer (1988, pp. 493–494), on the basis that Bartolf of Nangis, who writes before 1109 and may also have been part of the clergy at the Holy Sepulcher, refers to Fulcher as *frater*. Epp (1990, pp. 31–32), moreover, argues that the fact that Fulcher did not accompany Baldwin I on his visit to the Red Sea in 1116 suggests that Fulcher was presumably a canon by this time.

[58] Epp 1990, p. 27. Fulcher describes the cross as *alma* (2.21.14), *gloriosa* (2.32.2), *sanctissima et pretiosissima* (3.5.2), and *victoriosa* (3.9.2). For a repertory of references to the True Cross in Latin sources, see: A. Frolow, *La relique de la Vraie Croix: recherches sur le développement d'un culte* (Paris, 1961). For a discussion of the relic of the Cross in sources from the Latin East (with particular attention to Fulcher), see A.V. Murray, "'Mighty against the enemies of Christ': the relic of the True Cross in the armies of the kingdom of Jerusalem," in J. France and W.G. Zajac (eds.), *The crusades and their sources: essays presented to Bernard Hamilton* (Aldershot, 1998), pp. 217–238; for the role of the relic as a means legitimation for both the king and patriarch of Jerusalem, see D. Gerish, "The True Cross and the kings of Jerusalem," *The Haskins Society Journal* 8 (1996), pp. 137–155.

[59] FC, 1.30.4; see also 3.9.3–4. Giese (1987, p. 64) speculates that Fulcher may also have been a prior of the Olive Mount Priory, though this suggestion is rejected by Mayer (1988, p. 493).

[60] See the discussion in FC, pp. 42–48.

periodically, and only added the prologue until after the death of Baldwin I in April 1118. After the crusaders captured Tyre in 1124, Fulcher revised his work up to that point and added to it on a year-by-year basis until 1127. The final redaction of the *Historia Hierosolymitana* divides the narrative into three books: Book 1 opens with the Council of Clermont in November 1095 and ends with the death of Godfrey of Bouillon in July 1100; Book 2 covers the reign of Baldwin I (1100–1118), while Book 3 that of his successor, Baldwin II, up through 1127.[61] As the text ends rather abruptly, Fulcher probably died sometime in the fall of 1127, leaving his work, which would presumably have continued up through the end of Baldwin II's reign in 1131, unfinished.[62]

The Prologue of the *Historia* immediately identifies Fulcher's purpose in writing:

> Placet equidem vivis, prodest etiam mortuis, cum gesta virorum fortium, praesertim Deo militantium, vel scripta leguntur vel in mentis armariolo memoriter retenta inter fideles sobrie recitantur. Nam qui vivunt in mundo, audita intentione pia praedecessorum fidelium, quomodo mundi flore spreto Deo adhaeserunt et parentes uxoresque suas, possessiones quoque quantaslibet relinquentes iuxta praeceptum evangelicum Deum secuti sunt, ad diligendum eum ardentius compuncti, ipso inspirante, animantur.[63]
>
> It pleases those who are living and is beneficial to them even when they are dead, when the deeds of brave men, especially those who fight for God, are read in writing or are recited among believers in a sober manner after they have been memorized in the mind's repository. For those who live upon the earth are filled with a passionate compunction and inspired to love God when they hear the pious mission of earlier

[61] Given its occurrence in five manuscripts (with some minor variation), it would appear that the original title of Fulcher's work was *Gesta Francorum Iherusalem peregrinantium* ("The deeds of the Franks who went on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem"), which was, incidentally, also the title given to the work by Bongars in his *editio princeps* of 1611. Moreover, Bartolf of Nangis' abbreviation of Fulcher, which was based on the first recension and made around 1109, also bears this title (see below). It was not until the printed edition of Duchesne, whose manuscript bore the explicit *Explicit Historia Hierosolymitana dom. Fulcherii Carnot.* ("The History of Jerusalem by Lord Fulcher of Chartres ends"), that the work became known as the *Historia Hierosolymitana*. Hagenmeyer suggested that this was the title Fulcher gave to the revised, second recension (FC, pp. 19–20). In any case, the fact that the title *Historia Hierosolymitana* is found also in some manuscripts of William of Tyre's work may be a testament to the influence of Fulcher's work in the Latin East, regardless of whether or not this was the title that either author himself gave to his work. For the purposes of clarity, I will follow convention and refer to the work as *Historia Hierosolymitana*, or *Historia* in short.

[62] The plague of rats described in FC, 3.62, probably occurred in the spring or summer of 1127. See Epp 1990, p. 35.

[63] FC, Prol. 1.

believers, and how they spurned the flourishes of the world in order to cling to God, and left behind their parents, wives, and any and all possessions in order to follow God in accordance with the precept of the Gospel.

Fulcher's *Historia* aims both to please and to provide edifying examples for others to follow, doing so in an avowedly unadorned style—a good example of the so-called *Niedrichkeitstopos* that was the staple of Medieval Latin writing.[64] The use of the generically marked term *gesta* features prominently in the beginning. *Gesta*, as a subgenre of historiographical writing, focused on commemorating the actions of an individual or a specific group. Fulcher's purpose, therefore, is to provide a pleasing yet useful account of the *gesta virorum fortium* ("deeds of brave men") as exemplary models of behavior, portraying the participants of the First Crusade as respondents to the precepts of the gospels and inspired by God. Moreover, Fulcher expects his work both to be read and recited.

Another programmatically important passage occurs in the middle of Book 2:

Quoniam quidem ne vel scriptorum negligentia vel imperitia, vel quod rari erant forsitan vel suis impediti curis insudabant, haec gesta oblivioni non scripta darentur: malui ego Fulcherus scientia rudis, ingenio debilis, temeritatis naevo notari quam haec opera non propalari, prout, oculis vidi vel a relatoribus veridicis perscrutans diligenter didici. Precor autem haec legentem, ut nescientiae meae caritative indulgeat et dictamen istud nondum a quolibet correctum oratore locatim, si velit, corrigat; veruntamen historiae seriem propter pulchritudinem partium pompaticam non commutet, ne gestorum veritatem mendaciter confundat.[65]

Since these deeds would be given over to oblivion if not written down, and [were not recorded] either due to the neglect or inability of writers, or because they were few or were burdened by their own cares, I, Fulcher, being uneducated and untalented, preferred to be branded with the mark of temerity rather than for these works not be disseminated, [doing so] in accordance with what I myself witnessed or learned from truthful reporters in my careful investigation. I beg the reader to kindly forgive my ignorance and, if he wishes to, to correct my composition here and there, which has not yet been corrected by one schooled in rhetoric; however, he should not change the sequence of events for the purpose of polishing with purple prose some passages, to prevent the truthful account of the deeds from being brought into deceitful confusion.

[64] See also Prol. 2, where Fulcher apologizes for his *stilo rusticano*.

[65] FC, 2.34.1–2.

Fulcher again refers to his subject matter as *gesta* and calls attention to his own authorship, albeit with the obligatory formulae professing his humble talents. Moreover, Fulcher calls upon his reader to correct the work where necessary, admitting that his composition has not yet received sufficient polishing and proofreading—a very similar request to that found in Ralph of Caen, addressing Arnulf of Chocques in his Prologue.[66] The use of *dictamen* for composition here is marked, as a technical term for composition that was beginning to be in vogue at this time.[67] As it turned out, Fulcher himself would introduce numerous corrections when he began writing the third book in 1124. In this passage, for instance, the original *rei veritatem* ("truthful account of the facts") was replaced with *gestorum veritatem* ("truthful account of the deeds"), presumably to highlight the genre within which he was working.[68] Initially, this passage formed the end of Fulcher's work in 1105 (the version of Fulcher used by Guibert of Nogent ends at this point). Later, as his work began to cover the reigns of multiple rulers, Fulcher realized that a more suitable organization was required, at which point he divided his work into three books, one for each of the rulers (Godfrey, Baldwin I, and Baldwin II), to reflect more accurately the nature of the work as *gesta*.

Fulcher's history, as indicated, exists in two versions, commonly referred to as the first (ends at 1124) and second (1124–1127) redactions.[69] What sort of changes did Fulcher make? Fulcher made a number of factual corrections, possibly rereading the *Gesta Francorum* and

[66] RC, Prol. 8, and see below.

[67] Noteworthy in this respect are the *Breviarium de dictamine* and *Dictaminum radii* (=*Flores rhetorici*), of Alberic of Monte Cassino (d. ca. 1105) and the *Rationes dictandi* of Hugh of Bologna (written ca. 1119–1130), the latter of which, incidentally, is also the first known work to contain the term *prosimetrum*.

[68] As observed in Epp 1990, p. 142.

[69] The variants in Hagenmeyer's edition (FC) represent the first redaction.

Raymond of Aguilers' account in order to amend a few dates.[70] More substantial changes may have been made as part of an intellectual program, and Verena Epp has identified a number of tendencies that, she argues, are motivated by a sense of growing (proto-)nationalism.[71] An obvious example includes the addition of first-person possessives and verbs, thereby emphasizing the unity among the Franks who settled in the region. Such changes are vital to the study of the culture of the Latin East, and represent the development of a new voice in contradistinction to the earlier accounts of the First Crusade.

Although the works of both Fulcher and Ralph of Caen are *prosimetra*, the function of verse in Fulcher's *Historia* is decidedly different from that in the *Tancredus*. Far from providing an epic frame of narrative, the poems of Fulcher are short, epigrammatic lines of (sometimes leonine) dactylic hexameters that commemorate and mark key events, or offer gnomic sentiments. Often, these poems indicate the date in which an event (usually a military victory) occurred, sometimes in a cryptic fashion resembling a riddle.[72] Books 2 and 3 contain short epigrams that mark the end of a year, frequently containing astrological or meteorological references or information about the harvest of that year—all of which lends the poetry the feel of an almanac.[73]

For his historical account of the First Crusade in Book 1, Fulcher was forced to rely on the accounts of others for the events from the siege of Antioch in June 1098 up through the capture of Jerusalem in July 1099, and it has been demonstrated that Fulcher used the accounts

[70] For a list of corrections, see Epp 1990, pp. 144–146.

[71] See Epp 1990, p. 134 and e.g., FC, 1.11.5, 1.11.7, 1.11.8, 1.11.9. See also the discussion in Epp 1989, pp. 597–601.

[72] Bernhard Pabst's characterization of *Memorialverse* ("verses of commemoration") captures well the function and character of Fulcher's poetry: Pabst 1994, vol. 2, pp. 841–846.

[73] On the function of verse in Fulcher, see Epp (1990, p. 160).

of the *Gesta Francorum* and of Raymond of Aguilers for this purpose, indicating that both texts were available in Jerusalem by the years 1100–1101.[74]

The two recensions of Fulcher's history survive in a roughly equal number of manuscripts.[75] Of the total of eight manuscripts belonging to the first recension, seven also contain the histories of Walter the Chancellor and Raymond of Aguilers, leading Hagenmeyer to suggest that these texts were collected and circulated at a very early stage, possibly already in Jerusalem.[76] Of the second recension there are seven manuscripts.[77]

Fulcher's work was read extensively, both in the Latin East as well as the European mainland. In Europe, the first recension of ca. 1105 was used by Guibert of Nogent (ca. 1109) and Ekkehard of Aura (ca. 1115), and later was an important source for Orderic Vitalis (d. 1142) and William of Malmesbury (d. ca. 1143). Moreover, it was abbreviated by an anonymous scribe (tentatively identified with the otherwise obscure Lisiard of Tours), working in France after 1124.[78]

As for the Latin East, two abbreviations were made, one of which has been attributed to the otherwise unknown Bartolf of Nangis ca. 1109, while the other was commissioned by

---

[74] For a thorough discussion, see Hagenmeyer in FC, pp. 65–68.

[75] For an extensive discussion and description of the manuscripts, see FC, pp. 91–104. For a useful overview, see also M. Bull, "Historia Hierosolymitana," in D. Thomas and B. Roggema (eds.), *Christian-Muslim Relations. A Bibliographical History*, vol. 3 (Leiden, 2011), p. 406.

[76] FC, pp. 91–92. These manuscripts are Paris, BnF, MS lat. 14378 (ca. 1137–1146), fol. 5r–113v; Paris, BnF, MS lat. 5131 (12th c.), fol. 1r–109v; Paris, Bibl. de l'Arsenal, MS 1102 (late 12th/early 13th c.), fol. 1r–47r; Clermont-Ferrand, Bibl. mun., MS 262 (14th c.), fol. 2r–71r; London, British Library, MS Addit. 8927 (13th c.), fol. 1r–64r; Bern, Burgerbibliothek, MS 261 (12th/13th c.), fol. 4v–91v. The remaining manuscript of the first recension is London, British Library, MS Kings Library 5 B XV (12th c.), fol. 65r–134v.

[77] Douai, Bibl. mun., MS 882 (12th c.), fol. 70v–109r; Paris, BnF, MS lat. 12945 (13th c.), fol. 65r–112v; Paris, BnF, MS lat 18415 (12th c.), fol. 56r–93v; Paris, BnF, MS lat. 15038 (late 12th/early 13th c.), fol. 97v–172v; Cambridge, MS UL Ji. IV.4 (12th c.), fol. 1r–57r; Brussels, Bibl. nat., MS 9823-34 (12th c.), fol. 58r–123r; Paris, BnF, MS nouv. acquis. lat. 692 (13th c.), fol. 81r–107v.

[78] Much obscurity still surrounds this particular abbreviation and its compiler, which have been virtually neglected by modern scholars. For the text, see *Historiae Hierosolymitanae secunda pars*, in *RHC Oc*, vol. 5, pp. 549–585.

Baldwin III in or around 1146 and used both the accounts of Fulcher and Robert the Monk. Fulcher's *Historia* may also have been read by Ralph of Caen and Walter the Chancellor, both writing in Antioch.[79] Moreover, Fulcher's text influenced works of other genres in the East: it set an important and early precedent for a wide-scale use of the Maccabees and Josephus that would be paralleled in the poetry of Achard of Arrouaise and Geoffrey the Abbot, while excerpts from Fulcher's history were used in sermons for the feast commemorating the Liberation of Jerusalem.[80] Furthermore, there is evidence that in the liturgy of this feast, as many as nine lessons were taken from Fulcher.[81] Non-Latin authors writing in the East also utilized Fulcher's account, most notably Matthew of Edessa who wrote an Armenian chronicle between the years 1122–1137. Finally, as will be discussed below, Fulcher was the single most important author for William of Tyre, not only as a source of information, but also in terms of scope and structure.

The rich and variegated *Nachleben* of Fulcher's *Historia* (most of all in the Latin East) demonstrates that the text was not an isolated collection of reports reconstructing the various events that took place before, during, and after the First Crusade; rather, it presented crucial strategies for interpreting these events within a specific cultural framework that had a visible impact on the literary and religious life of the Crusader States for decades to come.

2.3 Bartolf of Nangis (?), *Gesta Francorum Iherusalem peregrinantium*

[79] See Hagenmeyer in FC, pp. 74–75. For objections against Ralph's use of Fulcher, see Manselli 1993, p. 145; for Walter, see T.S. Asbridge, *The creation of the principality of Antioch, 1098–1130* (Woodbridge, 2000), pp. 5–6.

[80] Achard may have been writing contemporaneously with Fulcher, but Geoffrey certainly wrote after Fulcher did (ca. 1136–1137). See also the discussions below.

[81] A. Linder, "The liturgy of the liberation of Jerusalem," *Mediaeval Studies* 52 (1990), pp. 110–131, at p. 121, with reference to London, British Library, MS Lat. Addit. 8927 (13th c.), in which the history of Raymond of Aguilers is followed by a liturgy of the Feast of Liberation. The suggestion of John and Laurita Hill (Hill and Hill 1974, p. 12; PT, p. 24) that the *lectiones* ("lessons") here refer to a lost historiographical work that may have been the source for the early accounts of the First Crusade should therefore be disregarded.

An early witness to Fulcher's widespread readership is an anonymous abbreviation titled *Gesta Francorum Iherusalem peregrinantium* ("The deeds of the Franks who went on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem").[82] Caspar Barth claimed to have come across a manuscript in which the account was attributed to one *Bartolphus peregrinus de Nangeio*, that is to say, a pilgrim from Nangis in North-central France.[83] As has become conventional, we will continue to refer to the author as Bartolf, although any evidence that Barth may have had to support this attribution is no longer accessible.

Although definitive evidence is lacking, the text appears to have been put together by someone who knew Fulcher and was also living in Jerusalem in the early twelfth century. In an original passage, the author refers to *nostri* ("our men") in contrast to *Pisani* ("Pisans") and *Ianuenses* ("Genoese"), which in this context must refer to the men of King Baldwin I.[84]

---

[82] The text was first printed by Jacques Bongars in 1611 on the basis of two manuscripts (one of which was apparently copied from the other) that are now lost, but which presented the title of the work as *Gesta Francorum expugnantium Iherusalem* ("The deeds of the Franks who conquered Jerusalem"): *Gesta Dei per Francos*, ed. J. Bongars (Hanover, 1611), vol. 1, pp. 561–593. In 1866 a critical edition on the basis of four manuscripts, dating from the twelfth to the fourteenth century, appeared as part of the *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades*: *RHC Oc*, vol. 3, pp. 491–543. These manuscripts are: Douai, Bibl. mun., MS 838 (12th c.); Saint-Omer, Bibl. mun., MS 8° (12th c.); Copenhagen, MS 2159 (13th c.); Montpellier, Faculté de Médecine, MS H. 139 (14th c.). From this edition Heinrich Hagenmeyer printed a short extract on the episode of the Sacred Fire in his appendix to Fulcher of Chartres: FC, pp. 834–836. More recently, Hiram Kümper identified three additional manuscripts containing the work, to which one further manuscript should be added: see H. Kümper, "Bartolf of Nangis," in G. Dunphy (ed.), *Encyclopedia of the medieval chronicle* (Leiden, 2010), vol. 1, p. 145. These additional manuscripts are: London, British Library, MS Stowe 56 (12th c.); Cologne, Historisches Archiv, MS W 35, 24r–76r (12th / 13th c.); Munich, Universitätsbibl., MS 8° 178 (second half 12th c.); Munich, Universitätsbibl., 2° 672, ff. 262r–302v (15th c.); St.-Petersburg, Rossijskaja Nacional'naja Biblioteka, MS lat. Q.v.IV.3, ff. 1r-21v (early 12th c.). A fresh edition based on all of the available manuscript evidence is a great desideratum.

[83] C. Barth, "Ad Bartolphi peregrini de Nangeio historiam Palaestinam animadversiones," in P. Ludewig (ed.), *Reliquiae manuscriptorum omnis aevi diplomatum ac monumentorum ineditorum adhuc*, vol. 3 (Frankfurt, etc., 1720), p. 500. Barth also argues, somewhat unconvincingly, that the author was German based on his use of phrases such as *multarum matrum filii* (BN, 42), which is supposed to be a reflection of German *vieler Mütter Kinder*. As the editors of the *Recueil* point out, Barth first discussed the attribution to Bartolf in the 1648 follow-up to his *Adversariorum commentariorum libri LX*, which I have not been able to consult.

[84] This observation was first made by F. Kühn, *Geschichte der ersten lateinischen Patriarchen von Jerusalem* (Leipzig, 1886), pp. 21–22 n. 5.

Furthermore, the author refers to Fulcher as *frater meus*[85] ("my brother") and presents a catalogue of Turkish generals not found anywhere else, which he claims to have received from those "coming from Antioch and Chaldaea," whom he may have interviewed with the help of translators.[86] The context here certainly would suggest a location somewhere in the Latin East, in which an author might be in close contact with other cultures and languages. Unless the reference to "people coming out of Syria" is meant to refer to those coming from parts of Syria not controlled by the crusaders (e.g., Damascus), it is doubtful that the author was writing in Syria, with Jerusalem being perhaps a more likely location.[87] This is corroborated by the fact that the work retains Fulcher's focus on Jerusalem, most notably in the account of the election of Patriarch Evrard, which is missing in Fulcher.[88]

Moreover, the work contains several episodes not found in Fulcher or anywhere else, most notably the episode of the miracle of the Sacred Fire in the Church of the Holy Sepulcher, of which the author appears to have been an eyewitness.[89] Other original elements include a much extended description of the holy places and the detail that the horse of Baldwin I was named *Gazela* ("gazelle") on account of its speed.[90]

---

[85] BN, 2.

[86] BN, 19: *Et quia hostium principes nullis adhuc nominibus praenotati sunt, nomina quorumdam, a quibusdam de Syria et Chaldaea egredientibus, per interpretes cognita sunt, quae ut potero diligenter declarabo*. The brief discussion of this passage by Hiram Kümper, who claims that Bartolf is announcing that he will cut short Fulcher's catalogue (which in reality is much shorter than that of Bartolf), clearly rests on a misunderstanding. See Kümper 2010, p. 145.

[87] As opposed to the (otherwise unsupported) suggestion that Bartolf was writing in Syria in Cahen 1940, p. 11, which then formed the basis for the same suggestion in Runciman 1951, p. 329.

[88] BN, 66.

[89] BN, 47–49, and see the introduction at p. xxxvi for this suggestion. This episode was included as an appendix to Hagenmeyer's edition of Fulcher's history: FC, pp. 834–836.

[90] BN, 31–33 and 58. For an English translation of Bartolf's description of the holy places, see *Jerusalem Pilgrimage,* pp. 172–176. The horse *Gazela* is also mentioned by Albert of Aachen: AA, 7.67 and 9.5.

Lastly, it is significant that Bartolf's work contains a double ending: the first occurs after the description of the rout of the Egyptian army at the Third Battle of Ramla in 1105, which is described as *ultimum bellorum* ("the last of the battles") and followed by the words *atque finis hic est* ("and this is the end").[91] This is where Fulcher originally ended his account, before continuing his history on a year-by-year basis and adding the account of the comet that appeared in 1106, which forms the *terminus post quem*.[92] Since the author refers to Tripoli as still being under Muslim control, the *terminus ante quem* is June 26, 1109, when the crusaders captured Tripoli.[93] Bartolf probably composed his adaptation of Fulcher not long after 1105, adding the final chapter in early 1109 at the latest. This shows that Bartolf must have been in close contact with Fulcher, making it very likely that he was active in Jerusalem.

After Bartolf has recounted the Council of Clermont, which functions as a prologue of sorts, he states his purpose in writing:

> Nunc igitur ad principium nostrae narrationis accedamus, et, Deo inspirante, enucleare tentemus quod frater Fulcherius Carnotensis, ut oculis vidit, aut facta ab eisdem qui fecerunt narrata memoriter et recollegit et in unum libellum congessit. Nos vero qui et libelli pagina, aliorumque narratu, arguta inquisitione edocti, prolixam narrationem vitantes, his tantum quae ad rem pertinere sentimus contenti, huius voluminis textum diligenter transformare curavimus.[94]

> Now let us proceed to the start of our narration, and, God willing, let us attempt to recount clearly that which brother Fulcher of Chartres stored up in his memory and gathered into one little book, based on his own eyewitness or as it was told to him by those who participated. But I, having been instructed in my keen investigation both by his little book and the relation of others, was satisfied with only those things that were directly relevant, and have taken it upon myself to transform the text of this book with care.

[91] BN, 71.

[92] As described in FC, 2.35.

[93] BN, 68 and 71.

[94] BN, 2.

Bartolf makes clear that he is interested in providing a barebones account of the events during and after the First Crusade, "transforming" Fulcher's history by stripping away all extraneous materials and condensing the text. Without any secure identification of the author it is difficult to determine what audience Bartolf may have had in mind for his reworking. The reference to Fulcher as *frater* ("brother"), however, may indicate that the author was himself a cleric, and hence may have been writing for the clergy. As the use of excerpts from Fulcher in sermons demonstrates, there was a demand in the kingdom of Jerusalem for brief accounts of the First Crusade within liturgical contexts. Still, a lay audience should not be excluded. Bartolf inserts what has been described as a "lengthy moral sermon" on the virtues of knightly chastity when describing the women's expulsion from the crusader camp at Antioch.[95] The extant sermons from the Latin East—one of which is explicitly directed to the knighthood—contain an important parallel, suggesting a degree of overlap in the intended audiences of both sermon and history.[96]

Bartolf's aim of simplification can also be seen in his treatment of the poetic sections of Fulcher's history. For instance, Bartolf replaced Fulcher's complicated astrological date of the capture of Antioch with a more straightforward reference to the month.[97]

Bartolf's main source is Fulcher of Chartres, whose history provides him with the overall structure. Into this framework Bartolf inserts other information acquired from both oral reports and written sources. These other written sources included the *Gesta Francorum*, which Bartolf

[95] BN, 12. See the discussion in V. Epp, "'Miles' und 'militia' bei Fulcher von Chartres," in *'Militia Christi' e crociata nei secoli XI-XIII: atti della undecima Settimana internazionale di studio: Mendola, 28 agosto-1 settembre 1989* (Milan, 1992), pp. 769–784, at p. 777.

[96] See below on the sermon in the Ripoll manuscript.

[97] Pabst 1994, vol. 2, pp. 847–848.

used independently of Fulcher, as well as the account of Raymond of Aguilers.[98] It has been suggested on this basis that Bartolf may have had access to the same library as Fulcher, which would also account for the direct access that Bartolf appears to have had to Fulcher's history.[99] Furthermore, Bartolf incorporated into his account of the miracle of the Sacred Fire a short Easter trope first found in the eleventh-century collection of the *Cambridge Songs*.[100]

Although Bartolf's abbreviation does not appear to have been read as widely as Fulcher's history, his account was further abbreviated and incorporated into Lambert of St.-Omer's *Liber Floridus* (ca. 1121).[101]

2.4 Ralph of Caen, *Tancredus*

The *Tancredus* of Ralph of Caen is one of the most important sources from the early period of the Crusader States.[102] As in the case of Raymond of Aguilers and Walter the Chancellor, the text itself is our only source for biographical information about the author. Nonetheless, a surprising amount may be gleaned from it about Ralph's background and education. Although it

[98] H. von Sybel, *Geschichte des ersten Kreuzzugs* (Düsseldorf, 1841), p. 55; for the *Recueil*, see the comments in the *apparatus fontium*, especially at BN, 9.

[99] FC, pp. 71–72.

[100] BN, 49; *Carmina Cantabrigiensia*, no. 44: *Hec est clara dies*. See the discussion in Pabst 1994, p. 848.

[101] For a recent discussion of this text and its manuscripts, see J. Rubenstein, "Lambert of Saint-Omer and the apocalyptic First Crusade," in N. Paul and S. Yeager (eds.), *Remembering the Crusades: Myth, image, and identity* (Baltimore, MD, 2012),, pp. 69–95.

[102] The text was first printed by Edmond Martène and Ursin Durand in 1717, then revised by L.A. Muratori for the *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores* in 1724, which in turn was the basis for the *Recueil des historiens des Croisades* in 1866 and later the *Patrologia Latina*: *Thesaurus novus anecdotorum*, ed. E. Martène and U. Durand, vol. 3 (Paris, 1717), pp. 107–210; *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, ed. L.A. Muratori, vol. 5 (Milan, 1724), pp. 285–333; *RHC Oc*, vol. 3, pp. 603–716; *PL*, vol. 155, cols. 489–590. A much improved edition, based on a fresh appraisal of the manuscript, was produced by Edoardo D'Angelo for the *Corpus Christianorum* series in 2011: *Tancredus*, ed. E. D'Angelo, *CCCM* 231 (Turnhout, 2011). Muratori's edition was translated into French: *Tancrède*, tr. M. Guizot, *Collection des mémoires relatifs à l'histoire de France*, vol. 23 (Paris, 1825, repr. 2004). An English translation, which relies on the faulty edition of the *RHC*, can be found in *The Gesta Tancredi of Ralph of Caen: a history of the Normans on the First Crusade*, tr. B.S. Bachrach and D.S. Bachrach (Farnham, 2005).

provides no secure information as to his family or place of origin, Ralph tells us that he was educated in Caen, and that he was still there as an *adulescentulus* ("young man") in October 1097. His memory of having seen then the same comet from Caen that the crusaders saw in Antioch allows us to place his birth tentatively around 1080.[103] Caen was an important center of Norman activities in the eleventh century and first half of the twelfth, whose abbey of St.-Etienne boasted William the Conqueror as its founder in 1059 and which had been home to such renowned scholars as Lanfranc of Bec in 1063 and William Bona Anima in 1070, the latter of whom had become a monk at Caen after returning from a pilgrimage to the Holy Land.[104]

With the exception of William of Tyre, Ralph is one of the few people about whose education we can do better than make a few inferences: he was educated at the school in the abbey of St.-Etienne in Caen, where he studied under Arnulf of Chocques, to whom Ralph addresses his work.[105] Arnulf himself was not an obscure figure by any means. Born around 1055 in Flanders, he taught at St.-Etienne until December 1096 at the latest. At that point he left for the Holy Land as chaplain of Robert Curthose of Normandy, where he became the first Patriarch of Jerusalem briefly in 1099, and later in 1112–1115 and 1116–1118.

Arnulf was a controversial figure in Jerusalemite church politics, and acquired the epithet *mala corona* ("wicked crown"), but he seems to have had a better reputation as a scholar.[106] In a

---

[103] So suggests D'Angelo (RC, p. v); see RC, 1801–1805.

[104] On the school of Caen see R. Foreville, "L'école de Caen au XIe siècle et les origines normandes de l'Université d'Oxford," in *Études médiévales offertes à M. le doyen Augustin Fliche* (Paris, 1952), pp. 81–100; see also the discussion in RC, pp. lxxxii–lxxxv.

[105] RC, Prol. 58–64.

[106] On this epithet, see *GF*, 8.20, pp. 45–46; PT, p. 85; WT, 11.15.2. For more on Arnulf of Chocques as patriarch, see R. Foreville, "Un chef de la première croisade: Arnoul Malecouronne," *Bulletin Philologique et Historique du Comité es Travaux Historiques et Scientifiques* (1957), pp. 357–374; see also K.-P. Kirstein, *Die lateinischen Patriarchen von Jerusalem: von der Eroberung der Heiligen Stadt durch die Kreuzfahrer 1099 bis zum Ende der Kreuzfahrerstaaten 1291* (Berlin, 2002), pp. 91–128. For Arnulf as teacher of Ralph of Caen, see Foreville 1952, pp. 83–91; L. Boehm, "Die Gesta Tancredi des Radulf von Caen, Ein Beitrag zur Geschichtsschreibung der Normannen

letter to a student of Arnulf of Chocques, Anselm of Canterbury remarks upon his teacher's wide-ranging knowledge of classical literature, with particular reference to Virgil.[107] Guibert of Nogent comments on Arnulf's knowledge of dialectic and grammar as qualifications for undertaking the tutelage of Cecilia, daughter of William the Conqueror and sister of Robert Curthose.[108]

As mentioned, Ralph was at Caen by 1097 and may have remained there until joining the expedition of Bohemond in May 1106 when he passed by Rouen to solicit aid for his campaign against the Byzantines in southern Italy. Ralph took part in the siege of Durazzo in 1107–1108. When the expedition proved unsuccessful, many Normans continued on to Jerusalem and Antioch, whereas Bohemond stayed behind in Italy.[109] The party that proceeded onward

---

um 1100," *Historisches Jahrbuch* 75 (1956), pp. 47–72, at 49–51; D.S. Spear, "The school of Caen revisited," *The Haskins Society Journal* 4 (1992), pp. 55–66; R. Manselli, *Italia e Italiani alla I Crociata* (Rome, 1993), p. 140; Murray 2000, pp. 182–183; N.R. Hodgson, "Reinventing Normans as Crusaders? Ralph of Caen's Gesta Tancredi," in *Anglo-Norman Studies* 30 (2007), pp. 117–132, at 117; RC, p. lxxxii. Caution must be exercised with regard to the account presented by H. Glaesener, "Raoul de Caen, historien et écrivain," *Revue Historique Écclesiastique* 46 (1951), pp. 1–21, as Manselli warned (1993, p. 140): "l'autore commette incredibili errori, per cui a Raoul di Caen viene attribuita la carriera del suo maestro Arnolfo, e lo si dice, senza addurre nessuna testimonianza, capellano di Tancredi, che solo molto più tardi, dopo il 1130, avrebbe coronato la sua carriera sacerdotale ottenendo il titolo di patriarca di Gerusalemme." This error can be traced to the treatment of De Ghellinck 1946, vol. 2, pp. 118–119.

[107] Anselm of Canterbury, *Opera omnia*, ed. F.S. Schmitt (Edinburgh, 1946–1951), vol. 3, Ep. 64, p. 180: *audivi quod legas a domno Arnulfo . . . audivi quoque quod ipse multum valeat in declinatione . . . et volo quatenus ut fiat, quantum potes satagas, et praecipue de Virgilio et aliis auctoribus quos a me non legisti, exceptis his in quibus aliqua turpitudo sonat.*

[108] Guibert of Nogent, *Dei Gesta per Francos*, ed. R.B.C. Huygens, *CCCM* 231 (Turnhout, 1996), 7.637–641: *Erat ibi tunc temporis quidam sub censura clericali agens, sub quo autem gradu nescio, qui vocaretur Arnulfus. Is, in dialecticae eruditione non hebes, cum minime haberetur ad grammaticae documenta rudis, regis Anglorum filiam monacham ea quam premisimus diu disciplina docuerat . . .* As Natasha Hodgson has pointed out, however, Guibert was probably characterizing Arnulf derisively by emphasizing his position as a woman's tutor: N.R. Hodgson, *Women, crusading and the Holy Land in historical narrative* (Woodbridge, 2007), p. 64 (the translation provided in n. 57 is incorrect, but the point still stands).

[109] See FC, 2.39.3; WT, 11.6.40–43. See also RC, pp. vi–vii and Manselli 1993, p. 141.

probably included Ralph, who would then have ended up at the court of Tancred, Bohemond's regent of Antioch at the time.[110]

We are unfortunately on less secure footing when it comes to Ralph's career. It has generally been assumed that Ralph was a member of the clergy and that he, like Raymond of Aguilers and Fulcher of Chartres (or indeed his teacher, Arnulf of Chocques), enlisted as a chaplain.[111] Edoardo D'Angelo rightly points out,[112] however, not only the absence of direct support for this conclusion, but also the existence of two pieces of evidence that would appear to oppose it: in the Prologue, Ralph claims to have fought alongside Bohemond and Tancred, and elsewhere he fondly reminisces about a hunt he once took part in—both of which activities would have been forbidden to clerics by canon law.[113]

Indirect evidence also suggests that Ralph may not have been a member of the clergy. In one passage in particular, Ralph exhibits an attitude bordering on the contemptuous when it comes to clergy associated with the crusader army. While narrating the siege of Jerusalem, Ralph mentions, not without a hint of derision, the attempts of priests to aid the army in carrying the

---

[110] For biographies of Tancred, see O. von Siedow, *Tancred. Ein Lebensbild aus der Zeit der Kreuzzüge* (Berlin, 1880); R.L. Nicholson, *Tancred: A study of his career and work in their relation to the First Crusade and the establishment of the Latin States in Syria and Palestine* (Chicago, 1938).

[111] So Glaesener 1951, p. 6–7; Bachrach and Bachrach 2005, p. 2; Minervini 2001, p. 627; Minervini 2002, p. 343; Hodgson 2007a, p. 117.

[112] RC, pp. v–vi. Boehm (1956, pp. 53–54) writes that Ralph was "wohl niederer Kleriker und mehr Kriegsmann," while Elm (2001, p. 165) hedges about the question of whether Ralph was a member of the clergy or not.

[113] RC, Prol. 15–16: *Huius tam preclari laboris cooperatoribus me contigit militare: Boamundo, cum Dyrachium obssideret, Tancredo paulo post, cum Edessam ab obsidione Turcorum liberaret*; RC, 3013–3014: *sic venatricem olim turbam, et ipse venator, iocundantem, licet ieiunam, vidi* . . . In a strange twist of logic, Bachrach and Bachrach (2005, p. 122 n. 164), when commenting upon the latter passage, suggest that it is unlikely that "Ralph is speaking here of himself . . . given the canonical prohibitions against hunting by priests." The translators do not explain to whom else the first person singular could refer. Similarly, Bachrach and Bachrach translate the first passage as "[i]t is fitting for me to battle on behalf of those who participated in this glorious labor," even though it would make more sense to translate *cooperatoribus* as an ablative absolute rather than a dative, as the sense of "on behalf of" would normally be rendered by using the preposition *pro* with the ablative (I pass over the fact that *contigit*, "it happened" or "it came to pass," cannot mean "it is fitting"...).

siege ladders.[114] If Ralph truly was Bohemond's chaplain during the siege of Durazzo, one might have expected a different attitude to what he describes as a *delicatus ordo* ("delicate order"). I would therefore tentatively suggest that Ralph was a member of the Norman nobility, and that he may have been, as has been proposed, a *miles literatus* ("educated knight").[115]

Ralph must have written his work after the death of Tancred on December 12, 1112, as Ralph writes in his Prologue that he delayed writing the work until after the death of its eponymous hero.[116] The *terminus ante quem* is the death of Arnulf of Chocques in April 1118, as Ralph addresses the work to his former schoolmaster and asks him to proofread it.[117] Since Ralph talks about a "delay" (*dilatio*) in writing the work while waiting for someone to take up the mantle, an initial compositional date of 1113 or 1114 seems probable.[118] The manuscript evidence shows that sections were inserted later, one of which concerns a prophecy of Bohemond II's death, and must therefore be dated to after February 1130.[119] Raoul Manselli's proposal, that a reference to the dilapidated state of Laodicea may indicate that the work was

[114] RC, 3533–3535: *Sed quos ad risum lacrimabilem non moveat sacerdos bellicus cum, fatiscente milicia, ille delicatus ordo, in albis et stolis scalam vehentes, flentes vehendo gemerent, flendo psallerent? Et haec quidem gestatio et opus erat et sermo, sed sermo magis*. This passage bears much resemblance to Fulcher's description of the priests during a skirmish with the Turks not long after the battle of Nicaea (FC, 1.11.9, and cf. 1.22.3, 2.31.12): *plorando cantabant, cantando plorabant*. In Fulcher, however, there is no trace of the derogatory tone in Ralph.

[115] So Edoardo D'Angelo in RC, p. vi. On the concept of the *miles literatus*, see R.V. Turner, "The *miles literatus* in twelfth- and thirteenth-century England: How rare a phenomenon?," *American Historical Review* 83 (1978), pp. 928–945; J. Fleckenstein, "Rittertum zwischen Krieg und Frieden," in J. Fried (ed.), *Träger und Instrumentarien des Friedens im hohen und späten Mittelalter* (Sigmaringen, 1996), pp. 151–168.

[116] RC, Prol. 31–38.

[117] RC, Prol. 58–64.

[118] So suggests Edoardo D'Angelo in RC, p. ix. For Ralph's passage, see RC, Prol. 39.

[119] RC, 2149–2189. See especially 2184–2185: *. . . et cetera, quae subdidit Mantuanus; quae nos in nece Boamundi iunioris vidimus completa.*

written after an earthquake struck in 1136, seems unlikely; the ruins referred to are in fact the ancient ruins, compared by Ralph to those of Antioch.[120]

Ralph of Caen is probably not to be identified with one *Radulfus de Acon, dux Antiochenus* ("Ralph of Acre, duke of Antioch") mentioned by Walter the Chancellor, as Edmond Martène argued.[121] This *Radulfus dux* is almost certainly the same Ralph who bore witness to a document issued by Tancred in 1101, when our Ralph was still in Europe.[122] On the other hand, it is possible that one *Radulphus cancellarius* (Ralph the chancellor), who witnessed a charter issued by Bohemond II of Antioch in 1127, may be Ralph of Caen.[123] Since this is the only surviving charter of Bohemond II, it is impossible to be certain.[124] If it is Ralph, it means that he replaced Walter the Chancellor (see below), who had presumably died.

It is possible, as has been suggested, that Ralph may have returned to Europe after his stay in the Latin East.[125] What is most likely Ralph's autograph manuscript ended up at the monastery of Gembloux (see below). In addition, traces of his work can be found at Monte Cassino, where it could have been the source of the *Hystoria de via et recuperatione Antiochiae atque Ierusolymarum* (although a copy could also have been the source instead).[126] Finally,

---

[120] Manselli 1993, p. 142. The passage occurs in RC, 4087–4089: . . . *urbs ea, sicut hodie ex ruinis ipsius deprehendere est, quondam nobilis* . . . I follow here Malcolm Barber's interpretation of the passage (Barber 2012, p. 34). See also the discussion of this passage in Chapter 2.

[121] WC, 1.2.1; *Thesaurus novus anecdotorum*, ed. E. Martène and U. Durand, vol. 3 (Paris, 1717), p. 109 (=*RHC Oc*, vol. 3, p. 595).

[122] This was pointed out by Manselli 1993, pp. 141–142.

[123] *I libri iurium della Repubblica di Genova*, vol. 1/2, ed. D. Puncuh (Rome, 1996), p. 154, no. 337.

[124] The next charter from Antioch that survives is issued by Raymond III in 1144, and does not mention this Ralph. See *I libri iurium della Repubblica di Genova*, vol. 1/2, ed. D. Puncuh (Rome, 1996), p. 154, no. 338.

[125] So Edoardo D'Angelo in RC, p. x.

[126] For a fuller discussion of the correspondences with Ralph in this text, see *Hystoria de via et recuperatione Antiochiae atque Ierusolymarum (olim tudebodus imitatus et continuatus): i Normanni d'Italia alla prima crociata*

Ralph mentions a visit to Rome. All of these circumstances may indicate a return to the European mainland at some point.[127] Alternatively, Ralph might have visited Rome on his way to southern Italy,[128] and if he did write his account in the West, his request to Arnulf to correct his work would scarcely seem logical.[129] Moreover, the fact that Ralph's manuscript ended up in the West should be no surprise, since all of the texts here under discussion made their way over to the European mainland at one point—otherwise they would have been unlikely to survive.

Internal evidence also suggests that Ralph was writing in the Levant rather than in Europe:

> Horum, ut dixi, via centifida iturum me revocat, ne, dum singulis vagabundus insistam, a cepto tramite devius aberrem. Celebrent suos Normannia, Flandria, Robertos; reliquos duces Occidens reliquus; michi unus Marchisides sufficit, cui non sufficio vel totus. Ignosce, Gallia, scriptoribus dives: iuvat me Antiocheno vacare principi; presente me gesta liberius persolvam debitor creditori. Verumtamen, ne nulla bene meritos silencium meum mercede remuneret, compendiosum quippiam conabor perstringere, quod scriptura posteritas prolixiori valeat stilo explicare.[130]

> The hundred-fold journey of these men recalls me to proceed on my way, and not to go wandering over each and every one of them and so to lose my way by drifting off the path I have set out on. Let Normandy and Flanders celebrate their Roberts; let the rest of the West celebrate the rest of the leaders; the scion of a marquis by himself suffices for me, although I by myself do not suffice for him. Forgive me, Gaul, you who are rich in writers: I have decided to dedicate myself to the prince of Antioch; the deeds he has done in my presence I will out of my own freewill repay to him as one who owes a debt.[131] However, to prevent me from rewarding their good service with silence, I will briefly try to go over that which posterity will be able to expand upon with a lengthier pen.

---

in una cronaca cassinese, ed. E. D'Angelo (Florence, 2009), pp. xxx–xxxiv. This text was previously known as *Belli Sacri Historia* or *Tudebodus imitatus et continuatus*.

[127] RC, 201.

[128] Indeed, D'Angelo himself (RC, pp. vii–viii) suggested this possibility earlier.

[129] But see the suggestion of Russo that this request is merely a ploy. His argument, however, that Ralph would never have taken on the role of humble student is not convincing. See L. Russo, "Tancredi e i Bizantini. Sui Gesta Tancredi in expeditione Hierosolymitana di Rodolfo di Caen," *Medioevo Greco* 3 (2002), pp. 193–230, at 198–199.

[130] RC, 1714–1723. See also the discussion of this passage in Chapter 4.5.

[131] Bachrach and Bachrach's (2005, p. 80) rendering of "[t]hrough the present *Gesta* I as a debtor will rather easily pay off my creditor" cannot be justified by the syntax.

Ralph suggests that there is a closely-knit connection between the heroes of the First Crusade, their homeland, and their biographers: Normandy, for instance, is called upon to offer praise to her own heroes, and similarly with Flanders. Ralph, on the other hand, associates himself and his literary activity exclusively with Antioch.

The narrative of the *Tancredus* begins in December 1096 and ends with the completion of the siege of Apamea on September 14, 1106, but the main focus of the narration is placed on the First Crusade rather than the subsequent events. Given the abrupt ending in the middle of the siege of Apamea, it seems likely that the work was left unfinished. Ralph's work may have been interrupted by the author's death, as there is no reason why he would not have wanted to continue recounting Tancred's exploits after 1106 (he died in 1112).[132] The numerous corrections and additions (one of which can be dated to 1130 or after), however, would indicate either that the work was meant to end where it does, or that the additions were made by someone else.[133]

The title of Ralph's work is *Tancredus* according to the incipit (*Incipit Tancredus Radulphi*, "The *Tancredus* of Ralph begins"), although the opening of the work, which declares its subject matter to be *res probe gestae* ("deeds done well"), has led previous editors to refer to the work as the *Gesta Tancredi*.[134] This change of title was aided by the fact that the work has much in common with the *chanson de geste* as a purveyor of chivalric ideals and is more concerned with the development of Tancred's heroic stature than with providing a detailed

[132] Manselli 1993, p. 142.

[133] RC, p. xxxi.

[134] The Prologue begins as follows: *Nobile est studium res probe gestas principum recensere . . .* I take *probe* to qualify the *res gestas* by which it is bookended rather than with *recensere*, as Bachrach and Bachrach have done (2005, p. 19).

historiographical account.[135] As such, the work is also closely related to the genres of biography, panegyric literature, and the mirror of princes.[136] In keeping with the strong emphasis on Norman culture and identity, the *Tancredus* has much affinity with other forms of Norman literary expression, most notably Dudo of St.-Quentin's tenth-century national history of the Normans—like the *Tancredus* cast in the form of a prosimetrum.[137] Yet at times the *Tancredus* transcends Norman ties of kinship, showing signs of a larger, pan-Frankish conception of culture, particularly in the passages relating to Baldwin I, the first king of Frankish Jerusalem.[138]

The bulk of the 1007 lines of verse in the *Tancredus* is in the form of the dactylic hexameter, which lends the work the flair of an epic poem, along with the constant use of epic epithets and stock epic signposts such as the phrases *nec mora* ("without delay") and *fama volans* ("winged rumor").[139] I would suggest that, by composing such a large portion of dactylic hexameters, and by making use of these epicisms in both prose and poetry, Ralph saw an

[135] See especially the work of Payen in this regard: J.-C. Payen, "Une légende épique en gestation: Les *Gesta Tancredi* de Raoul de Caen," *La Chanson de geste et le mythe carolingien: mélanges René Louis / publiés par ses collègues, ses amis et ses élèves à l'occasion de son 75e anniversaire*, vol. 2 (Saint-Père-sous-Vézelay,1982), pp. 1051–1062.

[136] Elm (2001, p. 169) describes the *Tancredus* as "eine Apotheose, eine Aristie Tankreds und seine normannischen Gefährten". See also Boehm 1956, p. 63, as well as p. 68: "Das Charakterbild Tankreds . . . scheint es sich organisch in die Tradition der abendländischen Fürstenspiegel einzufügen."

[137] For discussions of the *Tancredus* as an expression of Norman nationalism, see Payen 1982b; E. Albu Hanawalt, "Norman views of Eastern Christendom: from the First Crusade to the Principality of Antioch," in V.P. Goss and C.Verzar Bornstein (eds.), *The Meeting of two worlds: cultural exchange between East and West during the period of the Crusades* (Kalamazoo, MI, 1986), pp. 115–121; Hodgson 2007a; RC, pp. xvii–xviii, xlvii–xlviii.

[138] See the discussion in Chapter 3.6.

[139] The following epithets are frequent: *Wiscardigena, Marchisida, Wiscardides, Marchisi filius*, *Eustachides*. *Magnanimus*—the dead giveaway of the epic register—also occurs several times (RC, 808, 866, 915). For instances of *nec mora* and *fama volans*, see RC, 48, 52, 4020 and RC, 48, respectively.

opportunity to compose an epic on one of the heroes of the First Crusade without necessarily disassociating himself from historiography and the writing of *res gestae*.[140]

In addition to Ralph's epicizing and more generally classicizing language, Ralph's versification of the dactylic hexameter emerges as rather Virgilian when one compares the patterns of dactyls and spondees in the first four feet of Ralph's dactylic hexameters with those of other classical poets (Horace, Ovid, Lucan); however, in terms of syllable length of words, elision, and rhyme, it seems that Ralph follows the "medieval" rather than classicizing trends of versification in the Middle Ages.[141]

In two instances, Ralph also employs other meters when they are more suited to his subject matter. He composes an epitaph for Adhémar of Le Puy in elegiac couplets, and when Tancred first lays eyes on the city of Jerusalem from the Mount of Olives, Ralph bursts into a jubilant hymn in lyric meter as a representation of Tancred's piety.[142] This is the first poem that is introduced as such, and its meter is a hendecasyllable composed of a hemipes and an adonic (in quantitative verse)—the so-called Terentianean Verse after Terentianus Maurus (where it first appears) that was so popular for the use of hymn in the Latin Middle Ages.[143] The hymn deals with Christ's resurrection and the Harrowing of Hell and addresses in an apostrophe those

[140] Bernhard Pabst (1994, p. 857) informs us that the 556 dactylic hexameters in RC, 2211–2780 comprise the longest sequence of verse in any medieval Latin prosimetrum.

[141] See the analysis of Edoardo D'Angelo in RC, pp. lxxv–lxxvii. For further studies on Ralph's versification, see Pabst 1994, p. 858; Manselli 1993, pp. 152–153.

[142] RC, 2767–2780 (unfortunately, the elegiac couplets are not arranged as such by D'Angelo); RC, 3166–3195. For a discussion of this hymn, see P.C. Jacobsen, "Die Eroberung von Jerusalem in der mittellateinischen Dichtung," in D. Bauer, K. Herbers, N. Jaspert (eds.), *Jerusalem im Hoch- und Spätmittelalter: Konflikte und Konfliktbewältigung—Vorstellungen und Vergegenwärtigungen* (Frankfurt am Main, 2001), pp. 335–365, at 349–351.

[143] RC, 3164–3165: . . . *cuius videlicet salutis imago metrum est presens*. See for a discussion of the use of this meter D.L. Norberg, *An introduction to the study of medieval Latin versification*, tr. G.C. Roti and J. de La Chapelle Skubly (Washington, DC, 2004), pp. 73–74.

geographical locations which would have been visible to Tancred, relating the events of the New Testament associated with those sites, and ends with a salutation to the Virgin Mary and the Holy Trinity.

For Ralph, the poetry in his work could have had a commemorative function, to mark key events and to commemorate important figures for the benefit of future generations. In one instance, Ralph commemorates the valor of Tancred's charioteer, Ribold of Chartres, who was forced to go around the camp begging for another sword for his master. Ralph may have suspected that this figure would be lost in time's oblivion (and indeed we do not know anything else about this Ribold) and so he made sure to commemorate his noble act with three lines of hexameters—a clear sign of the function that poetry could have for Ralph.[144]

What was Ralph's purpose in writing, and what evidence do we have as to his intended audience? To begin with the first, let us look at the statements made by Ralph on this matter. In the Prologue, as mentioned, Ralph indicates that his purpose is *res probe gestas principum recensere* ("to survey the valiant deeds of princes"), and elsewhere professes that he aims to celebrate the deeds of a single hero (i.e., Tancred), and therefore not necessarily to write a full account of the events of the First Crusade, or indeed a history of the principality of Antioch—much to the dismay of modern historians of the Crusader States.[145]

In addition to crafting a heroic legend, Ralph also has subsidiary aims in writing his work. For instance, when the crusaders finally reach their destination, Ralph feels obliged to provide an ecphrasis of Jerusalem for the benefit of far-away readers:

---

[144] RC, 3364–3367: *Refertur itaque in castra medicandus auriga currus Tancredici, "Quem si non tenuit, magnis tamen excidit ausis"* (Ov., *Met*. 2.328)*; neve tacito nomine audaciam militis meritus non remuneret favor* . . . Pabst (1994, pp. 857–858) suggests that the long battle descriptions in dactylic hexameter provide dramatic pacing to the overall narrative, while D'Angelo (RC, p. xx) adds that Ralph frequently intersperses short bits of verse (often a line or even a half line) to express a gnomic sentiment.

[145] RC, Prol. 1.1; 1714–1723. For more on these passages, see Chapter 2, section 5, and Chapter 4, section 5, respectively.

> Tempus est in explanando sanctae civitatis situ paululum delectare, ut quorum pascere non valet oculos propter remotionem, saltem animos iuvet transmissa ad manus et infusa per aurem . . .[146]
>
> It is time to offer some delight in describing the layout of the holy city, so that [the city] may at least be transmitted by touch and sound to those who are unable to feast their eyes on it because of the distance.

Ralph imagines a readership far removed from the Holy Land, perhaps in Caen, and appropriately resorts to ecphrasis as a means to bring the city of Jerusalem before the mind's eye of his readers to render it tangible.[147]

Did Ralph also intend for his work to be read within the Crusader Levant? Surely at least to some extent, as he addresses the work to Arnulf, then patriarch of Jerusalem.[148] In spite of the close relationship that Ralph and Arnulf may have had, this is an odd choice for a dedicatee on the part of Ralph. Ralph himself relates how strained the relationship between Tancred and Arnulf became after the fall of Jerusalem in 1099, when Tancred looted the treasures of the *Templum Domini*. This event subsequently led to a legal dispute between the two obstinate men, whose speeches are recorded in a dramatic reenactment by Ralph. It is difficult to imagine what Arnulf's reaction might have been at receiving a panegyric of one who had been a bitter opponent to him, and to read that, much like Hector and Aeneas, his opponent and he were equal in virtue.[149]

---

[146] RC, 3275–3278.

[147] On ecphrasis (or *demonstratio*) in the rhetorical tradition, see Ps.-Cic., *Rhet. ad Her.* 4.55.68: *Demonstratio est cum ita verbis res exprimitur ut geri negotium et res ante oculos esse videatur.*

[148] RC, Prol. 58.

[149] RC, 3942–3950.

Since Tancred had already died when Ralph began to write, his work may have been meant to appeal to the Antiochene court of Roger of Salerno, regent of Antioch, as an expression of Norman nationalism counterbalancing the accounts of Raymond of Aguilers and Fulcher of Chartres, which were pro-Provençal and pro-French, respectively.[150]

Perhaps the *Tancredus* was also meant to appeal to the political and ecclesiastical elite of the kingdom of Jerusalem.[151] This would explain the inclusion of the exuberant *laus Flandriae* ("praise of Flanders") and the panegyric of Baldwin of Boulogne.[152] In this context it is important to recall that the later additions to the *Tancredus* include much material that is focused on Jerusalem rather than Antioch, as well as passages of more overtly religious content that deal with supernatural events, and passages that place Arnulf of Chocques in a better light.[153]

All of this would suggest one (or a combination) of the following possibilities: after the death of his main benefactor, Ralph may have moved to Jerusalem from Antioch and presented the work to his old friend and teacher as a means of soliciting patronage. Over the years, as Ralph became more ensconced within the Jerusalemite court, he may have decided to add materials that would be of more direct appeal to his patrons. It has been suggested that some of the later additions were made by Arnulf, who obliged his former pupil's request to correct the work, polishing and adding to the work as he saw fit.[154] Based upon my own examinations of the

[150] D'Angelo (RC, pp. liv–lv) is too narrow in arguing that Ralph's main purpose was to redefine and refute the Treaty of Devol of 1108, which placed Antioch under Byzantine authority and made Bohemond a vassal of Alexios Komnenos. Although there are vehement anti-Byzantine sentiments, these are largely confined to the opening of the work, in which Bohemond and Tancred's dealings with Alexios are described.

[151] Suggested by Albu Hanawalt 1996, p. 10.

[152] RC, 482–490 and 1142–1148.

[153] See RC, pp. xxxi–xxxvii for a detailed discussion of the various phases of composition, and especially p. xxxvi: "Tutti i tipi di interventi redazionali, per come qui ricostruito, sembrano avere un fulcro, un motore: Gerusalemme ed il regno latino instauratovi."

[154] So Edoardo D'Angelo in RC, p. xxxv.

handwriting, however, I conclude that the hand remains the same throughout, and that the hand that made the additions is the same as that which wrote the earlier portions of the work. Given the nature of the manuscript as a working copy (as evidenced by the numerous additions and revisions, written on small scraps of parchment, to be inserted in a final, neat copy), this hand is most likely that of Ralph himself.[155]

Ralph writes difficult prose that is both terse and rhetorically ornate, sometimes unnecessarily obscure, but often impressive in its *callidae iuncturae* or witty juxtapositions of words and phrases. For those used to the more lucid and unadorned prose of the *Gesta Francorum* or of Raymond of Aguilers, Ralph of Caen is jarring in its at times overwrought playfulness, and perhaps this has given rise to dismissal and condemnation alike of Ralph's style.[156] More recent studies, however, have pointed out the artful skill with which Ralph composed both prose and poetry.[157] One particularly notable feature of Ralph's style is the unusual degree of classicism, most directly noticeable through the anachronistic use of vocabulary proper to Graeco-Roman culture, with words such as *legio*, *phalanx*, and *consul*.[158] Another obvious expression of Ralph's classicism is his frequent reference to classical mythology, sometimes juxtaposed with biblical references.[159]

---

[155] Since one of the additions refers to Bohemond II's death in 1130, this would mean that Ralph lived at least until 1130.

[156] Runciman (1951, vol. 1, p. 331) described Ralph's style as "that of an ignorant but very pretentious man." For similar, more recent appraisals, see G.M. Cantarella, "La frontiera della crociata: i Normanni del Sud," in *Il Concilio di Piacenza e le Crociate* (Piacenza, 1996), pp. 225–246, at p. 227; E. Albu Hanawalt, *The Normans in their histories* (Woodbridge, 2001), pp. 176–177.

[157] Manselli 1993, p. 139; Elm 2001, pp. 168–169. For earlier positive assesments of Ralph's style, see already Manitius, vol. 3, pp. 422–424; De Ghellinck 1946, pp. 118–119; Glaesener 1951; Boehm 1956.

[158] For a brief discussion, see RC, p. lxvii.

[159] See especially the passage in RC, 637–648, where references to Herod and Sodom are juxtaposed with Eurydice, and see the discussion in Chapter 2.

The *Tancredus* abounds in rare Latin words such as *barbicana* ("singing barbarously") and *linguositas* ("effluence of speech"), and sometimes Ralph can be seen to show off with such extremely rare specimens as the verb *conquinisco*, meaning "to bow down," which he likely found in Priscian.[160]

If his study of *grammatica* had taught Ralph rare lexical items, his study of dialectic also influences his language on occasion, as when Ralph employs technical terminology in describing Bohemond as refuting Peter Bartholomew, discoverer of the Holy Lance of Antioch, with the use of "sharp conjectures" (*inventorem coniecturis falsificat argutis*, "he disproves the discoverer with sharp conjectures").[161] Rhetoric, the remaining art of the trivium, pervades the *Tancredus*, particularly in the form of what is known in rhetoric as *exaedificatio*, or fully developing a theme and embellishing it with a variety of rhetorical figures—the most common of which are the *figura etymologica*, paronomasia, anaphora, alliteration, polyptoton, and hyperbaton.[162]

A particularly striking element of Ralph's prose is the constant use of hunting metaphors and similes, along with the appropriate technical vocabulary and the attention to the names in Latin of the various types of birds.[163] This lends the *Tancredus* the feel of romance literature, which is also frequent in the eleventh-century *Ruodlieb*, the earliest representative of verse romance.[164]

---

[160] RC, 1468; 3874; 3216. See Prisc., *Inst*. 2.508.28. For brief discussions of rare lexicological items in Ralph, see Manselli 1993, p. 154; RC, p. xlvii.

[161] RC, 2942. See also *acutis Boamundi argumentorum spiculis* in RC, 2967–2968, as well as RC, 4124–4125: *dumque effectus instat propior, efficacius repellitur causa efficiens*.

[162] On *exaedificatio*, see Cic. de Or. 2.15.63.

[163] For a discussion, see RC, p. lxxii, as well as N.R. Hodgson, "Lions, tigers, and bears: encounters with wild animals and bestial imagery in the context of crusading to the Latin East," *Viator* 44:1 (2013), pp. 65–94, at 74–75.

[164] For a recent edition with commentary, see *Ruodlieb: con gli epigrammi del Codex latinus monacensis 19486: la formazione e le avventure del primo eroe cortese*, ed. R. Gamberini (Firenze, 2003). Compare also the similar scene in Walter the Chancellor: WC, 2.3.12.

Whether or not Ralph made use of any of the extant eyewitness accounts of the First Crusade has been a matter of some debate, but in the absence of any clear evidence it appears that Ralph largely based his work on conversations with Bohemond and Tancred, Arnulf of Chocques, as well as other unidentified oral sources otherwise unavailable to us.[165]

As for Ralph's use of literary sources, the impressively wide range of classical authors that Ralph demonstrates to have read has long been acknowledged, although Glaesener's extraordinarily optimistic suggestion that Ralph may have read Greek authors such as Thucydides, Herodotus, Homer, and Sophocles must be rejected out of hand.[166] The absence of Greek authors notwithstanding, Ralph displays a deep familiarity with the poetry of Horace, Ovid, Persius, Lucan, Statius, Juvenal, Avianus, and above all Virgil, who is the only one quoted by name (as *Mantuanus*, "the man from Mantua"). Moreover, Ralph betrays knowledge of the prose of Sallust, Pliny the Elder, Cicero, Priscian, and Livy, who is quoted five times over the course of the *Tancredus*.[167]

Given the fact that only one manuscript of the *Tancredus* survives, it is clear that Ralph did not gain a wide readership. There is persuasive evidence, however, that Walter the

---

[165] Manselli (1993, pp. 142–143, 145) argues, *contra* Hagenmeyer (1890, pp. 70–73) and Bréhier (1924, p. xv) that Ralph did not make use of the *Gesta Francorum* (or any other eyewitness account of the First Crusade), but rather that he meant the classical authors when he talks about *scripta* that inspired him (RC, Prol. 1–2). Runciman (1951, vol. 1, p. 331) also did not think that Ralph used any other known account. Although Manselli claims not to have found a single trace of Raymond of Aguilers in Ralph, it must be noted that Ralph, too, mentions the detail of Kerbogha playing chess (RC, 2500)—the source of which is usually attributed to Raymond, although Ralph could also have gotten it from Fulcher of Chartres (who, in turn, used Raymond as a source). For passages pointing to Bohemond and Tancred as sources, see RC, Prol. 18–21; for Arnulf of Chocques, see RC, 3048–3051; for unidentified oral sources, see RC, 1667–1681, 1763–1766, 2819–2826, 4007–4009.

[166] Glaesener 1951, p. 6: "Dès son jeune âge, Raoul semble avoir vivement goûté et admiré les classiques grecs et latins, tant les historiens comme Thucydide, Hérodote, Tite-Live, Salluste, Tacite, que les poètes comme Homère, Sophocle, Virgile, Horace et Lucain." Ralph is also suggested to have read Xenophon (p. 8 n. 4). Manselli's claim (1993, p. 151) that none of Ralph's contemporaries had a better knowledge of Latin literature seems doubtful, or at least difficult to prove.

[167] Liv. 5.50.7 in RC, Prol. 32–33; 8.38.9 in 4433; 10.41.10 in 1875; 22.31.4 in 1569 and 2053. For a discussion of other traces of Livy, see Glaesener 1951, pp. 16–20; Manselli 1993, p. 152; Russo 2002, p. 201 n. 33.

Chancellor, also writing in Antioch, may have read the *Tancredus*, as correspondences in phrasing or even of entire passages in Walter and Ralph show.[168] On the basis of these parallels, it has been suggested that Walter can be conceived of as writing a kind of sequel to the *Tancredus*.[169] As was mentioned, the *Tancredus* was also used as a source in a compilation most likely assembled in Monte Cassino—the so-called *Hystoria de via et recuperatione Antiochiae atque Ierusolymarum* ("The history of the voyage to and recovery of Antioch and Jerusalem").[170]

The single extant manuscript of the *Tancredus* is currently in Brussels, Bibl. royale, MS 5369–5373, where it was brought after being discovered in 1716 by Edmond Martène in the wake of a fire at the monastery of Gembloux.[171] The codex consists of five parts in different hands, dating from the eleventh to the late twelfth centuries and containing texts of Ovid, Ausonius, and Symmachus. Given the many additions, corrections, and erasures in the portion containing the *Tancredus*, it is almost certain that this must constitute the author's autograph.[172] If this is true, then this would be one of the few extant autographs from the Latin East, together with Stephen of Antioch's *Liber Mamonis in astronomia*.[173]

2.5 Walter the Chancellor, *Bella Antiochena*

[168] See D'Angelo (RC, pp. xcii–xciv), who identified 11 such correspondences.

[169] RC, p. xcii.

[170] See D'Angelo 2009, pp.xxx–xxxv.

[171] For a description of the manuscript, see RC, pp. xxiii–xxix.

[172] This was first suggested by Martène: *Thesaurus novus anecdotorum*, ed. E. Martène and U. Durand, vol. 3 (Paris, 1717), p. 110.

[173] See below on Stephen of Antioch.

The first work to focus solely on events that took place after the First Crusade is the *Bella Antiochena* ("Wars of Antioch") by Walter the Chancellor who, like Ralph of Caen, settled in Antioch, and described the events of 1114–1115 and 1119–1122.[174] We are solely dependent on the work for biographical information about the author, who mentions himself by name twice: "the author Walter," and "I myself, Walter the Chancellor."[175] Although no charters or administrative documents bear his name, there is no reason to doubt that he held the position of chancellor of Antioch, especially given the intimate knowledge he displays of the inner workings of Prince Roger's court. The only conclusions that we may draw concerning Walter's career is that he probably held office at least during the period of the events he describes, the outer limits of which are 1114–1122; he must have left office by 1127, when Ralph the Chancellor appears as a third witness to a charter issued by Bohemond II, prince of Antioch.[176] One may tentatively conclude that, prior to taking office, Walter probably was of a clerical background, given his overt support at every turn of the Antiochene clergy, and of Patriarch Bernard in particular. A good example of this occurs in Book 2, when King Baldwin II first enters Antioch after Roger has died in the Battle of the Field of Blood in 1119, whose first point of action is to consult with Patriarch Bernard and the clergy, "as befitted a king."[177]

---

[174] Walter was first edited by J. Bongars in 1611 on the basis of MS Bern 261, reprinted in the *Patrologia Latina* in 1853: *Gesta Dei per Francos*, ed. J. Bongars (Hanau, 1611), vol. 1, pp. 441–467; *PL*, vol. 155, pp. 995–1038. Hans Prutz printed a new edition with the use of two additional manuscripts, but in 1895 Paul Riant used all seven extant manuscripts for a fresh edition in the *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades*: *Quellenbeiträge zur Geschichte der Kreuzzüge*, ed. H. Prutz (Danzig, 1876), vol. 1, pp. 1–55; *RHC Oc*, vol. 5, pp. 75–132. A year later, Heinrich Hagenmeyer published his own critical edition, henceforth WC. An English translation can be found in T.S. Asbridge and S.B. Edgington (trs.), *Walter the Chancellor's the Antiochene Wars* (Brookfield, VT, 1999).

[175] WC, 1.1.1, 2 prol. 1.

[176] *I libri iurium della Repubblica di Genova*, vol. 1/2, ed. D. Puncuh (Rome, 1996), p. 154, no. 337; R. Hiestand, "Ein unbekanntes Privileg Fürst Bohemunds II. von Antiochia für das Hospital vom März 1127 und die Frühgeschichte der antiochenischen Fürstenkanzlei," *Archiv für Diplomatik* 43 (1997), pp. 27–46, at pp. 44–46.

[177] WC, 2.9.8: *ecclesiastico consilio corroboratus . . . facta oratione et vegetatus patriarchali consilio . . .* See also his remark in WC, 2.10.1: *patriarcha et ordo clericalis, cuius iuris est bona monere, facere et docere . . .*

The *Bella Antiochena* was likely written in three stages: Book 1 must have been written sometime in the period between late 1115 and mid-1119, as it does not contain any reference to the Battle of the Field of Blood or Prince Roger's death in the summer of 1119.[178] Book 2, on the other hand was written at some point from 1122 onward, and may have been written in two stages, as is borne out by the end of chapter 12, which has a closing formula that is otherwise only found at the end of Book 1 and the end of Book 2. Given that we do not know when Walter was released from imprisonment at Aleppo or when he died, a definite date cannot be supplied.

The form of the *Bella Antiochena* is that of the prosimetrum—a fact that has been neglected in recent work, but which is important in understanding the nature of the text.[179] Both Book 1 and 2 open with a couplet of dactylic hexameters, which are very likely of Walter's own composition.[180] Both couplets have internal or leonine rhyme, a particularly favored form in medieval Latin poetry from the Carolingian period onward.[181] Furthermore, there are two longer poems in each of the books: Book 1 ends with a hymn commemorating the victory in the First Battle of Tall Danith in 1115 and the procession into Antioch of the Christian army led by Prince Roger. The hymn has the same meter as Fortunatus' hymn on the Holy Cross (*Vexilla regis prodeunt*, "The king's banners go forth"), which is also alluded to during the battle, when the prince's banners are described as *vexilla principis prodeunt* ("The prince's banners go forth").[182] Finally, there is a short poem in the digression in the middle of Book 2: this poem, too, is

[178] Asbridge and Edgington 1999, p. 8.

[179] The omission is notable in the otherwise excellent introduction to the English translation by Asbridge and Edgington 1999, pp. 1–72.

[180] See WC, p.119 n. 1.

[181] For further discussion, see the introductory section below on "poetry."

[182] The most recent edition is *Venanzio Fortunato: Opere*, ed. S. Di Brazzano (Rome, 2001); WC, 1.6.3.

rhythmical rather than quantitative.[183] The poem commemorates the defeat of the Antiochene army at the Battle of the Field of Blood, and particularly the capture of the survivors, among whom was Walter himself.

Although these poems cannot be classified as occasional poetry, inasmuch as they were presumably composed well after the occasions they describe, they are clearly commemorative of these events and would have appealed most directly to the community of Antioch. The principal audience can therefore be located among the Antiochene court and clergy, among whom Walter expected an oral performance of his work, as the many references to "listening" and "reciting" would indicate.[184]

Walter's chief purpose in writing his historical account is didactic, as he specifies in the opening of the prologue to Book 1:

> Operae pretium est audire et utilitati congruit, quomodo, quibus miraculis, qua gratia Deus arbiter bellum cum Parthis manu Rotgerii, principis Antiocheni, ex insperato gessit. Auditis etenim miraculorum virtutibus proborumque virorum actibus mali prosternentur facilius, boni etiam incitabuntur ad melius.
>
> It is worth the effort and useful to hear how, by what miracles, and through what grace God, as arbiter, waged war with the Parthians through the agency of Roger, prince of Antioch, doing so unexpectedly. For upon hearing the miraculous virtues and deeds of worthy men, wicked men are laid low all the more easily, while good men are encouraged to even better action.

Walter is first and foremost concerned with delivering moral instruction and clearly considers his account a *litterarum commemoratio actorum proborum virorum* ("a literary recounting of the deeds of worthy men"), to paraphrase the words that Walter puts into Prince Roger's mouth

[183] The poem consists of two stanzas of six lines each in the pattern 8p+7pp, with almost identical rhyme schemes: ABCBAB, ABCBCB.

[184] See WC, 1 prol. 1: *operae pretium est audire* and *auditis enim miraculorum virtutibus*; the prefatory poem to Book 2: *Galterius hic recitavit*; 2 prol. 1 and 2 prol. 2: *auditorum*.

when he delivers a rousing speech to his army before the First Battle of Tall Danith.[185] As becomes clear from the rest of the prologue, Walter is also interested in demonstrating the causes of historical events, and in doing so in an orderly and structured manner.[186]

Book 2 is very different from Book 1, in that it concerns not a victory but rather a crushing defeat of the Antiochenes. This change of subject matter necessarily alters the tone of the work, as Walter explains in the prologue to Book 2:

> Inter diversos prisci temporis bellorum eventus, profecto illorum aliquis ab historiographis adsertus, maestitiae seu gaudii mentibus auditorum quoquomodo causam intulit. Illud vero doloris dolorum ac totius infelicitatis elogium . . . ita funditus gaudia removit totiusque miseriae terminos modumque excessit, ut nec verbis exprimi nec mente concipi possit . . . unde necessario fateri cogimur quod nec historiographus ad plenum rei seriem describere valeat nec alius aliud quam divinam fuisse ultionem dicere praesumat. Verumtamen ne penitus a memoria labi videatur, quod dignum relatu auditorum saluti possit consulere, mutato stilo primi belli, prospere succedentis, ego ipse Galterius cancellarius, utriusque fortunae particeps exsistens expertusque . . . partem secundi cedentis in contrarium describere curavi . . .[187]

> Among the various outcomes of wars of bygone times, there are some put forward by historiographers that in some way offer to their listeners reason for sadness or joy. But the account of this sorrow of sorrows and utter misfortune . . . so fully removed all joys and exceeded the bounds of all misery, that it could not be expressed in words or be conceived with the mind . . . Therefore we must necessarily admit that a historiographer cannot describe fully this sequence of events, nor that anyone else should be so bold as to call it anything other than divine vengeance. Nevertheless, to prevent from appearing to slip into oblivion that which is worthy to relate and might be salubrious to its listeners, I myself, Walter the Chancellor, have changed the tone of the first war, which had a prosperous outcome, and have taken pains to describe a part of the second war, which had the opposite outcome, seeing as how I have experienced and shared in both fortunes . . .[188]

---

[185] WC, 1.6.1: *Mementote quanta laude, quanta veneratione, quanta etiam litterarum commemoratione acta proborum virorum toto mundo adscribantur memoriae*. For a fuller discussion of Walter's purpose in writing, see A. Mallet, "The 'Other' in the crusading period: Walter the Chancellor's presentation of Najm al-Din Il-Ghazi," *Al-Masāq* 22 (2010), pp. 113–128.

[186] WC, 1 prol. 1: . . . *ut ex causis praelibatis sequentium effectus perpendatur*; and see on Walter's concern with preserving the proper order in his narrative WC, 2.2.3: . . . *ne prolixitate verborum videar rei ordinem praeterisse*. Compare the similar sentiment in FC, 2.34.1–2.

[187] WC, 2 prol. 1–2.

[188] My translation here differs significantly from that of Asbridge and Edgington 1999, p. 109, where the *quod* in *unde necessario fateri cogimur quod* is translated as a causal conjunction rather than an object noun clause.

Walter's purpose in Book 2 is to warn against the deadly sin of pride (*umquam in suis bonis actibus superbire*) by writing his own account to posterity (*posteritatis memoriae commendando designabimus*) of those who died in the Battle of the Field of Blood and of those who were captured and tortured afterward (among them himself).[189]

Walter's dense rhetorical style resembles Sallust, particularly in its brevity and use of *sententiae* or aphoristic language—filled with such *bon mots* as *non bene viventium sed bene pascentium*[190] ("not of those living well but eating well"). Apart from the style and the strong moral and didactic focus, it is possible that the choice for the title of *Bella Antiochena* may also have been influenced by Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae* ("The war with Catiline") and *Bellum Iugurthinum* ("The Jugurthine war").

Walter frequently uses such rhetorical figures as asyndeton and tricolon, and particularly relishes the *figura etymologica*.[191] The most prominent aspect of Walter's style, however, is the use of poeticisms, often reminiscent of some phrase from a classical poet.[192] A good example can be found in the beginning of Book 2, when Walter is setting the stage for the catastrophe at the Field of Blood and heightening the sense of foreboding:

---

[189] WC, 2 prol. 3. In terms of the development of historiography in the Latin East, I note that Walter's pessimistic tone in the second prologue is very similar to that of William of Tyre at the end of his work in the prologue to Book 23 (see below).

[190] WC, 1 prol. 3.

[191] E.g., WC, 1.7.4: *sentiunt, vident, audiunt murorum turrium aedificiorumque diversorum ruinam . . . tandem victores reversi diversa ferendo mittendo ducendo*; 1.1.3: *par tormentum praedicatur de disparibus . . .*

[192] Although Walter's Latin is positively brimming with classical allusions, echoes, and reminiscences, some of the suggestions of Asbridge and Edgington are highly unlikely, as in the suggestion (1999, p. 113 n. 21) that Walter looked to Quintillian, *Inst.* 1.10.35 when describing Patriarch Bernard as motioning with his finger in his admonition of Prince Roger (WC, 2.1.5: *aperte principi digito vae! vae! illud demonstravit*). The text of Quintilian was extremely rare in the Middle Ages, and its use in the twelfth century was mostly confined to Bec, Chartres, and St. Gall. For the manuscript tradition of Quintilian, see M. Winterbottom, "Quintilian: *Institutio oratoria*," in L.D. Reynolds (ed.), *Texts and Transmission: a survey of the Latin classics* (Oxford, 1983), pp. 332–334; for a fuller discussion of his medieval fortune, see P. Lehmann, "Die Institutio oratoria des Quintilianus im Mittelalter," *Erforschung des Mittelalters*, vol. 2 (Stuttgart, 1959), pp. 1–28.

> Nos autem sinistro omine in praeceps rapti, non attendentes superbos merito deiici, humiles exaltari, quasi leonibus fortiores tigribusque inmitiores ad Agrum Sanguinis castra metaturi iter extorsimus . . .[193]
>
> We, however, rushed headlong under an ill omen, not mindful of the fact that the proud are rightly cast down, while the humble are exalted, and we forced our way as though we were stronger than lions and fiercer than tigers, in order to strike camp at the Field of Blood.

This short fragment is packed with verbal echoes from various sources, beginning with *sinistro omine* from Ovid[194] and *in praeceps rapti* from Juvenal,[195] whereas *superbos merito deiici, humiles exaltari* clearly looks to Luke;[196] *leonibus fortiores*, on the other hand, occurs in Samuel.[197] The unique phrase *iter extorsimus*, moreover, is highly poeticizing.

In a rare instance, Walter also employs the language of philosophy. He explains, for example, that the weak fortification of the tower into which a portion of the routed army of Roger had fled was the "efficient cause" of their surrender to Il-ghāzi.[198] Perhaps still in the sphere of philosophy, shortly afterward Walter appears to reference Boethius when the tortured captives lament that "death, though often invited, does not come to them."[199]

---

[193] WC, 2.2.1.

[194] Ov., *Her.* 13.49: *di, precor, a nobis omen removete sinistrum.* For a later usage of this phrase see WT, 16.19.1 and 20.17.13.

[195] Juv. 8.135: *quod si praecipitem rapit ambitio atque libido*.

[196] Luke 1:51–52.

[197] 2 Sam 1:23.

[198] WC, 2.6.1: *efficiens causa exstitit* . . . The same phrase was used earlier by Ralph of Caen: see RC, 418.

[199] WC, 2.7.1: . . . *verbis increpant mortem saepe vocatam et revocatam eisdem maestis non venire*. Cf. Boeth., *Cons.* 1.1 v. 13: *Mors hominum felix quae se nec dulcibus annis / inserit et maestis saepe vocata venit*.

As to his sources, Walter on several occasions specifies that he is an eyewitness of the events he describes.[200] Where Walter did not possess direct knowledge of the events that transpired, he is careful to vouch for the reliability of his sources.[201] Based on some similarities in phrasing, Hagenmeyer suggested that Walter may have made use of Fulcher of Chartres in describing the events of 1119.[202] Asbridge rightly objects, however, that it is doubtful that Walter would have used Fulcher for anything other than for information on Jerusalem, given Walter's proximity to Antioch and the events that occurred.[203]

Seven manuscripts containing Walter's work are extant, dating from the twelfth to thirteenth centuries. The oldest manuscript, which dates to the period 1137–1146, was probably the exemplar of the others, and also contains the accounts of Fulcher of Chartres and Raymond of Aguilers (see above).[204] Given the early dating, the exemplar from which this manuscript was produced may very well have been Walter's autograph.

2.6 *Balduini III Historia Nicaena vel Antiochena necnon Ierosolymitana*

In 1718, Edmond Martène came upon a history of the First Crusade in a manuscript at the monastery of Himmerod in the diocese of Trier, titled *Balduini III Historia Nicaena vel*

---

[200] See for example WC, 2.7.8: *quidam . . . redempti sunt, sicut in fine narrationis regalis belli edisseram, et est ratio: contigt enim ex regalibus plures sorte miserrima cum his admisceri, de quibus pro visu et auditu rata discutiam*.

[201] WC, 2.8.9: *certis internuntiis didicimus*; 2.16.9: *ut pro serio exsistentium in conflictu didicimus*; 2.13.1: *Nunc autem quaedam illorum, quae de Christicolarum captivorum exterminio discutienda praelibavi, pro visu et auditu seriatim edisseram*.

[202] WC, pp. 39–46.

[203] Asbridge 2000, pp. 5–6.

[204] Paris, BnF, MS lat. 14378. The other manuscripts are: Paris, BnF, MS Reg. lat. 5131 (13th c.); Paris, BnF, Bibl. de l'Arsenal, MS 1102 (late 12th, early 13th c.); Clermont-Ferrand, Bibl. mun., MS 262 (14th c.); London, British Library, MS Add. 8927 (13th c.); Bern, Burgerbibliothek, MS 261 (12th/13th c.); Rome, BAV, MS Reg. Christ. 547 (14th c.).

Antiochena necnon Ierosolymitana ("Baldwin III's History of Nicaea, Antioch, and Jerusalem").[205] Believing it to be an as yet unknown account, he proceeded to copy the manuscript with the intent to publish it. He quickly discovered, however, that the majority of the text represents an abbreviation of Robert the Monk's *Historia Iherosolimitana* and decided to publish only the prologue, which he believed to be the sole original portion of the text.[206] The text then vanished for a number of years, and while the original manuscript of Himmerod is probably lost beyond recovery as the result of the monastery falling into ruins after the French Revolution, Martène's copy was rediscovered by Paul Riant in 1881 (which had at this point been separated into two parts), whose edition of the text appeared posthumously in the *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades* in 1895.[207]

The prologue consists of 34 dactylic hexameters with leonine rhyme, and unlike the abbreviation of Bartolf of Nangis, allows us to date the text quite securely. It opens with a brief summary of the First Crusade, the culmination of which is presented as the founding of the kingdom of Jerusalem. A brief history of the kingdom of Jerusalem follows, largely consisting of a list of the kings and the length of their reigns (not always correct).[208] After King Fulk, the current king of Jerusalem is named:

> Post patrem ternis Baldwinus tertius annis,

[205] E. Martène and U. Durand, *Amplissima Collectio*, vol. 5 (Paris, 1729), pp. 511–512.

[206] Ed. E. Martène, *Amplissima Collectio*, vol. 5 (Paris, 1729), p. 536, repr. in *PL*, vol. 155, cols. 1089–1092.

[207] P. Riant, *AOL* 1 (1881), pp. 549–550. The text is now divided between: Paris, BnF, MS fr. 9077, ff. 180–205; Paris, BnF, MS fr. 9080, ff. 254–257. For the edition (hereafter *HN*), see: *Balduini III, Hierosolymitani Latinorum regis quarti, Historia Nicaena vel Antiochena necnon Jerosolymitana*, ed. P. Riant, *RHC Oc*, vol. 5.1, pp. 139–185.

[208] Baldwin II (1118–1131) is said to have reigned for fifteen years, while Fulk is said to have reigned for thirteen years (1131–1143). See *HN*, 24–28. I reject here Riant's proposed transposition of l. 27 to l. 28; although this would result in the correct number of years for Baldwin II's reign, it would directly contradict the statement in l. 25 and leave King Fulk without an indication of the duration of his reign.

> Praefectus regno iam nomine clarus avito,
> Qui compilavit simul et conscribere fecit
> Hoc opus; aeternae[209] sibi sit retributio vitae!
> Incipit Historia Nicena vel Antiochena,
> Urbis praeclarae necnon Ierosolymitanae.[210]
>
> Three years after his father [comes] Baldwin III, placed at the head of the kingdom and already distinguished by the name of his grandfather. He compiled and had this work written down: may he be granted the reward of eternal life! The *History of Nicaea, Antioch, as well as the splendid city of Jerusalem* begins.

The prologue tells us that the work was compiled at the specific request of Baldwin III, three years after his father's death. Given that Fulk died in 1143, and that Baldwin III had been officially crowned together with his mother Melisende on Christmas Day in 1143, this presumably places the date of composition in the year 1146, when Baldwin III would have been fifteen or sixteen years old.[211] Melisende had been active on the political scene of Jerusalem at least as early as 1129, managing to assert her position against her husband King Fulk, and the two even had a falling out that divided the royal court into two factions in 1134.[212] When Fulk died, Melisende governed the kingdom more or less autonomously, and refused to relinquish her

[209] To preserve the leonine rhyme as well as the quantitative meter, I have rejected Riant's reading of *aeterna* in favor of Martène's original reading of *aeternae*.

[210] *HN*, 29–34.

[211] For Fulk's death, see WT, 15.27, although William incorrectly places Fulk's death in 1142. For Baldwin and Melisende's crowning, see WT, 16.3. Deborah Gerish points out that the dating may be more complicated, since it is unclear whether the poet counted by regnal or ecclesiastical years (which usually began in Easter), and whether or not he counted partial years as whole ones. See D.E. Gerish, "Remembering kings in Jerusalem: the Second Crusade, the *Historia Nicaena vel Antiochena*, and royal identity," in J.T. Roche and J.M. Jensen (eds.), *The Second Crusade: holy war on the periphery of Latin Christendom* (forthcoming, May 2015). I am very grateful for having received an advance copy of this publication.

[212] For discussions of Queen Melisende's role in Jerusalemite politics, see H.E. Mayer, "Studies in the history of Queen Melisende of Jerusalem," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 26 (1972), pp. 95–182; B. Hamilton, "Women in the Crusader States: the queens of Jerusalem (1100–1190)," in D. Baker (ed.), *Medieval women: dedicated and presented to Professor Rosalind M. T. Hill on the occasion of her seventieth birthday* (Oxford, 1978), pp. 143–173; see more recently Hodgson 2007b, pp. 134–135 and 185–188. There is also a new biography of Queen Melisende: M. Tranovich, *Melisende of Jerusalem: the world of a forgotten crusader queen* (London, 2011).

role even after Baldwin III reached the age of majority in 1145. Eventually, a full-scale civil war threatened to break out in a crisis between mother and son in 1152.

The *Historia Nicaena* must be viewed in this historical context. The young Baldwin III may have considered an act of literary patronage a way of asserting his political power within the court of Jerusalem, and sought to rival his mother, who had established herself as a patron of the arts.[213] But why would Baldwin choose a compilation of historiographical texts as his first major act of royal patronage? A clue may perhaps be provided by William of Tyre in his portrait of Baldwin:

> Ingenii etiam vivacitate preditus, fidelis etiam memorie erat assequutus beneficium; erat autem et commode litteratus et fratre suo domino Amalrico, qui ei successit, multo amplius: cum vero quid ocii ex occupationibus publicis decerpere poterat, libenter incumbebat lectioni; historiarum precipue auditor, antiquorum regum et optimorum principum gesta moresque diligenter investigabat; litteratorum maxime, sed et prudentum laicorum confabulationibus plurimum recreabatur.[214]

> He had been furnished with a keen intellect, and had also acquired the gift of a reliable memory; he was suitably well-read and much more so than his brother, Lord Amaury, who succeeded him: whenever he was able to enjoy a bit of free time from his public obligations, he gladly engaged in reading; he listened to history in particular, and inquired sedulously into the deeds and characters of ancient kings and the best of rulers; he was greatly entertained by conversations with those who were well-read in particular, but also with prudent members of the laity.

According to William, Baldwin III particularly enjoyed listening to tales of history, and may have sought to increase his own prestige by commissioning a "royal version" of the splendid deeds of the first kings of Jerusalem.

---

[213] See the chapter on Melisende's patronage in WT, 15.26. The most notable example of this patronage is the so-called "Melisende Psalter" now in the British Library. See on this the extensive discussion in J. Folda, *The art of the crusaders in the Holy Land, 1098–1187* (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 130–163, and more recently J. Folda, "Melisende of Jerusalem: queen and patron of art and architecture in the Crusader Kingdom," in T. Martin (ed.), *Reassessing the roles of women as 'makers' of medieval art and architecture* (Leiden, 2012), vol. 1, pp. 429–477.

[214] WT, 16.2.12–19.

The person responsible for teaching the young prince the history of his kingdom would commonly have been the court chaplain, so it is here that we may perhaps find the person responsible for the *Historia Nicaena*.[215] Unfortunately, it is uncertain who fulfilled this occupation in 1146 or the years in direct proximity. In the 1130s, a *Petrus capellanus* ("Peter, the chaplain") bore witness to three documents, the last of which is dated to 1138, where he is listed as *reginae capellanus* ("chaplain of the queen").[216] The next chaplain does not appear until 1150 in a charter that represents one of Baldwin's first independent political acts and has, given its amateurish nature, been described as "a diplomatic disaster."[217] It was witnessed by one *Adam regis capellanus* ("Adam, chaplain of the king"), who may also be the same as a canon from Acre named Adam, and was written *per manum Danielis clerici regis, fratris Salientis in Bonum Hugonis* ("by the hand of Daniel, cleric of the king, brother of Hugo Saliens in Bonum").[218] Both of these figures were closely connected with the king by 1150, and so either of them could have been responsible for the *Historia Nicaena*.[219]

While it has received some attention in scholarship, the *Historia Nicaena* has been described as a "pedestrian, unimaginative and largely neglected compilation," as well as "derivative and generally disregarded."[220] Regarding the text itself, this assessment is accurate

---

[215] On the role of chaplains within the kingdom of Jerusalem, see Mayer 1988.

[216] *Diplomata*, vol. 1, nos. 124, 138, 141.

[217] *Diplomata*, vol. 1, no. 221, at p. 407: "eine diplomatische Kalamität."

[218] This Adam witnessed three charters and would go on to become bishop of Paneas: *Diplomata*, nos. 138, 244, 258.

[219] Another chaplain active in this period, one *Fredericus*, is explicitly connected only with Queen Melisende, so I have left him out of this discussion. See *Diplomata*, no. 177 and Mayer 1988, p. 496.

[220] B.Z. Kedar, "The Jerusalem Massacre of July 1099 in the Western historiography of the Crusades," *Crusades* 3 (2004), pp. 15–75, at p.25 and Edbury 2007, p. 28. Compare also Hagenmeyer's judgment of the text as "ganzen wertlosen Erzählung" (FC, p. 84). It should also be mentioned that the *Historia Nicaena* has been suggested as a source for late medieval *exempla* in Dominican sermons by Paolo Maggioni: James of Voragine, *Legenda aurea*, ed.

enough, since its account of the First Crusade represents a series of excerpts from Robert the Monk's history, while for the subsequent period the compiler has chosen short episodes from Fulcher of Chartres up through Baldwin II's capture in 1123, which the compiler has abbreviated and adapted.[221] The work can hardly be considered an original composition in our modern sense, although it would appear that greater creativity was used in the latter section. Dramatic details are added, as when the news of Baldwin's capture, described by Fulcher as merely a *rumor*, is rendered as *rumor vehemens et horridus nostris* ("a stunning and terrible rumor for our people"),[222] while in comparison with other accounts of the First Crusade, the compiler appears to deliberately downplay the massacre that took place at the capture of Jerusalem.[223] The text is of interest, moreover, as a witness to the earliest known reception of Robert the Monk in the Latin East, as well as to the role that Latin historiography played within the cultural landscape of the Jersulemite court. Finally, the prefatory poem is of significant interest as evidence of how a young king (or the person who compiled the work upon his request) viewed the kingdom of Jerusalem as an institution.

2.7 William of Tyre, *Historia Hierosolymitana*

P. Maggioni (Florence, 1998–1999), vol. 1, p. xlviii and 398 n. 139. However, this suggestion has been summarily rejected in J.B. MacGregor, "The First Crusade in late medieval *exempla*," *The historian* 68 (2006), pp. 29–48, at p. 45.

[221] The text that the compiler used was probably the first recension of Fulcher, which extended only to the year 1124.

[222] FC, 3.16.2; *HN*, 80. Note here, as in Bartolf of Nangis, the use of the first person plural with the possessive, indicating the compiler's self-identification with the Jerusalemites.

[223] Kedar 2004, p. 26.

The final historical work composed in Latin to be discussed is the monumental work of William of Tyre.[224] Here again we do not possess any testimonia about our author from any other authors, making us solely dependent on the work of William. Although he offers a wealth of information in the nearly one-thousand pages of the modern edition of his work, we are still in the dark about some of the basic questions surrounding the person of William.[225]

William tells us that he was born in Jerusalem, but whether his parents or grandparents were the ones who had settled there is uncertain, given the ambiguous meaning of the word *progenitores*.[226] In the same passage, he writes that he returned to Outremer in 1165 after nearly twenty years of study; William would have left at the age of fifteen at the earliest, which calculating backwards, allows us to tentively place his birth in 1130. This would mean that either

[224] William's *Historia* was first printed in Basle by Nicolaus Brylinger and Jean Oporinus in 1549, based on a now lost manuscript edited by Philibert Poyssenot: *Belli Sacri Historia, Libris XXIII comprehensa, de Hierosolyma, ac Terra Promissionis* . . . (Basle, 1549). It was reprinted in 1564 by Henri Pantaléon in Basle: *Historia belli sacri verissima, lectu et iucunda et utilissima, libris viginti tribus ordine comprehensa* . . . (Basle, 1564). The first critical edition appeared at the hand of Jacques Bongars in 1611, based on three manuscripts still extant; the text was later reprinted in the *Patrologia Latina* in 1855: *Gesta Dei per Francos*, ed. J. Bongars (Hanau, 1611); *PL*, vol. 201, cols. 201–892. Auguste-Arthur Beugnot and Auguste Le Prévost then prepared a fresh edition on the basis of three manuscripts (two of which are the same as those used by Bongars), with the addition of the *Eracles*, for the first volume of the *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades* in 1844: *RHC Oc*, vol. 1. All other editions have now been superseded by the excellent edition of Robert Huygens, which includes a heretofore unknown portion of the text: *Willelmus Tyrensis, Archiepiscopus, Chronicon, CCCM* 63–63A, ed. R.B.C. Huygens (Turnhout 1986), henceforth WT. An English translation, based on the older edition in the *Recueil* can be found in E.A. Babcock and A.C. Krey (trs.), *A history of deeds done beyond the sea, by William, archbishop of Tyre* (New York, 1943). The fullest introduction to William of Tyre and his work is in P.W. Edbury and J.G. Rowe, *William of Tyre, historian of the Latin East* (Cambridge, 1988).

[225] On the life of William, see H. Prutz, "Studien über Wilhelm von Tyrus," *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde* 8 (1883), pp. 91–132, at pp. 91–106; A.C. Krey, "William of Tyre: The Making of an Historian in the Middle Ages," *Speculum* 16:2 (1941), pp. 149–166; R.C. Schwinges, *Kreuzzugsideologie und Toleranz: Studien zu Wilhelm von Tyrus* (Stuttgart, 1977), pp. 19–35; R. Hiestand, "Zum Leben und zur Laufbahn Wilhelms von Tyrus," *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 34 (1978), pp. 345–380; R.B.C. Huygens, "Editing William of Tyre," *Sacris Erudiri* 27 (1984), pp. 461–473; Edbury and Rowe 1988, pp. 13–22.

[226] WT, 19.12.11: . . . *ad propria remeans paternis laribus et pie matris . . . restitutus sum complexibus, in sancta et deo amabili Ierosolima initium ortus habens et a progenitoribus domicilium.* Given the fact that *progenitor* generally seems to imply for William a more distant relation than parents (e.g., at WT, 1.11.14, 9.5.8, 16.6.22, it seems to mean "ancestor"), Hiestand (1978, p. 347 n. 12) was in favor of interpreting the word as meaning "grandparent." However, at WT, 1.15.49, *progenitor* is used to mean "father."

his grandparents had come to Jerusalem in the First Crusade or early in its wake, or that his parents came to Jerusalem somewhat later in the 1120s.

The ethnic origin of William's (grand)parents has also been a matter of debate. Hans Prutz suggested that William was of French origin, due to his precise knowledge of French topography.[227] As we now know, however, William spent a considerable amount of time studying in France (see below), so that this is not a very cogent argument. Emily Babcock and A.C. Krey, on the other hand, proposed that William's roots were Italian, arguing that William's interest in trade and his use of technical vocabulary related to shipping suggested that he was from a wealthy Italian merchant background.[228] Robert Huygens added the possibility that William's consistent use of the term *ultra-* and *transmontanus* ("from across the mountains") to refer to France may suggest an Italian perspective, but the fact that the Frenchman Raymond of Aguilers used the similar *transalpinus* to refer to France, without any evidence that he was writing from Italy, calls this argument into question.[229]

As to the social status of William's family, we are fortunate to possess a charter issued by Baldwin IV in 1175 in which William's brother Ralph is listed as a witness under *burgenses* ("burgesses"), which would have been the equivalent of the local middle class.[230]

---

[227] Prutz 1883, p. 93.

[228] Babcock and Krey 1943, at p. 7. See especially WT, 1.7.25–27 and 1.7.41.

[229] WT, vol. 1, p. 461–462. See for instance WT, 15.18: *tam multi de partibus ultramontanis quam de cismarinis regionibus*. Huygens admits that this use could also reflect the fact that William spent some time in Italy—first for his studies in Bologna, later to attend the Third Lateran Council in 1179. For Raymond, see RA, p. 107.

[230] See Bresc-Bautier, no. 160 (=*RRH*, Additamentum 1904, no. 531). For a discussion on William's terminology referring to the various social classes of the kingdom of Jerusalem, see C. Kostick, "William of Tyre, Livy, and the vocabulary of class," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 65:3 (2004), pp. 353–368. For the social classes of the burgesses more generally, see Prawer 1985, pp. 145–170. The standard reference work on burgesses is now: M. Nader, *Burgesses and burgess law in the Latin Kingdoms of Jerusalem and Cyprus (1099–1325)* (Aldershot, 2006).

William most likely received his early education at the school connected with the Church of the Holy Sepulcher, where John of Pisa, the later Cardinal John of SS. Silvester and Martin in Rome (of the church now known as S. Martino ai Monti), was in charge of educating "young clergy" in 1136.[231] William's clear favoritism toward John in relating the church politics of Tyre, it has been suggested, may point to a previous relationship that the two shared as master and pupil.[232] On the basis of a similar argument, Krey had suggested the influence of Peter of Barcelona, prior of the Holy Sepulcher until 1148 and Geoffrey, prior and later abbot of the *Templum Domini* in ca. 1136/7–1160.[233]

In 1961, Robert Huygens made one of the most important textual discoveries in the field of crusade studies: the lost chapter of William's history that describes his extensive studies in Western Europe spanning nearly twenty years.[234] He began his studies in the liberal arts in Paris near St. Victor on Mt. Geneviève under Bernard of Moelan, deacon Ivo of Chartres,[235] and Peter Helias, and also attended the disputations of Alberic de Monte, Robert of Melun, Mainer, Robert

[231] H.E. Mayer, "*Guillaume de Tyr à l'école*," *Mémoires de l'Académie des sciences, arts et belles-lettres de Dijon* 117 (1985–86), pp. 257–265, based on the remarks in WT, 16.17 and 18.8. A document from the cartulary of the Chapter of the Holy Sepulcher bears the subscription: *scriptum per manum Iohannis Pisani qui eo tempore ad Sepulchrum clericulos docebat*. See Bresc-Bautier, no. 103 (De Rozière, no. 107). This passage is discussed in W. Hotzelt, "Die Chorherren vom Heiligen Grabe in Jerusalem," *Das Heilige Land in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart: gesammelte Beiträge und Berichte zur Palästinaforschung* (Cologne, 1940), vol. 2, pp. 107–136, at p. 118. Buchthal (*Miniature painting in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem* (London, 1957), p. xxx) suggests that this may be the same person mentioned by William of Tyre (WT, 16.17.26) as archdeacon of Tyre in 1146.

[232] Mayer 1985–86.

[233] Krey 1941, p. 10; see also Hiestand 1978, pp. 363–364. Krey also suggests the figure of Fulcher, patriarch of Jerusalem from 1146–1157. However, Fulcher did not come into office until after William would have left to study in Europe. As the lost chapter describing William's studies (see below) was not found when Krey wrote this piece, many of his suggestions with regard to William's earlier life and education must be approached with care, although the discussion of the end of William's career remains of importance.

[234] See R.B.C. Huygens, "Guillaume de Tyr étudiant. Un chapitre (XIX, 12) de son 'Histoire' retrouvé," *Latomus* 21 (1962), pp. 811–829. For an important discussion of William's study of the liberal arts and their impact on his thought and writings, see Schwinges 1977, pp. 286–290.

[235] Not to be confused with the celebrated figure of St. Ivo of Chartres, who died in 1116.

Amiclas, and Adam of Petit-Pont. Sometime afterward, William moved to Orléans to study the classics with Hilary of Orléans and geometry with William of Soissons, before moving back to Paris to study theology with the renowned Peter Lombard and later with Maurice of Sully, a former student of Abelard, who would be celebrated for his role in laying the foundations of the Notre-Dame de Paris. Finally, William spent the remaing four years studying law in Bologna with Martinus Hugo, Bulgar, and Jacobus—all former students of the renowned legal scholar Irnerius of Bologna.[236]

Returning to his homeland in 1165, William quickly proceeded through the ranks of the ecclesiastical hierarchy: he became a canon of Acre in 1165 and archdeacon of Tyre in 1167. He also curried the favor of the royal court in Jerusalem in this period, as he was sent on a diplomatic mission to Manuel Komnenos by King Amaury in 1168 and appointed to be the tutor for the future King Baldwin IV in 1170. He became archdeacon of Nazareth in 1174 and was appointed chancellor of Jerusalem by regent Raymond III of Tripoli in the same year; a year later, he became the archbishop of Tyre.

The swift advance of his career was stymied a few years later, when an unfortunate change in the political climate of the kingdom of Jerusalem led to the appointment of his rival Eraclius of Caesarea to the patriarchate of Jerusalem in 1180.[237] William of Tyre may have suffered collateral damage in the ongoing struggle for the throne between King Amaury's two wives, Agnes of Courtenay and Maria Komnena. After succeeding his brother Baldwin III to the

[236] William claims to have studied both civil and canon law (WT, 19.12.1): . . . *iuris quoque tam ecclesiastici quam civilis prudentiam avidissime sum sequutus* . . . However, as Edbury and Rowe point out (1988, p. 15), none of the teachers he mentioned were canonists.

[237] On Eraclius, see B.Z. Kedar, "The Patriarch Eraclius," in B.Z. Kedar, H.E. Mayer, and R.C. Smail (eds.), *Outremer: Studies in the history of the crusading kingdom of Jerusalem presented to Joshua Prawer* (Jerusalem, 1982), pp. 177–204 (repr. in Kedar 1993, no. viii).

throne in 1163, Amaury had his first marriage with Agnes annulled in order to seek an alliance with the Byzantines through his marriage with Maria in 1167.

When William's career in the Jerusalemite court began in the late 1160s, he became associated with the faction of Maria Komnena and her supporter Raymond III, count of Tripoli. Although this had a beneficial effect upon William's career in the short term, when he was appointed chancellor in 1174 of Jerusalem while Raymond was regent after Amaury's death earlier that year, this turned out to have disastrous consequences in the long term, as the faction of Agnes would eventually win out. Agnes found powerful support from her second husband Reginald Grenier, lord of Sidon, as well as Amaury and his younger brother Guy of Lusignan, Raynald of Châtillon, lord of Oultrejourdain, Eraclius, bishop of Caesarea, and Gerard of Ridefort, master of the Knights Templar. More importantly, however, Agnes had borne Amaury a son, Baldwin IV, while Maria had only borne him a daughter, Isabella. Since Baldwin IV (the "leper king") was not expected to live long, the struggle for Isabella's hand in marriage grew fierce in the late 1170s. When Baldwin married off Isabella to Guy of Lusignan in the summer of 1180, the hopes of Maria's faction were dashed definitively, and in the fall of 1180 Eraclius, not William, was chosen to be patriarch.

The end of William's life became the subject of some controversy as early as the Old French continuations of the early thirteenth century, which relate that William resisted Eraclius' candidacy for the patriarchal see of Jerusalem, and when the latter won out, William was subsequently excommunicated on a Maundy Thursday.[238] When William traveled to Rome to appeal his case with Pope Alexander III, Eraclius had his opponent poisoned by a physician.

---

[238] For a discussion of the passages, see P.W. Edbury and J.G. Rowe, "William of Tyre and the Patriarchal Election of 1180," *The English Historical Review* 93:366 (1978), pp. 1–25.

Although in the past some scholars have accepted this account as largely factual,[239] the fantastical nature of the story as well as the factual inaccuracies it contains have made it subject to much criticism from more recent scholars, who tend to view the account as a fabrication made by partisans of William of Tyre.[240] To begin with, the pope in question cannot have been Alexander III, who died in 1181. Moreover, as Edbury and Rowe have worked out meticulously, if we accept the excommunication on a Maundy Thursday, it would have had to have been on April 14 of 1183.[241] There are two problems with this date: first, William's history, which continues up through 1184, does not mention the excommunication; second, Joscius, William's successor as archbishop of Tyre, does not appear until October 26, 1186.

The question of William's excommunication must remain undecided until further evidence is presented, as does that of the date of William's death. Rudolf Hiestand pointed out an obit from the Church of St.-Maurice of Chartres, which lists William's death as September 29, though it does not give the year.[242] Edbury and Rowe object to the now commonly-held year 1186 as argued by Hiestand and others,[243] since it would only provide for three weeks between William's death and the election of Joscius, tentatively preferring 1184, when Eraclius was in Europe.[244]

---

[239] Prutz 1883, p. 106; R. Röhricht, *Geschichte des ersten Kreuzzuges* (Innsbruck, 1901), p. 391, who dates the excommunication to April 2, 1181.

[240] Krey 1941, p. 160; H.E. Mayer, "Zum Tode Wilhelms von Tyrus," *Archiv für Diplomatik* 5–6 (1959–1960), pp. 182–201; Hiestand 1978, p. 348.

[241] See Edbury and Rowe 1988, pp. 20–21. Eraclius was away in Europe on Maundy Thursday in 1185, while William's patron Raymond of Tripoli was in control of the kingdom in 1184 and 1186.

[242] Hiestand 1978, p. 351.

[243] Hiestand 1978, p. 351; Mayer 1959–1960, p. 197; Huygens 1984, p. 462 and WT, p. 1.

[244] Edbury and Rowe 1988, p. 22. The Old French continuations appear to indicate that Eraclius was in Europe when William died.

William mentions two other works that he wrote, although they are unfortunately no longer extant. The first is a *Historia de Orientalibus principibus* ("History of Eastern rulers"), first mentioned by William in the beginning of his history, in dealing with the early history of Jerusalem in the centuries preceding the First Crusade.[245] He refers his readers who are interested in a fuller account of this period to his earlier work on Eastern rulers, which began with a description of the life of Muhammad and continued up to his own day. This work, like his other history, was commissioned by King Amaury, and must therefore have been started between 1165 (when William returned from Europe) and 1174 (death of King Amaury), and was probably added to by William on a continuous basis.

The other lost work mentioned by William is a report of the Third Lateran Council in 1179 that he attended as archbishop of Tyre, although it has been suggested that traces of the account survive in the extant canons of the council.[246] It apparently contained a list of the names, number, and titles of those who attended, as well as a summary of the statutes passed at the council. William refers those who are interested in the work to the episcopal archive of Tyre.[247]

[245] WT, 1 prol. 84–89; see also 19.21.55–61. See for discussions of this work Manitius, vol. 3, p.432; Prutz 1883, pp. 107–114; Schwinges 1977, pp. 41–42; H. Möhring, "Zu der Geschichte der orientalischen Herrscher des Wilhelm von Tyrus: Die Frage der Quellenabhängigkeiten," *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch* 19 (1984), pp. 170–183; Edbury and Rowe 1988, pp. 31–32; A.V. Murray, "William of Tyre and the origin of the Turks: observations on possible sources of the Gesta orientalium principum," in M. Balard, B.Z. Kedar, and J. Riley-Smith (eds.), *Dei gesta per Francos: Etudes sur les croisades dédiées à Jean Richard* (Aldershot, 2001), pp. 217–229.

[246] See B.Z. Kedar, "De Iudeis et Sarracenis," in R.I. Castillo Lara (ed.), *Studia in honorem eminentissimi cardinalis Alphonsi M. Stickler* (Rome, 1992), pp. 207–213 (repr. in Kedar 2006, no. xiii).

[247] WT, 21.25.73–79: *Cuius* [sc. *synodi*] *siquis et statuta et episcorum nomina, numerum et titulos scire desiderat, relegat scriptum quod nos ad preces sanctorum patrum, qui eidem synodo interfuerunt, confecimus diligenter, quod in archivo sancte Tyrensis ecclesie inter ceteros, quos eidem ecclesie contulimus libros, cui iam sex annis prefuimus, iussimus collocari.*

Most manuscripts of William's history do not give a title.[248] Two manuscripts, however, give the incipit as *Incipit historia rerum in partibus transmarinis gestarum a tempore successorum Mahumeth usque ad annum domini M.C.LXXXIIII*, *edita a venerabili Willelmo Tyrensi archiepiscopo* ("The history of the events in the lands across the sea begins, from the time of the successors of Muḥammad to the year of our Lord 1184, written by William, venerable archbishop of Tyre").[249] As Huygens rightly remarks, this title has to be of Western origin, since William only uses the phrase *in/de partibus transmarinis* to refer to Europe, never for the Latin East.[250] Huygens therefore refers to the work via the more neutral *Chronicon* ("Chronicle"), which is indeed used on occasion by William to refer to his work.[251] However, since two manuscripts give the incipit *Incipit Prologus Domini Guillelmi Tyrensis Archiepiscopi in Hystoriam Ierosolimitanam* ("The prologue of William, archbishop of Tyre, to the history of Jerusalem begins"),[252] and since William also refers to his work as a *historia* on multiple

[248] For discussions on the manuscript tradition of William, see R.B.C. Huygens, "Le tradition manuscrite de Guillaume de Tyr," *Studi medievali* 5 (3rd Series, 1964), pp. 281–371; Huygens 1984; WT, vol.1, pp. 3–32. Only nine manuscripts and one fragment of William's *Historia* in Latin survive today, the oldest two of which are dated to the year 1200, while one manuscript dates to 1197–1207: Paris, BnF, MS lat. 17801 (1197–1207); Rome, BAV, MS lat. 2002 (1200); Chambéry, MS B 3240 (1200); Montpellier, Bibl. de la Faculté de Médecine, MS 91 (13th c.); Paris, BnF, MS lat. 6066 (13th c.); Rome, BAV, MS Reg. lat. 690 (13th c.); London, British Library, MS Royal 14 C. X (13th c.); Cambridge, Magdalene College, MS F.4.22 (13th c.); Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 95 (14th c.); Paris, BnF, MS lat. 17153 (15th c.).[248] None of the extant manuscripts constitute William's autograph, nor indeed were any of the manuscripts produced in the Latin East. Huygens separates the manuscripts into an English and a French strain, concluding that no manuscripts came from the German or Italian regions. The two oldest English manuscripts present what could almost be considered a medieval critical edition of William's text, and appear to have attempted to correct their examplar by introducing interpolations from other manuscripts, or even by presenting their own emendations *ope ingenii* in order to achieve a more readable text. See Huygens 1984, pp. 466–467 and WT, vol. 1, pp. 22–31.

[249] These are Montpellier, Bibl. de la Faculté de Médecine, MS 91 (13th c.) and Paris, BnF MS lat. 6066 (13th c.).

[250] WT, 10.20.39, 19.4.23, 19.12.12.

[251] See WT, vol. 1, pp. 32–34.

[252] These are London, British Library MS Royal 14 C. X (13th c.) and Cambridge, Magdalene College MS F.4.22 (13th c.).

occasions,[253] I will adopt Edbury and Rowe's practice of referring to the work as the *Historia Hierosolymitana*.[254] One further argument that would speak in favor of this title is the fact that it is probably also the title that Fulcher of Chartres gave to the final redaction of his work, thereby possibly setting a precedent for William.

It is not known precisely when William began writing his *magnum opus*, but we are told that he had already conceived the plan of writing a history in late 1169. In an important passage, William describes how he interviewed various participants in the failed expedition in Egypt, undertaken by a coalition led by Amaury and Manuel Komnenos in 1169.[255] Apparently he had spent much of that year in Rome to take care of *familiaria negotia* ("private business"?), and was therefore entirely dependent upon the reports of others.[256] The passage demonstrates that William had already begun to collect information and make notes. In his Prologue, moreover, William writes that King Amaury had ordered him to write a history and frequently insisted upon the endeavor. Given that William was already in the king's good graces by 1168, when he was entrusted with leading an embassy to the Byzantine court, he may have already begun writing as early as 1168 or 1167.[257]

---

[253] WT, 1 prol. 84–85, 12.6.41, 16 pref. 1, 17.1.1, 17.7.3, 18.3.70–71, 19. rubr. 12, 19.12.2, 21 rubr. 5, 21 rubr. 8, 22.4.14.

[254] Edbury and Rowe 1988, p. 1 n. 1. As is more common practice, I am opting for the regularized Latin spelling of Jerusalem, as opposed to Ebury and Rowe's *Historia Ierosolimitana*.

[255] WT, 20.17.35–40: . . . *reversi autem, predicte questionis solutionem querentes, variis multorum relationibus de rei veritate cupiebamus edoceri, nam longe a spe nostra dicebatur accidisse. Qua nostra sollicitudine nos trahente—hec omnia scripto mandare iam conceperamus—invenimus Grecos etiam in predicto negocio non sine lata culpa fuisse.*

[256] We do not know exactly what type of *negotia* these were. Is *familiaris* to be interpreted here as his own private matters, matters pertaining to his family, or perhaps to his diocese in Tyre (William was archdeacon of Tyre in 1169)? See also the comments of Huygens (WT, p. 1 n. 4) and Edbury and Rowe (1988, p. 16 n. 16).

[257] Krey and Babcock (1943, pp. 12–13, p. 369 n. 20) suggest the earlier date.

William spent at least thirteen years working on the *Historia*: the first datable reference is in 1171, while the last events he relates occur in 1184.[258] The writing process may not have been so straightforward, however, since evidence suggests that William went back and revised portions of his text even as he continued adding to it. One clue, recently observed by Benjamin Kedar, is in William's description of the Church of the Holy Sepulcher, sometimes referred to as the "Church of the Lord's Sepulcher," other times as the "Church of the Holy/Lordly Resurrection." Given that the latter occurs in a passage that can be dated to the early 1180s, it allows for the hypothesis that William decided to apply this phrase systematically, going back through earlier portions of his history but never completing the process.[259]

Unlike Fulcher of Chartres, Ralph of Caen, or Walter the Chancellor, William decided to write his history entirely in prose, with the exception of one elegiac couplet on the death of Zengi.[260] William claims that "one of our men" (*quidam nostrum*) spoke these words, and it is unclear whether William is reporting verses composed by someone else or—perhaps more likely, given the commemorative occasions for which William's predecessors tended to compose verse—put the words in verse himself.[261]

The work was arranged by William into twenty-three books, as he writes in the Prologue:

> Distinximus autem volumen universum in libros viginti tres eorumque singulos certis designavimus capitulis, quo lectori facilius quicquid de articulis historie sibi viderit necessarium occurrat, propositum

[258] For passages datable to 1171, see WT, 4.24.3–7; 19.21.52–55; the events in the incomplete Book 23 all occur in 1184.

[259] B.Z. Kedar, "Some new light on the composition process of William of Tyre's *Historia*," in S.B. Edgington and H.J. Nicholson (eds.), *Deeds done beyond the sea: Essays on William of Tyre, Cyprus and the military orders presented to Peter Edbury* (Farnham, 2014), pp. 3–11.

[260] WT, 16.7.10–11: *Quam bonus eventus! Fit sanguine sanguinolentus / vir homicida reus nomine Sanguineus*.

[261] So suggested Prutz 1883, p. 98.

> habentes, vita comite, que deinceps nostris temporibus rerum futurarum depromet varietas, his que premisimus addere et numerum augere librorum pro quantitate occurrentis materie.[262]
>
> I have separated the entire work into twenty-three books, and indicated each one with a proper heading, in order that the reader might more easily come across what he deems to be necessary from among the periods of history. I have the intention of adding to those books I have already written all of the various things that will occur in my time, and to increase the number of books in accordance with the amount of additional material—provided that I am still alive.

This tells us that the final redaction of the work as we now have it was indeed the work of the author himself and not a scribe, and that the Prologue was one of the last sections that was written. This redaction must have been made in or after 1184, to which the last events described by William can be dated.

The work falls into two discrete units: books 1–8 give an account of the First Crusade culminating in the capture of Jerusalem in 1099, while books 9–23 offer a history of the kingdom of Jerusalem.[263] William's account of the First Crusade is innovative by beginning the narrative not with the Council of Clermont in 1095, but rather with the rise of Islam and the conquest of Jerusalem by 'Umar in 638. The second unit of the work has a clear structure: there are two books covering the rule of every king of Jerusalem, with but a few exceptions: the short reign of Godfrey of Bouillon, which is described in Book 9; the reign of Baldwin III in books 16–18—with twenty years easily the longest of all the kings of Jerusalem; and the unfinished Book 23, which covers the beginning of Baldwin V's reign up through 1184. The first book covering a king's rule will typically open with the coronation ceremony of the successor, to be followed by a description of the physical traits and general character of the new king in Einhardian fashion, while the second book concludes with a short eulogy describing the death of the king. Something

[262] WT, 1 Prol. 118–125.

[263] Consult for a useful overview of the structure of William's work and the chronological range of each book the table in H. Propst, *Die geographischen Verhältnisse Syriens und Palästinas nach Wilhelm von Tyrus, Geschichte der Kreuzzüge*, vol. 1 (Leipzig, 1927), pp. 9–10.

interesting happens to this otherwise fixed structure in the last three books of the work: since Baldwin IV was not yet of age when his father Amaury left him the throne, Count Raymond III of Tripoli was named to be regent from 1174–1176. Book 21 therefore contains two character portraits: that of Baldwin IV and of Raymond III. Moreover, since Baldwin IV's death in 1185 extended beyond the final redaction made by William in 1184, Book 22 does not conclude with the death of the king, as one would expect, but with Baldwin IV's handing over the throne to his nephew Baldwin V in 1183, as he was suffering from leprosy.

This clear-cut structure strongly centered around the kings of Jerusalem found an important precedent in the organization set down by Fulcher of Chartres. By starting his history with the loss of Jerusalem to the Muslim conquests in the reign of the Byzantine Emperor Heraclius, however, William managed to outdo his predecessor; William thereby firmly established his work as a history of the Holy Land, while the increased scope of the work allowed him to address in greater depth the causes that led up to the First Crusade and the establishment of the kingdom of Jerusalem. More importantly, William managed to establish a continuity with the Byzantine and ultimately Roman Empire through the figure of Heraclius—a continuity that would also manifest itself in both implicit and explicit references to Charlemagne.[264]

The case of Book 21 might indicate that William viewed his patron Raymond III as being on the same level as the kings of Jerusalem, and perhaps even had hopes that Raymond would one day be king in his own right. Krey suggested that, when William's hopes for such an arrangement were dashed, he decided to cut short his history and to live out the rest of his days

[264] On this aspect, see the discussion in Chapter 4, sections 2 and 3.

removed from the public life.[265] Huygens, however, raised the possiblity that, based on the codicological evidence, the remainder of Book 23 could have been lost in a similar way that the chapter of William's studies in Europe had been lost.[266]

There are several pieces of evidence that point to the audience that William had in mind. Firstly, we know that it was originally commissioned by King Amaury,[267] so that it stands to reason to assume that William began with the courtly audience of Jerusalem in mind. Secondly, the Prologue of Book 1 opens with an address to *Venerabilibus in Christo fratribus, ad quos presens opus pervenerit, eternam in domino salutem* ("Eternal greetings in the Lord to the venerable brothers in Christ, to whom the present work shall have arrived"), which would indicate a clerical audience, perhaps chiefly the clergy associated with Tyre and its environs. This is corroborated by the fact that William directs those interested in his account of the Third Lateran Council to the episcopal archives of Tyre.[268] Finally, although William mentions in the Prologue only his previous benefactor King Amaury (who had died by the time it was written), presumably he intended his work to be read at the court of his patron Raymond III of Tripoli. Evidence of this may be seen in his blushing objection that his character portrait of Raymond (usually only reserved for royalty) was not designed as a panegyric, but merely to inform the reader.[269]

---

[265] Krey 1941, p. 19–160, followed by Hiestand 1978, pp. 374–380.

[266] Huygens in WT, vol. 1, p. 34 n. 64.

[267] WT, 1 Prol. 80–84 and 20.31.42–41.

[268] WT, 21.25.73–79.

[269] WT, 21.5.8: *Et quoniam de comite nobis sermo, rerum serie sic exigente, se obtulit, dignum est ut de eo que pro certo comperimus posteris memorie mandemus, non ut panegericos propositum sit scribere, sed, quantum compendiose Historie sermo patitur succinctus, quis qualisque fuerit edoceamus.*

William's purpose in writing is clearly expressed in the three prefaces that the work contains. The general prologue indicates that William is concerned with *regum gesta describere* ("relating the deeds of kings"), and refers to his work indirectly as a *historia* as well as a *rerum gestarum series* ("sequence of deeds"), and in the preface to Book 23, William refers to his subject matter as *virorum fortium, qui in nostro Oriente maximeque Ierosolimis per annos octoginta et amplius principatum tenuerunt, egregia facta* ("the excellent deeds of the brave men who held rule for more than eighty years in our East and specifically in Jerusalem").[270] In this last preface, moreover, in which William expresses his utter disappointment with the times, he writes:

> Nichil enim in nostrorum principum actibus occurrit quod memorie thesauris vir prudens credat esse mandandum, nichil quod aut lectori recreationem conferat aut scriptori proficiat ad honorem.[271]
>
> For there is nothing among the deeds of our [current] rulers that a prudent man would consider worthy of entrusting to the treasure house of memory, nothing that could bring entertainment to the reader or bestow honor upon the author.

William implies here that his primary purpose—should his subject matter allow for it—is to record the deeds of the rulers of Jerusalem in the hope of providing some form of entertainment, as well as to achieve honor as an author. Later in the preface, however, William's hypothetical readers remind him of his didactic and moral purpose, so that, even if there is no entertainment to be had, William should continue with his work.[272]

---

[270] WT, 1 Prol. 1–2; 1 Prol. 34, 85, 99; 1 Prol. 50 and 16 pref. 4–5; 23 pref. 11–13.

[271] WT, 23 pref. 16–20.

[272] WT, 23 pref. 41–45: . . . *plane liquet rerum gestarum scriptoribus utramque sortem pari esse ratione propositam, ut sicut gestorum feliciter narratione posteros ad quandam animositatem erigunt, sic infortuniorum subiectorum exemplo eosdem reddant in similibus cautiores.*

We may find elsewhere in his work further indications of William's purpose in writing, as well as of the audience and the reception he may have envisioned. Earlier we quoted William's character portrait of Baldwin III, who is described as being particularly fond of listening to historical narratives.[273] The emphasis on the reading of history is in fact somewhat of a recurring motif, as in William's description of the character of Baldwin III's younger brother Amaury in Book 19:

> Modice litteratus erat et fratre multo minus, sed ingenii vivacitate et tenacis memorie beneficio, interrogatione frequenti, legendi studio cum aliquid ocii regni occupationes indulgebant, iuxta id quod regibus solet contingere, satis commode erat instructus. In questionibus argutior, in earum solutionibus plurimum recreabatur. Historiarum pre ceteris lectionibus erat avidus auditor, memor perpetuo, promptus et fidelissimus recitator.[274]

> He was moderately well-read, and much less so than his brother, but he was sufficiently educated by means of his own keen intellect and tenacious memory, as well as by frequently asking questions and by the practice of reading, whenever the occupations of his kingdom—as is the fate of kings—allowed him to have some free time. He was quite bright in the questions he asked, and was greatly entertained by getting them answered. He was an avid listener to recitations of history, above all other topics, and always good at memorizing them and reciting them promptly and faithfully.

Amaury managed to make up for the less than impressive number of books on his nightstand by his interest in history and his keen intellect. Stephen Jaeger, in his study of medieval courtly culture, lists the work of William of Tyre as an example of the *topos* of rulers reading works of

[273] WT, 16.2.12–19; see above on the *Historia Nicaena*.

[274] WT, 19.2.12–19. See also the discussion of this passage in connection with the preface in Babcock and Krey (trans.), vol. 2, p. 296, n. 3. A sensible criticism of reading too much into these lines was made by D.W.T.C. Vessey: one should refrain from taking William's own presentation of the commission of his work at face value. At the same time, one may read William's words, not as a necessarily accurate depiction of the historical circumstances that led to William taking up the pen, but as reflecting his purpose and intended audience. See D.W.T.C. Vessey, "William of Tyre and the art of historiography," *Mediaeval Studies* 35 (1973), pp. 433–455, at 437–438.

history, one that originated with Einhard's life of Charlemagne and need not be taken too seriously.[275]

However, Baldwin III commissioned the *Historia Nicaena*, while William's own history had originally been commissioned by Baldwin's younger brother Amaury. Even if we are unable to determine independently if these Frankish kings actually had an interest in history (in both instances, the authors are our only source for the claim that their works were commissioned by the kings in question, so that the argument inevitably becomes circular), it clearly was important that they be presented in this way. While there is no doubt that William looks to Einhard, especially when it comes to the character portraits of important individuals, this does not mean that William includes this particular detail without attaching any meaning to it. William may have intended, through his character descriptions, to create examples to be followed by future princes of the Latin Kingdom—a kind of *speculum principum* ("mirror of princes"). Historiography for William had a didactic and moral purpose: whether his statements regarding Baldwin III and Amaury's love of reading history were true or not, they encouraged future princes, such as Baldwin IV, to do the same.[276]

Key evidence concerning William's overall historiographical program can also be found in a passage often overlooked by scholars. The passage occurs in Book 13 describing events of the year 1124, when the crusader army, led by Count Pons of Tripoli and Domenico Michele, doge of Venice, had negotiated the surrender of Tyre with the Turkic *atabeg* of Damascus—much to the dismay of the army, which had looked forward to plunder. Once the city has been captured by the Crusaders, William describes the aftermath of the siege of Tyre:

---

[275] C.S. Jaeger, *The origins of courtliness — civilizing trends and the formation of courtly ideals — 939–1210* (Philadelphia, 1985), p. 228.

[276] William also claims that Baldwin IV, like his father, enjoyed reading history: WT, 21.1.50.

> Egressi ergo cives longa obsidione fatigati, sublevandi gratia tedii ad castra nostra deproperant, considerantes diligentius quisnam esset populus iste tam ferreus, tam laboris patiens, tam in usu armorum edoctus, qui tam egregiam civitatem et tam munitam urbem infra menses paucos ad supremam redegisset inopiam et extremas subire conditiones compulisset: intueri libet machinarum formam, castellorum proceritatem, armorum genus, castrorum positionem, principum etiam nomina diligentius investigare cunctaque cum sollicitudine percunctari, ut inde posteris fide plenas certa relatione texere possint historias. Nostri quoque civitatem ingressi urbis munitionem, edificiorum robur, turrium eminentiam, murorum soliditatem, portus elegantiam, introitus difficultatem admirantes, civium etiam commendant constantiam, qui in tanta famis necessitate positi et tanta laborantes inedia deditionem eo usque protraxerant: nam civitate a nostris recepta, non nisi quinque modii frumenti in civitate reperti sunt. Et licet prima facie durum plebeis visum foret quod predictis conventionibus civitas in nostram deveniret potestatem, consequenter tamen placere incipit: commendatur labor impensus et perpete dignum memoria opus credunt, quod eorum laboribus et sumptibus est consummatum.[277]

> The citizens leave the city, exhausted by the long siege, in order to relieve their weariness and hasten to our camp, observing carefully to see who were these people that were so unyielding, so long-suffering, so practiced in the use of arms, who had reduced such an extraordinary city that was so well-fortified within a few months to the utmost poverty, and had driven it to suffer the most extreme conditions: they enjoy gazing upon the sight of the cranes, the steep height of the fortifications, the manner of weaponry, the location of the camp, and to ask with diligence the names of the leaders and to inquire carefully into every detail, so that they might compose fully reliable histories for posterity. Our men, too, entered the city and admired the fortification of the city, the strength of the buildings, the loftiness of the towers, the solid walls, and the elegant harbor, and the difficult access into the city, and they praised the perseverance of the city's inhabitants, who had postponed surrendering for so long, despite the dire famine and hunger they suffered; for when our men took their city, only five measures of grain were found in the city. And although at first it seemed disagreeable to the main soldiery that the city had come into our control by means of the aforementioned treaty, afterward it began to be pleasing to them: they praised the effort that they had expended and believed their achievement to be worthy of eternal memory, which had been accomplished at their effort and expense.

When the citizens of Tyre, after a protracted siege, are finally able to venture beyond the city walls, their act of curious observation is compared to that of the historiographer: they wish to ascertain with diligence all details pertaining to those who had formerly besieged them, in order that they might then relate these facts to posterity. The result of this activity is that both parties are able to observe one another in wonder and admiration—leading, in fact, to a certain appreciation and understanding of the opposing camp. Moreover, the common soldiery of the Crusader army, at first upset at being denied the loot of the city, begins instead to rejoice in the

[277] WT, 13.14.1–21.

reward of fame that history will grant their efforts.[278] Although it is unlikely that people on either side of Tyre's city walls held such noble sentiments, we may see in this passage a metaphor of how William envisions the nature of historiography, and the role it can play within the larger scheme of things.

William of Tyre is undisputedly the greatest literary stylist the Latin East produced, and ranks as one of the greatest writers of the Middle Ages more generally.[279] William's concern for a carefully-wrought style comes to the fore in the Prologue to his work:

> Ad hec nichilominus eque vel amplius formidabile historiarum scriptoribus solet discrimen occurrere, totis viribus fugiendum, videlicet ne rerum gestarum dignitas sermonis ariditate et oratione ieiuna sui dispendium patiatur. Verba enim rebus, de quibus agitur, decet esse cognata nec a materie nobilioris elegantia scriptoris linguam vel pectus oportet degenerare. Unde magnopere cavendum ne amplitudo materie tractatus debilitate subcumbat et vicio narrationis exeat macilentum vel debile, quod in sui natura pingue solidumque subsistit.[280]

> In addition to this, an equally or even more distressing danger is wont to confront historiographers that needs to be avoided with every effort, namely that the dignity of deeds past suffer a loss through dry and unadorned speech. For words should befit the subjects at hand, and neither the writer's tongue nor his heart should be lowly in comparison to the elegance of his noble subject matter. Therefore one should take care to prevent the fullness of his subject matter from collapsing because of his weak writing, with the result that the subject matter itself becomes feeble and frail, though it is rich and coherent by nature.

William professes here the Horatian doctrine of *decorum* ("that which is fitting"), which ultimately goes back to the Aristotelian concept of *to prepon* ("what is fitting").[281] The dichotomy set up by William between *amplitudo* ("fullness") vs. *debilitas* ("weakness") and *pingue solidumque* ("rich and firm") vs. *macilentum vel debile* ("meagre and weak")

[278] A very similar passage is found describing the siege of Alexandria in WT, 19.31, where William describes the function of history in terms of entertainment: *diligenter videndo colligunt unde ad propria reversi suis aliquando texere possint historias et audientium animos gratis confabulationibus recreare.*

[279] On William's style and language, the fullest treatment is that of Huygens in WT, vol. 1, pp. 39–72.

[280] WT, 1 Prol. 33–42.

[281] See esp. Hor. *Ars P*. 86–118 and 155–178, although William may here have had a passage from Boethius about Plato in mind: Boeth. *De cons. Phil.* 3 pr. 12.38.

demonstrates the stylistic ideal to which he strives: clearly he felt that his rich subject matter required an equally rich and full style, and so it is perhaps not surprising that he turned to the *lactea ubertas* ("milky richness") of Livy as his main stylistic model.[282]

More than any other writer of the East, William strives for a balanced arrangement of long periodic structures with frequent occurrence of hyperbaton.[283] William mentions the historiographers Livy and Josephus by name in the preface to Book 23, where they are praised both for their eloquence and for their moral and didactic content, making it clear that they figure as important forbears and examples to be followed.[284] Edbury and Rowe were skeptical of William's knowledge of Livy, but subsequent studies have shown that William uses vocabulary that he must have drawn from Livy's first and fourth *Decades*.[285] I would like to go a step further and suggest that William was not only indebted to Livy in terms of vocabulary, but also as a model of carefully crafted historiographical prose in the periodic style.

As for William's historical sources, he relies heavily upon the works of Raymond of Aguilers, Fulcher of Chartres, and above all Albert of Aachen for the First Crusade. Another important historical source for William was Einhard, not only in terms of the methodology and structure of the overall work, but also for his account of Charlemagne's relations with the Holy

[282] See Quint. 10.1.32 for this famous description of Livy's style.

[283] The deliberate *inconcinnitas* or imbalance achieved by Ralph of Caen and Walter the Chancellor in imitation of Sallust may be contrasted here.

[284] WT, 23 pref. It should be remembered that, after all, Jerome praised Josephus as a *Graecus Livius* (*Epistulae* 22.35).

[285] Edbury and Rowe 1988, p. 37. The authors' suggestion (p. 33), moreover, that unattributed quotations of classical authors demonstrates a less intimate knowledge is not corroborated by the general practice of medieval authors—as indeed our survey of Latin texts has already shown. For more recent evaluations of William's knowledge of Livy, see M.R. Tessera, "*Prudentes homines ... qui sensus habebant magis exercitatos*: a preliminary inquiry into William of Tyre's vocabulary of power," *Crusades* 1 (2002), pp. 63–71, at p. 68; Kostick 2004.

Land and diplomatic relations with Caliph Hārūn al-Rashīd, quoted verbatim by William.[286] The preface to Book 16 declares that, from this point on, William is no longer chiefly relying on written accounts of others but basing his account upon interviews with eyewitnesses that he himself conducted, as well as his own autopsy.[287] William also had access to documents such as deeds and letters, some of which are inserted into his account.

The most intriguing sources used by William are the elusive *Arabica exemplaria* ("Arabic manuscripts") supplied to him by Amaury.[288] William mentions only one of these sources by name: *auctorem maxime sequuti virum venerabilem Seith, filium Patricii, Alexandrinum patriarcham* ("having followed especially the venerable author Sa'īd ibn Baṭrīq, patriarch of Alexandria"), also known as Eutychius, patriarch of Alexandria from 933–940, whose work comprised a world chronicle in Arabic until 937 and continued up through 1028 by Yaḥya ibn Sa'īd of Antioch.[289] Where may Amaury have acquired these *Arabica exemplaria*? It has long ago been suggested by Huygens that the no less than four thousand volumes reportedly stolen by Baldwin III in 1154 from the Syrian diplomat 'Usāma b. Munqiḏ may have ended up in Amaury's possession when he became king, and were supplied by him to William for the purpose of writing his two histories.[290]

---

[286] Einhard, *Vita Karoli Magni* 16; WT, 1.3.21–34. See the discussion in Chapter 4.

[287] WT, 16 pref. It is worthwhile to mention that William consistently uses the phrase *fide oculata* to indicate autopsy—a phrase introduced by Einhard (see *Vita Karoli Magni* Prol. 1, and the discussion in Chapter 4).

[288] WT, 1 prol. 84 and 19.21.61.

[289] WT, 1 prol 87–89. Eutychius, *Annales*, ed. L. Cheikho, B. Carra de Vaux, H. Zayyat, Corpus SS Christ. Orientalium, SS Arabici, Ser. 3.7 (Beirut, etc. 1909). A more recent partial edition can be found in *Das Annalenwerk des Eutychios von Alexandrien: ausgewählte Geschichten und Legenden / kompiliert von Sa'id ibn Baṭrīq um 935 A.D.*, ed. M. Breydy (Louvain, 1985). An Italian translation can be found in *Gli annali / Eutichio, patriarca di Alessandria, 877-940*, tr. B. Pirone (Cairo, 1987).

[290] Huygens 1964, p. 12. The passage occurs in *Usāmah's memoirs, entitled Kitāb al-i'tibār, by Usāmah ibn-Munqidh*, ed. P.K. Hitti (Princeton, 1930), pp. 70–71. For an English translation, see *The book of contemplation: Islam and the Crusades*, tr. P.M. Cobb (London, 2008), pp. 43–44.

The question is whether William would have been able to consult these Arabic works directly. Although William displays an astonishing breadth of knowledge, August Krey was too optimistic in claiming that William knew not only Latin and French, but also Arabic, Greek and "at least a smattering of Hebrew and other eastern tongues."[291] William's linguistic competence has since been critically reevaluated: based on the evidence found in the *Historia*, there is nothing to suggest that William possessed more than a superficial knowledge of Greek, and less still of Arabic, let alone Hebrew.[292] The only evidence of Greek knowledge, other than possibly William's embassies to the court of Manuel Komnenos, is the occasional gloss of basic words such as *potamos* ("river").[293] Apart from incidental translation of Arabic place names,[294] William gives an incorrect translation of the inscription in the Dome of the Rock, a strong indicator that William relied on second-hand information.[295] Similarly, William provides an incorrect translation of the appellative *al-mahdī* given to the first Fāṭimid caliph, 'Ubayd Allāh al-Mahdī Billāh, glossing it as "one who levels, as one who directs everything toward peace" (*complanans,*

[291] Krey 1941, p. 150, followed by De Ghellinck 1946, p. 122; Schwinges 1977, p. 32, 41, 156, 175; Hiestand 1978, pp. 362–363.

[292] Möhring 1984, pp. 173–174; Huygens 1984, p. 468 and WT, vol. 1, pp. 2–3.

[293] WT, 13.2.9–10. William was sent on two different embassies to the Byzantine emperor: first in 1168 (when Manuel Komnenos was in Serbia), and later in 1179–1180.

[294] E.g., *Telle Saphi* (i.e., Arabic *tall ṣāfīy*) is correctly translated as *Collis Clarus* at WT, 15.25.14–15. For other examples, see WT, 11.30.12, 14.22.45–46, 20.19.46–48, 19.21.47, 19.25.25, 22.17.4–5, 19.20.8–9, 19.20.11.

[295] WT, 1.2.49–52 and 8.3.49, where William claims that the inscription proclaimed the edifice to have been built by the Caliph 'Umar, when in fact it bears the name of Caliph al-Ma'mūn (who replaced the name of Caliph 'Abd al-Malik with that of his own)—the origin of the common conflation of the Dome of the Rock with the Mosque of 'Umar (which is not on the Holy Esplanade but next to the Church of the Holy Sepulcher). This was first observed in Möhring 1984, p. 174. For a discussion of this inscription, see C. Kesler, "'Abd al-Malik's inscription in the Dome of the Rock: a reconsideration," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* 1 (1970), pp. 2–14. William of Tyre, in turn, probably relied on the testimony of Eutychius, who relates a story in which 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb began the construction of the Dome of the Rock. See Eutychius, *Gli annali / Eutichio, patriarca di Alessandria, 877-940*, tr. B. Pirone (Cairo, 1987), pp. 336–337.

quasi qui universa ad quietem dirigit) rather than "the guided one."[296] This example in particular may be evidence that William possessed only a rudimentary knowledge of Arabic, or relied on a source who did, given the frequency in Arabic of the word *mahdī.* In the absence of any definitive trace of advanced Arabic competence in William's writings, it is likely that the *Arabica exemplaria* were translated for him rather than consulted directly.

William's history was read almost immediately after its author died, as we find the first traces in the *Cronosgraphia* ("Chronicle") of Guy de Bazoches, a participant in the Third Crusade (1189–1192).[297] Around 1220, a continuation of William's account up through 1192 was written in Latin by an anonymous author, possibly writing in England.[298] Moreover, there are traces that William's work continued to be read in the Latin East: James of Vitry (d. 1228) evidently used portions of William's history (and possibly also William's lost work on Eastern rulers) in his *Historia Orientalis* ("History of the East"), as did William of Tripoli in his *Tractatus de statu Sarracenorum* ("Treatise concerning the conditions of the Saracens") composed in 1273.[299] In England, Matthew Paris (d. 1259) closely based his description of the

[296] WT, 19.21.31. As observed by R.H.C. Davis, William, or his source, misconstrued the word *mahdī*, which is a participle of form 1 of the root *h-d-y* ("to guide"), perceiving it instead to be related to the root *m-h-d* ("to make smooth or plain"). See R.H.C. Davis, "William of Tyre," in D. Baker (ed.), *Relations between East and West in the Middle Ages* (Edinburgh, 1973, repr. 2010), pp. 64–76, at 73.

[297] This text has not yet been edited in its entirety; see WT, vol. 1, pp. 76–77. The last portion of the text was published in *Wido von Bazoches, Ex Guidonis de Bazochiis Chronographie libro septimo*, ed. A. Cartellieri and W. Fricke (Jena, 1910). As Kedar has pointed out, Guy de Bazoches largely copied William of Tyre's rubics (see Kedar 1982, n. 70).

[298] *Die lateinische Fortsetzung Wilhelms von Tyrus*, ed. M. Salloch (Leipzig, 1934).

[299] First suggested by Prutz 1883, pp. 109–114, and followed by Möhring 1984, pp 180–182—who, however, is extremely critical of Prutz's approach of attempting to discern traces of William's *Historia de Orientalibus principibus* in either James of Vitry or William of Tripoli, given that the text is no longer extant. For editions see *Histoire orientale = Historia orientalis / Jacques de Vitry; introduction, édition critique et traduction*, ed. J. Donnadieu (Turnhout, 2008); *Notitia de Machometo; De statu Sarracenorum / Wilhelm von Tripolis; kommentierte lateinisch-deutsche Textausgabe*, ed. P. Engels (Würzburg, 1992).

Latin East on that of William of Tyre.[300] Matthew claims to have received a manuscript of William of Tyre brought back from the Holy Land from Peter des Roches, bishop of Winchester, though this was probably William's *Historia de Orientalibus principibus* rather than the *Historia Hierosolymitana*, which he likely used in a copy that was already circulating in England.[301]

William's work received its greatest readership in translations into the vernacular. An Old French translation was made in France around 1223, commonly known as *L'Estoire de Eracles empereur et la conqueste de la terre d'Outremer* ("The history of Emperor Heraclius and the conquest of the land of Outremer ") or *Eracles*, which is supplemented by an Old French continuation in 51 manuscripts.[302] This translation was in turn rendered into Spanish under Alfonso X of Castile (d. 1284) with the title *Gran Conquista de Ultramar* ("The grand conquest of Outremer").[303]

3. POETRY

The following group of texts is unified by formal characteristics rather than any considerations of content, inasmuch as they all exclusively consist of verse. There are elements beyond mere form, however, that unite these texts and place them within the larger tradition of Western medieval

[300] *Historia Anglorum*, ed. F. Madden, Rerum Britannicarum Medii Aevi scriptores 44, vol. 1 (London, 1866), p. 163.

[301] See Huygens in WT, 78–87; Edbury and Rowe 1988, p. 3.

[302] *Guillaume de Tyr et ses Continuateurs*, ed. P. Paris (Paris, 1879), 2 vols.; *L'Estoire de Eracles empereur et la conqueste de la terre d'Outremer*, *RHC Oc*, vols. 1–2; *The Chronicle of Ernoul and the Continuations of William of Tyre*, tr. M.R. Morgan (Oxford, 1973). I await Peter Edbury's new edition of the *Eracles*; in the meantime, see his surveys of the manuscript evidence in "The French Translation of William of Tyre's Historia: the Manuscript Tradition," *Crusades* 7 (2007), pp. 61–105 and "New Perspectives on the Old French Continuations of William of Tyre," *Crusades* 10 (2010), pp. 107–136.

[303] For the most recent edition, see *La gran conquista de ultramar: Biblioteca Nacional MS 1187*, ed. L. Cooper (Madison, WI, 1989).

poetry. Although poems of a personal nature were produced in the Middle Ages, one must always consider the role of patronage and the performative context, especially in dealing with an institutional or courtly context. A Latin poem was a valuable production, both materially and in terms of the cultural capital it implied on behalf of the patron by virtue of its classical and religious associations.[304] As such, Latin poetry could prove to be an effective means for religious institutions to solicit both laypersons and members of the clergy in positions of power for patronage in the form of material assistance. As we will see below, this was also true for the Latin East, both in the early days of the kingdom of Jerusalem with the poetry of Achard of Arrouaise, first prior of the *Templum Domini*, as well as at the very end of our period in 1187, as seen in the poetry of Albert of Tarsus. First, however, we will discuss briefly some of the problems associated with identifying poetry from the Latin East, and make a few preliminary observations on the formal characteristics of the poetry from the Crusader States.

Crusader poetry has received a considerable amount of scholarly attention. By "crusader poetry," however, is usually meant the poetic production from Europe dealing with the topic of the crusades, rather than the poetry composed in the Crusader States.[305] Although there are but limited remains, few scholars have studied the Latin poetry composed in the Levant, and as yet not one study has discussed all extant poems together. One of the problems facing scholars in the field is that, in a body of often anonymous poems, it is difficult to determine a place of provenance. Without the poet or patron's name, we are dependent on other clues that might place

[304] On medieval Latin literature and cultural capital, see the stimulating essays in R.J. Hexter and D. Townsend (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of medieval Latin literature* (Oxford, 2012), "Part II. Latinity as cultural capital."

[305] For the Latin tradition, see A. Schmuck, *Mittellateinische Kreuzlieder: poetische Werbung zum Kreuzzug* (Diss., Universität Würzburg, 1954); G. Spreckelmeyer, *Das Kreuzzugslied des lateinischen Mittelalters* (Munich, 1974), and *idem* (ed.), *Mittellateinische Kreuzzugslieder: Texte und Melodien* (Göppingen, 1987). For studies of both Latin and vernacular traditions, see F.W. Wentzlaff-Eggebert, *Kreuzzugsdichtung des Mittelalters: Studien zu ihrer geschichtlichen und dichterischen Wirklichkeit* (Berlin, 1960); U. Müller, *Kreuzzugsdichtung*, 2nd ed. (Tübingen, 1979); I. Hartl, *Das Feindbild der Kreuzzugslyrik: das Aufeinandertreffen von Christen und Muslimen* (Bern, 2009).

a poem's composition in the East: references to geographical locations, political situations, or a general Eastern cultural context (e.g., the use of Greek words) may be indications, though the critic must proceed with caution. This general lack of critical attention has meant that there is still no clear picture of the extent of Latin poetry from the East, as much work still needs to be done in combing through repertories of Latin verse in order to identify which poems may have been composed in the East.

In terms of formal characteristics, the small body of extant poetry from the Latin East identified here would accord with the general tendency of early twelfth-century poetry in having an ambiguous attitude to the use of rhyme, especially leonine or internal rhyme. Since the rise to popularity of leonine rhyme in the ninth through the eleventh centuries, a classicist resistance to the overuse of assonance can be seen in the early twelfth century with the works of Marbod of Rennes, Hildebert of Lavardin, and especially Gilo of Paris, who abandonded this form mid-way through his epic poem on the First Crusade.[306] Accordingly, while most of the poetry produced in Outremer is representative of the leonine tradition (Fulcher of Chartres, Walter the Chancellor, Achard of Arrouaise, Geoffrey the Abbot), Ralph of Caen studiously avoids this particular poetic form. The lyric poetry (*Hierusalem letare*, *Carmen Buranum* 51a, Albert of Tarsus, the lyric poems in Walter the Chancellor), as a poetic genre typically avoiding internal rhyme, must be considered separately from this development.

3.1 *Hierusalem, letare*

[306] See Gilo of Paris, *Historia vie Hierosolimitane*, ed. and tr. C.W. Grocock, with J.E. Siberry (New York, 1997), 6.1–3, and the discussion in Norberg 2004, pp. 33–34, as well as that in J. Martin, "Classicism and style in Latin literature," in Benson, Constable, and Lanham 1982, pp. 537–568, at pp. 557–560.

The first poem to be discussed is found in a well-known manuscript copied in the late twelfth century at the monastery of Ripoll in Catalonia.[307] Different scribes copied a variety of texts, including works important for the history of Spain, but also several texts dealing with the crusades. Among these are a fragment of Raymond of Aguilers' *Historia Francorum qui ceperunt Iherusalem* ("History of the Franks who captured Jerusalem") and an anonymous compilation of accounts of the First Crusade, which is directly followed by a sermon (*Pensate karissimi*, "Consider, dearest ones"), which leads into a hymn (*Hierusalem, letare*, "Jerusalem, rejoice").[308]

Both sermon and hymn are probably to be dated to the first half (earlier rather than later) of the twelfth century, based on the fact that the late twelfth-century text seems to have undergone a series of corrections and revisions over a considerable period of time, and also because of the reference to the Holy Lance, a much-contested subject in the early twelfth century that would not have been topical at a later date.[309] Moreover, there is a second hand in the

[307] Paris, BnF, MS Lat. 5132. The hymn was first printed separately by Edélestand du Méril in 1847, reprinted by Heinrich Hagenmeyer in 1877: *Poésies populaires latines du Moyen Age*, ed. E. du Méril, (Paris, 1847), pp. 255–260; *Ekkehardi Uraugiensis abbatis Hierosolymita*, ed. H. Hagenmeyer (Tübingen, 1877), Beilage IX, pp. 385–387. Fresh editions were made, first in the *Analecta Hymnica*, and later by Anton Schmuck, Goswin Spreckelmeyer, and John France: G.M. Dreves, *AH*, vol. 45b, pp. 76–78, no. 95; Schmuck 1954, pp. 95–99; Spreckelmeyer 1974, pp. 204–214 and Spreckelmeyer 1987, pp. 4–6; France 1988, pp. 654–657. See also the discussion, with selections printed, in J. Szövérffy, *Secular Latin lyrics and minor poetic forms of the Middle Ages: a historical survey and literary repertory from the tenth to the late fifteenth century*, 3 vols. (Concord, NH, 1992–1994), vol. 1, pp. 370–371, and in Hartl 2009, pp. 54–61. The most recent edition is that of Amnon Linder, who reassessed all of the available evidence: A. Linder, "A new day, new joy: the liberation of Jerusalem on 15 July 1099," in *L'idea di Gerusalemme nella spiritualità cristiana del Medioevo: atti del Convegno internazionale in collaborazione con l'Istituto della Görres-Gesellschaft di Gerusalemme* (Vatican City, 2003), pp. 46–64. The edition of both sermon and hymn used is that of Linder 2003, henceforth referred to as "Ripoll sermon," and "Ripoll hymn," respectively.

[308] See for a description of the manuscript and its history Linder 2003, pp. 58–59. The hymn consists of thirty-five strophes each followed by a single-verse refrain (*Iherusalem exulta*, "Rejoice, Jerusalem"). Every strophe has four verses of seven syllables each, the rhythmic pattern of which can be represented as 4x7p with end rhyme. In terms of genre, the hymn should be considered a sequence of the Office rather than Mass, which would have followed instead the Alleluia or Tract.

[309] So argued in France 1972, pp. 782–783 and 1988, p. 643. For the reference to the Holy Lance, see Ripoll hymn, strophe 16 and. See also Walther, no. 9812, where the hymn is dated as early as 1099, although presumably the commemorative Feast of the Liberation would not have taken place until a year after the conquest of Jerusalem at

manuscript which has contributed three interlinear variant readings, suggesting a longer period in which oral performance and transmission had given rise to variants.[310] Finally, participants of the First Crusade are addressed repeatedly in both sermon and hymn, making it likely that they were composed early in the twelfth century.[311]

Although John France initially suggested that the poem may have been composed at Ripoll, Amnon Linder argued that both sermon and hymn could only have been composed in Jerusalem.[312] The manuscript evidence suggests that the text was not composed for this manuscript, given the omissions and errors in the sermon and the alternative readings provided in the hymn. Unlike Amnon Linder, I am not convinced that the historical text and the sermon are entirely unrelated texts, but the fact that the fragment of Raymond of Aguilers is written as one continuous text with the other (otherwise unknown) historical account at least does not exclude the possibility that multiple texts were grouped together by a scribe, rather than composed. Indeed, the sermon functions well as an independent text, with a clear structure and coherent tone.

---

the earliest (i.e., 1100). Spreckelmeyer (1974, p. 213), dates the hymn to 1100. For a discussion of the feast, see the introduction below on "Sermons."

[310] Ripoll hymn, strophe 31, 34, 35.

[311] Ripoll sermon: *passim*; Ripoll hymn: strophe 6, 8, 18, 23.

[312] France 1972, p. 783; Linder 2003, pp. 58–59. Later, France (1988, pp. 642–643) suggested only that the collection of texts in the Ripoll manuscripts was assembled for commemorating the Feast of the Liberation of Jerusalem, but did not specify whether he thought the texts themselves to have been composed at Ripoll, rather than copied. More recently Cesar Dominguez revived John France's earlier suggestion, apparently unaware of the work of Linder: C. Dominguez, "Lírica y cruzadas en el ámbito hispanomedieval. Una lectura de las cantigas gallego-portuguesas desde la Literatura Comparada," in J. Casas Rigall and E.M. Díaz Martínez (eds.), *Iberia Cantat. Estudios sobre poesía hispánica medieval* (Santiago de Compostela, 2002), pp. 153–186. The overall argument concerning the reception of this hymn and its role in early Spanish lyric poetry remains valuable. A similar discussion (which also ignores the findings of Linder) is found in N.L. Paul, *To follow in their footsteps: the Crusades and family memory in the high Middle Ages* (Ithaca, NY, 2012), pp. 269–270.

Additional evidence may be found within the sermon itself. When the preacher talks about *illis qui se tantis comitunt periculis* ("those who commit themselves to such great dangers"), one could argue that the use of the third person here creates some distance between audience and participators of the First Crusade.[313] However, the preacher speaks in this section concerning all those who participated in the crusade in general. Moreover, the exhortation to the knights is unequivocally direct, as the preacher tells them how fortunate they are to be allowed to behold (present tense) the various holy sites. This is followed by pointing at the gate now free of enemies: *ecce portam Iherosolimitanam* ("behold the gate of Jerusalem").[314]

Although the hymn has historically been printed and discussed separately, it should be viewed within the context of the sermon which precedes it, which was most likely delivered in front of the Golden Cross on the north wall, as part of the celebrations involving the Feast of the Liberation of Jerusalem commemorating the capture of Jerusalem on July 15, 1099.[315] The close connection between hymn and sermon (other than the manuscript context) can be observed in the close resemblance between the hymn's incipit (*Hierusalem, letare*, "rejoice, Jerusalem") and the end of the sermon, in which Jerusalem is apostrophized (*Letare, Iherusalem*), which is itself a reference to the Introit to the Liberation Mass, identical with the Introit to the Mass of the fourth Sunday of Lent: *Laetare, Ierusalem*.[316] Finally, the very end of the sermon indicates that the hymn was meant to be sung immediately afterward:

---

[313] Ripoll hymn, p. 59.

[314] Ripoll sermon, pp. 61–62. It is unclear which gate is meant here; possibly Herod's Gate, the gate nearest to the point of entry of the crusaders, which the procession would have passed by on the Feast of the Liberation (see the section below on sermons).

[315] For more on the sermon, see the section "Sermons" below.

[316] A. Linder, "The liturgy of the liberation of Jerusalem," *Mediaeval Studies* 52 (1990), pp. 110–131, at pp. 118 and 123; Szövérffy 1992–1994, vol. 1, p. 370. William of Tyre refers to this introit as a means of dating a battle between the armies of Amaury and Shirkūḥ on March 18, 1167: WT, 19.24.71.

> Item itemque etiam atque etiam letando cum Iherusalem, cantemus in laude eius hoc cuiusdam[317] philosophy [*sic*] descriptum carmen canorum.[318]
>
> Rejoicing again and again with Jerusalem, let us sing in its praise this sonorous hymn, copied from a certain wise man.

The hymn, described here as a *carmen canorum* ("sonorous song"), was apparently not a composition of the patriarch himself, who would have delivered the sermon, but of a poet, unusually described here as a *philosophus* ("philosopher").[319]

The opening strophe sets the theme for the entire hymn: the personified city of Jerusalem, which first led the tearful life of a slave, can now rejoice in freedom. Central throughout is the relation of past and present. The following five strophes deal with the First Crusade and the events leading up to it, beginning with an elaboration of Jerusalem's lengthy servitude under the yoke of the Turks, and continuing with a reference to the papal call for the crusade, and the accompanying proclamation that all who answered would be absolved of their sins, to which the poet refers as a "divine decree."[320] The goal of the crusade is then stated quite succinctly in the sixth strophe: to reclaim Christ's sepulchre as their own heritage. The rewards that await those who have answered the call are discussed in the following three strophes, followed by a depiction of Christ's relationship with the crusaders in terms of familial ties of kinship. Strophes fourteen and fifteen focus on the militaristic aspects of the crusade, presenting it as an armed

[317] I follow here the reading of France (1988, p. 654) rather than the clearly erroneous *cuidam* of Linder.

[318] Ripoll sermon, p.62.

[319] Note the very similar attribution of Achard's poem on the history of the *Templum Domini* to *cuiusdam sapientis* in one of the manuscripts (see below).

[320] Ripoll hymn, 3.

pilgrimage. The hymn then focuses on the discovery of the Holy Lance, granting the crusader army victory at the siege of Antioch, with Christ fighting on the front lines.[321] This leads the poet to reflect on the martyr's death during the crusade as a form of rebirth, which flows neatly into a juxtaposition of the earthly and the heavenly Jerusalem:

> Iherusalem terrestris
> Principium celestis
> Letare novis festis![322]
>
> Earthly Jerusalem, starting-point of the heavenly [Jerusalem], rejoice in this new feast!

Deftly managing to tie the hymn to the celebrations at hand, the poet identifies the month, year, day of the week, and time of day on which Jerusalem was captured, drawing parallels between Christ's death and the conquest of Jerusalem. Referring to this feast day as a *tempus honoris* ("time worthy of honor"), the poet proclaims that Christ was crucified on the sixth hour (i.e., noon), even as his city was liberated at the same hour, then joyfully exclaims:

> Urbs capitur hac ora,
> Nulla sit ergo mora,
> Nostra sit vox canora.[323]
>
> The city was captured on this hour, so let there be no delay, but let our voices be song-filled!

[321] But contrast this with Thomas Asbridge's discussion of what actually transpired: T.S. Asbridge, "The Holy Lance of Antioch: power, devotion and memory on the First Crusade," *Reading Medieval Studies* 33 (2007), pp. 3–36.

[322] Ripoll hymn, 22.1–3.

[323] Ripoll hymn, 29.1–3.

Once again the hymn is closely tied to the liturgical context, and it would appear that the sermon and hymn would have been delivered at the hour of noon. The remaining strophes deal with the history of the capture of the city, praising Godfrey of Bouillon and vividly describing, in consonance with the various eyewitness reports, the rivers of blood that flowed through the streets.[324] The final two strophes rejoice in the banishment of the Jews from Jerusalem, which ties in well with the sermon's direct address to and disparagement of the Jews of Jerusalem, suggesting a close collaboration between the person who wrote the sermon (possibly, but not necessarily, the patriarch who would have delivered it) and the poet who composed the hymn.[325] The last strophe concludes with a depiction of Christ as a triumphal king who has regained his rightful throne, implying that the capture of Jerusalem is parallel to and symbolic of Christ's resurrection:

> Sit gloria speleo,
> Unde surrexit leo,[326]
> Suscitatus a Deo.
> Iherusalem, exulta![327]
>
> Glory be to the cave from where the lion rose up, awoken by God. Jerusalem, rejoice!

This allusion to the Holy Sepulcher would have been particularly resonant as the beginning and end point of the procession.

[324] For an overview, see the discussion in Kedar 2004.

[325] See below on the Ripoll sermon.

[326] For the imagery of Christ as a lion (king of the animals), see the discussion in Spreckelmeyer 1974, p. 212.

[327] Ripoll hymn, 35.

As we will see, the hymn's unusually strong focus on historical narrative corresponds perfectly to the tendency of the surviving sermons for the Feast of the Liberation of Jerusalem to incorporate historiographical materials within a liturgical context, demonstrating how important it was for the newly-established crusader community of Jerusalem to situate recent events within an interpretative framework.

3.2 Achard of Arrouaise, *Super Templo Salomonis*

The next poem to be discussed forms part of a collection of three poems composed by two poets, Achard of Arrouaise and Geoffrey the abbot.[328] The first poem was composed by Achard, who travelled to the Holy Land from St. Nicolaus d'Arrouaise with Cono, cardinal legate and bishop of Praeneste, probably in the fall of 1110, whereupon he became the first prior of the community of secular canons established at the *Templum Domini* (the name the crusaders gave to the Dome of the Rock).[329] His poem deals with the history of the *Templum Domini* and the Jewish temples

[328] The poem survives in five manuscripts, of which one comprises a short fragment, all dating between the mid-twelfth and the early thirteenth centuries: Braunschweig, Stadtbibl., Fragment (24) (mid-12th c.); Besançon, Bibl. mun., MS 187 (second half 12th c.); Rome, BAV, MS Reg. lat. 150 (late 12th c.); Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Laud. misc. 406 (late 12th, early 13th c.); Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS 603 (late 12th, early 13th c.). Angelo Mai was the first to print portions of the poem (the beginning and end) from the Vatican manuscript in 1852, which was then printed in its entirety by Melchior de Vogüé in 1881: *Nova patrum bibliotheca*, ed. A. Mai (Rome, 1844), vol. 1, part 2, pp. 213–214; M. de Vogüé, "Achard d'Arrouaise, poème sur le Templum Domini," *AOL* 1 (1881), pp. 562–579. Unaware of De Vogüé's edition, Wilhelm Brandes printed a short fragment from Braunschweig in 1889: W. Brandes, "Bruchstück eines rhythmischen Gedichtes, die Geschichte des Tempels zu Jerusalem betreffend," *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde* 14 (1889), pp. 424–431. A.C. Clark then printed from a manuscript in Oxford those lines not in the Vatican manuscript in 1911: A.C. Clark, "Poème sur le Temple de Salomon par Achard d'Arrouaise," *ROL* 12 (1911), pp. 263–275. Finally, the poem was edited in its entirety for the first time in a critical edition based on all of the extant manuscript evidence by Paul Lehmann: P. Lehmann, "Die mittellateinischen Dichtungen der Prioren des Tempels von Jerusalem Acardus und Gaufridus," in *Corona quernea, Festgabe Karl Strecker zum 80. Geburtstage dargebracht* (Leipzig, 1941), pp. 296–330 (henceforth abbreviated as AP). Sabino de Sandoli, apparently unaware of any other edition, printed the text of De Vogüé (which only has 517 of the total of 817 lines), with notes and an Italian translation, in 1978: *IHC*, vol. 2, pp. 51–61.

[329] See Lehmann in AP, pp. 299–300 (who claims the year 1108 without citing evidence). For Cono of Praeneste, sometimes referred to as Kuno, see C. Dereine, "Conon de Préneste," in *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques*, vol. 13 (Paris, 1956), pp. 461–471; R. Hiestand, "Legat, Kaiser und Basileus. Cuno von Praeneste und die krise des Papsttums von 1111–1112," in *Aus Reichsgeschichte und Nordischer Geschichte. Festschrift Karl Jordan*, ed. H. Fuhrmann, H.E. Mayer, and K. Wriedt (Stuttgart, 1972), pp. 141–

that had stood there before it. His successor as prior was Geoffrey (soon to become abbot when the priory was promoted to an abbey), who followed Achard's poem with two books, the first of which is a versification of 1 and 2 Maccabees and focuses on issues of simony, while the second book is a versification of Josephus' *Jewish War*, which aims at providing an abbreviated account of the *Jewish War* in verse, while also relating the events to Biblical history.

Achard is first mentioned in charters as the prior of the *Templum Domini* in 1112.[330] He is mentioned for the last time in a charter dating between Christmas 1135 and September 1, 1136,[331] and since his successor Geoffrey is mentioned in two charters dating between September 24 and December 24 of 1137, he must have died sometime in the period between late 1135 and the end of 1137.[332]

Achard's poem opens with an acrostic that identifies the addressee and the poet: *BALDVINO REGI PRIOR TEMPLI ACARDVS* ("Achard, prior of the Temple, to King Baldwin").[333] It is unclear, however, whether King Baldwin I (1100–1118) or Baldwin II (1118–1131) is meant here. Since Achard ends his poem with the hope that the return of the *Templum Domini*'s stolen treasure will allow it to be dedicated during a summer in the near future,

---

152; A. Cadderi, *Conone di Preneste: cardinale legato di Pasquale II, Gelasio II, Callisto II (?–1122)* (Rome, 1974).

[330] *Diplomata*, vol. 1, no. 52 (*RRH* no. 68). *Pace* Giovanni Loche, who claimed that Achard is listed here without specification of his capacity, clearly misreading the charter: *Aicardus Templi Domini, Fulcherus Montis Oliveti, priores*. See G. Loche, "Il *Templum Domini* e le sue tradizioni secondo le fonti scritte in epoca crociata," *Liber Annuus* 59 (2009), pp. 281–299, at p. 290.

[331] *RRH*, no. 167; edited in Bresc-Bautier, no. 61.

[332] *RRH*, nos. 172 and 173.

[333] The poem comprises 817 lines of rhythmic or accentual poetry in lines of 15 syllables with end-rhyming couplets, known as *versus caudati* in medieval classifications, on which see: W. Meyer, *Gesammelte Abhandlungen zur mittellateinischen Rythmik* (Berlin, 1905–1936), vol. 1, p. 79; C. Erdmann, "Leonitas," in *Corona quernea, Festgabe Karl Strecker zum 80. Geburtstage dargebracht* (Leipzig, 1941), pp. 15–28, at pp. 18–19; Norberg 2004, p. 62 n. 20. Each line has a caesura after the eighth syllable, so that each line can be divided up into discrete units of 8p+7pp. In the earlier Middle Ages, such a pattern was used in hymns in what amounted to a rhythmical imitation of the quantitative trochaic septenarius, but these rigid constraints are not followed by Achard in any consistent manner (see Norberg 2004, pp. 107–108).

Lehmann argued that the composition of the poem should be placed later rather than earlier in his career, considering that the dedication did not take place until the spring of 1141.[334] Although Achard did not live to see the dedication (presumably having passed away somewhere between late 1135 and the fall of 1137), a dedication to King Baldwin I (d. 1118), according to Lehmann, would be too far removed from the eventual dedication of the *Templum*.

Hans Eberhard Mayer, on the other hand, argued for a date very early in Achard's career. Calling attention to a charter dating from 1109 in which King Baldwin I granted the *Templum Domini* to Tancred, he suggests that Achard's poem was written to protest this affront to the community of canons that had taken up residence in the *Templum*.[335] Moreover, he points out that there is evidence that Achard's petition had concrete results: a charter issued by King Amaury in 1166 confirms a monetary grant of Baldwin I to the *Templum*, which would have been issued in the period between the winter of 1109/1110 and the spring of 1112.[336] Furthermore, we know from other sources that restorations to the *Templum Domini* began as early as 1114–1115, which could have been the result of Achard's solicitation for royal

---

[334] AP, 811–815; see Lehmann in AP, p. 300. The precise dating of the dedication of the *Templum Domini* has been the matter of some debate: for a date of April 9, see B. Hamilton, *The Latin Church in the Crusader States: the secular church* (London, 1980), pp. 371–372 and S. Schein, "Between Mount Moriah and the Holy Sepulchre: the changing traditions of the Temple Mount in the central Middle Ages," *Traditio* 40 (1984), pp. 175–195, at p. 183; Huygens, on the other hand, puts the date at April 1 in his edition of William of Tyre (see WT, 15.18.4–6), whereas Pringle puts it at March 3. See Pringle, *Churches*, vol. 3, p. 402.

[335] H.E. Mayer, "Zur Frühgeschichte des Templum Domini in Jerusalem," in *Bistümer, Klöster und Stifte im Königreich Jerusalem*, Schriften der MGH 26 (Stuttgart, 1977), pp. 222–229, at p. 225 and p. 227. The charter in question is quoted by Albert of Aachen. See AA, 11.12.

[336] Mayer 1977, p. 228. The charter can be found in *Diplomata*, vol. 2, no. 316 (*RRH*, no. 422a). This dating is based on a remark of William of Tyre, who seems to indicate that restorations were set under way as early as 1114: *Hec* [sc. *rupes*] *autem ante nostrorum introitum et postmodum annis quindecim nuda patuit et aperta, postea vero qui eidem prefuerunt loco, albo eam cooperientes marmore, altare desuper et chorum, in quo clerus divina celebrat, construxerunt* (WT, 8.3.94–98.).

patronage.[337] Sylvia Schein added that Achard indicates that he knows the identity of the robbers who looted the *Templum Domini*, which would point to an earlier rather than a later dating.[338] This point is difficult to argue against, since Achard's remark on this matter could hardly have been relevant if it were made sometime in the 1130s, by which point Tancred (d. December 12, 1112), the main person responsible for the looting, had been dead for at least eighteen years.

The major objection to an earlier dating would be the fact that Achard's name does not appear in charters as prior of the *Templum Domini* until 1112, and so there is no evidence from before this date that Achard held this office. However, this would only present a problem if the grant (dated to 1109–1112 by Mayer), was issued before 1112. Given the arguments put forth so far, we will tentatively accept Mayer's suggested date of composition in the period 1109–1112.[339]

Opening his poem with a conventional poetic formula known as a priamel, Achard enumerates a number of topics that have been the subject matter of poetry in the past, but which he will spurn: warfare, *topothesia* (literary topographical description), and pagan mythology. Focusing on the latter, Achard relates how previous poets composed poetry in praise of gods that were created by men (l. 3: *opus quidem manuum*); he proceeds to qualify their poetry as *fabulae* and *mendacium* (l. 5, "fanciful tales"). The function of this priamel is to pronounce a truth claim.[340] Instead of calling upon the muse to inspire him, Achard invokes the Holy Spirit to enlighten him:

---

[337] FC, 1.26.7–9 and WT, 8.3.94–98.

[338] Schein 1984, p. 181 n. 21; see also J. Prawer, *The history of the Jews in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem* (Oxford, 1988), p. 47. For Achard's passage, see AP, 21–23.

[339] This earlier dating is followed in *IHC*, vol. 2, p. 51; *Jerusalem pilgrimage*, p. 12; Loche 2009, p. 291.

[340] On the notion of "truth claim" as a function of medieval literature, see Otter 2005, pp. 112–113.

Presta, queso, supplicanti	digne posse promere
Regis opus Salomonis,	quod intendo scribere.
Ipsum quoque, cui scribo,	michi fac placabilem,
Omnem nostram sublevare	quo velit pauperiem.
Reddi cogat, que ad suam	ipsorum perniciem
Templi bona tenent, ex quo	capta est Ierusalem,
Esse se qui profitentur	defensores fidei,
Magis autem comprobantur	inimici domini.[341]

> Bestow, I ask, upon your supplicant the ability to relate in a worthy manner the work of King Solomon, about which I intend to write. And make well-disposed to me the person to whom I write, in order that he may wish to alleviate all our poverty, and return the property of the Temple that has been held ever since the capture of Jerusalem—to their own destruction!—by those who claim to be the defenders of the faith, but are proven to be the Lord's enemies.

The opening of the poem leaves little doubt about its purpose and intended audience: the poet writes to the court of the Jerusalemite king in order to have returned to the *Templum Domini* those treasures that were taken from it during the capture of Jerusalem on July 15, 1099. To lend the work a bit of added cachet, and to build his case for the return of what rightfully belongs to the Temple, Achard proposes to write a poem dealing at length with the history of the Temple. This would surely convince the king and his court of the dignity of the site and the respect due to it and its current monastic community. In fact, Achard goes much further: he states quite plainly that the king's own salvation depends on the rightful return of the stolen treasure.[342]

Achard provides a summary of the history of Jerusalem and its place within the various empires of the eastern Mediterranean, progressing through a kind of *translatio imperii*, or the passing on of the rule of empire across the ages, and ends with a studied debate about who built the current *Templum Domini*, with Helena (mother of Constantine the Great), Justinian, and

---

[341] AP, 13–20.

[342] AP, 26–32.

Heraclius all being offered as equally plausible.[343] The poet then gives thanks to God for delivering the *Templum*, along with the other holy sites of Jerusalem, into the hands of the crusaders, before lodging one final complaint about the fact that these same crusaders plundered the *Templum*. In fact, Achard points out that the Muslims not only preserved the treasures in the *Templum* for centuries but even added to them, while the Christian army—which should most of all have been respectful—looted them at the first opportunity.[344]

Achard's poem is important for being one of the few extant works of the Latin East that is explicitly connected with the royal court of Jerusalem.[345] In essence, the poem functions as a mirror for princes by setting up biblical examples to be followed by King Baldwin—most notably the example of King David. When Achard relates how David built an altar at the current site of the *Templum Domini* to atone for his sin of pride and to escape the wrath of the avenging angel, there is no question about the lesson to be drawn from this cautionary tale.[346] Likewise the

---

[343] See especially AP, 491–574. As pointed out by Lehmann (AP, pp. 302–303), this bears much similarity to a passage in the pilgrim guide of Rorgo Fretellus (RF, 53). The question of who founded the *Templum Domini* was thus both a learned literary debate as well as a pressing matter of institutional history and cultural identity. A similar passage can also be found in John of Würzburg, see JW, 218–231. Important in this regard is the study of the development of literary traditions surrounding the founding of the *Templum Domini* in A. Graboïs, "La fondation de l'abbaye du *Templum Domini* et la légende du Temple de Jérusalem au XIIe siècle," in M. Balard (ed.), *Autour de la première croisade: actes du Colloque de la Society for the Study of the Crusades and the Latin East, Clermont-Ferrand, 22–25 juin 1995* (Paris, 1996), pp. 231–237.

[344] AP, 794–808. A nearly identical sentiment can be found in a text connected with another community of Augustinian canons in the Latin East, the *Inventio Patriarcharum* probably commissioned by the community of Hebron in the late 1130s (for which see section 6.2 below), as well as in Rorgo Fretellus, who complains that the Franks and Venetians plundered Tyre (RF 1, 25).

[345] Other examples include the abbreviated history commissioned by Baldwin III and William of Tyre's history of the Holy Land, as well as his non-extant history of Eastern rulers, both originally commissioned by Amaury I.

[346] AP, ll. 110–127. The warning would have been all the more evident given that Achard addresses Baldwin early on as "successor of renowned King David" (AP, l. 24).

figure of Judas Maccabeus and his brothers, as restorers of the Temple and vanquishers of its despoilers, were to be construed as meaningful examples to the Frankish king of Jerusalem.[347]

Furthermore, the poem would have played an important role for the newly-established monastic community of the *Templum Domini* by providing a brief history of their site in an accessible form, thereby forging links with its biblical past. Achard's poem could therefore have very well been performed within both courtly and monastic contexts. Traces of an intended performance may be found in the frequent references by the poet to his poetic activity in terms of an oral performance.[348] Most immediately, however, the poem may have been composed for the the dedication of the *Templum Domini*, or at least in anticipation of it, as the following passage toward the end of the poem indicates:

Dedicatio ter facta	diversis temporibus
A Iudeis fuit, sicut	dictum est superius.
Facienda Christianis	reservatur ultima,
Ut tocius anni plene	distinguantur tempora.
Fiet enim in estate,	largiente domino,
Et sollempnitas preclara	Christiano populo
In eternum permanebit	illa dedicatio.[349]

> As was said above, three times has there been a dedication by the Jews, all at different times of the year. The last dedication is reserved for the Christians, so that all the seasons of a full year may have their significance. God granting, it will take place in the summer, and that dedication will forever remain a splendid festivity for the Christian people.

The work may well be considered occasional poetry, as Achard clearly had expectations that his poem would find a place in the celebrations surrounding the dedication of the *Templum Domini*, and represents a foundational text in the early days of the community of canons of the

[347] See below in Chapter 3.8.

[348] E.g., AP, 43 and 44.

[349] AP, 809–815.

Templum.[350] It should be noted here that Achard's poem is a considerable innovation from anything that has come before. As such, the priamel at the start deserves to be taken seriously as more than merely a literary convention. Although the style and form of the poem would hardly qualify as high art, the combination of a petition to the king with a commemorative poem containing skillful abbreviations of various biblical and related texts (in and of themselves by no means devoid of elegance) substantially departs from earlier medieval poetry. Moreover, the idea of abbreviating episodes of the books of the Maccabees and of Josephus' *Jewish War* lays the groundwork for the later productions of his successor Geoffrey.

Achard bases his account largely on biblical source materials, especially Kings and Chronicles, as he himself states.[351] In narrating the expulsion of the money-changers from the Temple,[352] Achard invokes the authority of *orthodoxi patres* ("orthodox church fathers"), probably obliquely referring to Jerome's commentary on the Gospel of St. Matthew.[353] Other sources utilized by Achard (but not explicitly acknowledged) include Josephus' *Jewish war* in the Latin translation by Ps.-Rufinus and Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical history* in the Latin translation by Rufinus.[354]

---

[350] For the function of literature in the early period of the Crusader States as establishing new traditions, particularly with reference to the regular communities of the *Templum Domini*, the Priory of Mt. Sion, and the Church of Hebron, see the discussion in K. Elm, "Nec minori celebritate a catholicis cultoribus observatur et colitur. Zwei Berichte über die 1119/20 erfolgte Auffindung und Erhebung der Gebeine der Patriarchen Abraham, Isaak und Jakob," *Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte* 94:4 (1997), pp. 318–344.

[351] AP, 36.

[352] AP, 648–653.

[353] *PL*, vol. 155, col. 1047.

[354] On the Latin translations of Josephus, see below on Geoffrey's versification of Josephus' *Jewish War*. Josephus is used as the source for a story of cannibalism occurring during the siege of Jerusalem in 70 AD by the Roman forces of Vespasian and Titus (AP, 715–740), while Eusebius is used as a source for the story of the martyrdom of St. James the Less (AP, 759–778).

The closest thing resembling a title is found in the incipits of a manuscript that opens with: *INCIPIT PREFATIO IN TRACTATV CVIVSDAM SAPIENTIS super templo Salomonis* ("The preface to a treatise on the Temple of Solomon by a certain wise man begins").[355] Another manuscript, containing all three poems, conceives of the three poems as a single work which it attributes to Geoffrey: *Incipit opus Gaufridi prioris de templo Super libros Machabeorum* ("The work of Prior Geoffrey of the Temple on the Books of Maccabees begins").[356] Both the reference to Geoffrey and to the Maccabees indicate that the scribe who penned this incipit was more concerned with the work of Geoffrey than that of Achard, and that, in the absence of further evidence, the title of *Super templo Salomonis* for the first poem is to be preferred.

3.3 Geoffrey, abbot of the *Templum Domini*, *Super libros Macchabeorum* and *De septem libris Iosephi*

Nothing is known about the life of Achard's successor Geoffrey before he arrived in the Holy Land.[357] Our first knowledge about Geoffrey comes from the appearance of his name in a charter of the Knights Templar dating to the period of September 24 to December 24 of the year 1137, where he is listed as prior of the *Templum Domini*.[358] A charter belonging to the Holy Sepulcher

[355] Rome, BAV, MS Reg. lat. 150, at f. 159r.

[356] Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Laud. misc. 406 (late 12th, early 13th c.).

[357] For what little information we have about the life of Geoffrey, see Barber 2012, pp. 177–178; R. Hiestand, "Gaufridus abbas Templi Domini: an underestimated figure in the early history of the Kingdom of Jerusalem," in P. Edbury and J. Phillips (eds.), *The Experience of Crusading*, vol. 1 (Cambridge, 2003), pp. 48–59; A. Linder, "An unpublished charter of Geoffrey, abbot of the Temple in Jerusalem," in B.Z. Kedar, H.E. Mayer, and R.C. Smail (eds.), *Outremer: Studies in the History of the Crusading Kingdom of Jerusalem presented to Joshua Prawer* (Jerusalem, 1982), pp. 119–129. Geoffrey's two poems are edited in: E. Poleg, "On the Books of Maccabees: an unpublished Poem by Geoffrey, Prior of the 'Templum Domini,'" *Crusades* 9 (2010), pp. 13–56 (henceforth abbreviated as GA, Macc); J. Yolles, "Geoffrey, prior of the *Templum Domini*, *On the seven books of Josephus*," *Crusades* 13 (2014), pp. 77–118 (henforth GA, Ios).

[358] *RRH*, no. 173. Edited in *Cartulaire général de l'Ordre du Temple, 1119?–1150*, ed. G. D'Albon (Paris, 1913), no. 141, where it is incorrectly dated to September 1, 1137 – April 2, 1138. On the dating, see

from the same period lists Geoffrey as abbot of the *Templum Domini*, so that the institutional change of priory to abbey must have occurred at some point in the fall of 1137.[359] From this, combined with the fact that the incipit of one manuscript attributes all three books of the poem to "prior Geoffrey," we may conclude that Geoffrey succeeded Achard as prior of the Temple before its status changed from a priory to an abbey, and that he probably wrote the poems in this period—that is, between December 25, 1135 and December 24, 1137.[360] Geoffrey is no longer listed in charters after 1160, and in April of 1166 his successor Hugh appears as a witness in charters.[361] Geoffrey was sent as an envoy on two different embassies to the Byzantine Emperors John II Komnenos and Manuel Komnenos, in 1142/1143 and in 1158/1159, respectively, and William of Tyre explains that the reason for these assignments was his fluency in Greek.[362]

Geoffrey must have been a figure of considerable prominence in the kingdom of Jerusalem during the middle of the twelfth century.[363] This is attested by his frequent appearance as a witness to charters, as well as the existence of a charter which he issued himself. Dating to the period 1146–1166, it concerns the confirmation of Ernaldus Ruffus II of the donation of Woodbridge Priory to the abbey of the *Templum Domini*, while Geoffrey in turn confirmed that Ernaldus and his heirs would maintain the privilege of electing its prior.[364] The charter, bearing

---

Diplomata, vol. 2, p. 857. The significant fact that Geoffrey is listed here as *prior* rather than *abbas* seems to have gone unnoticed by scholars.

[359] *RRH*, no. 172; edited in Bresc-Bautier, no. 23, where it is incorrectly dated between January 1 and February 5 of 1138. For objections to this dating, see H.E. Mayer, *Die Kanzlei der lateinischen Könige von Jerusalem* (Hannover, 1996), vol. 2, pp. 856–857, where the charter is dated to September 24 – December 24 of 1137.

[360] This is Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Laud. misc. 406 (late 12th, early 13th c.).

[361] *Diplomata*, vol. 1, no. 260; *Diplomata*, vol. 2, no. 316.

[362] WT, 15.21.11–12, 18.24.6–7.

[363] See Linder 1982 and Hiestand 2003.

[364] The charter is edited in Linder 1982, p. 121.

Geoffrey's personal seal showing a figure seated on a throne holding a *baculum*, with the dome of the *Templum Domini* on the reverse, provides valuable evidence that Geoffrey's sphere of influence extended well beyond the Latin East.[365]

One final important piece of evidence concerns the aforementioned letter written by Geoffrey to Count Geoffrey of Anjou, eldest son of Fulk of Anjou, king of Jerusalem from 1131–1143. In this letter, Geoffrey describes himself as *dominici ac sanctissimi Templi quod est in Ierusalem prior* ("prior of the most sacred Temple of the Lord which is in Jerusalem"), indicating that it must have been written before the institutional change to an abbey in the fall of 1137.[366] The ostensible purpose of the letter is to solicit material aid from the count, presumably for the renovation of the *Templum Domini*. At the start of the letter, Geoffrey writes:

> Quoniam credimus vobis non esse incognitum, quante dignitatis semper, a quibus vel qualiter fundatum Templum Dei fuerit, queve aut quanta inibi fuerint facta miracula, scribere noluimus. Ipsius enim dignitatem et mysterii profunditatem scribere libri potius esset quam epistole.[367]
>
> Since I believe that you are not ignorant of the great dignity always possessed by the Temple of God, and by whom and how it was founded, or what great miracles took place in that very place, I did not wish to write of this. Indeed, to write of the dignity and the profound mystery would be proper to a book rather than a letter.

Hiestand was the first to argue that the book in question is not a mere commonplace, but in fact refers to Achard of Arrouaise's poem on the history of the Temple, which Geoffrey revised for the purpose of solliciting the count of Anjou for patronage, in the process claiming the

[365] The seal can be found in H.E. Mayer, *Das Siegelwesen in den Kreuzfahrerstaaten* (Munich, 1978), p. 32 and plate 1.5. This seal is from a different charter, confirming the purchase of a house within the *septa Templi* by one otherwise unknown Arnaldus the Baker (Fornerius). See for this charter *RRH*, no. 173b, and the discussion and edition in Hiestand 2003, pp. 58–59.

[366] See Hiestand 2003, pp. 52–53, 58.

[367] Hiestand 2003, p. 58.

authorship as his own.[368] In support of this argument, he adduces the fact that one of the manuscripts attributes all three poems to Geoffrey, suppressing Achard's authorship.[369] Moreover, the fact that a twelfth-century manuscript containing Achard's poem originates from Poitiers would indicate that this poem may have accompanied Geoffrey's letter to Anjou.[370]

In his edition of Geoffrey's poem on the Maccabees, Eyal Poleg, on the other hand, argued that Geoffrey's letter primarily refers to this poem rather than to Achard's poem on the history of the Temple.[371] Given the significant differences in style, content, and purpose between Achard's poem and Geoffrey's poem on the Maccabees, he deems it unlikely that Achard's poem was revised by Geoffrey. Instead, it is argued, the use of the term *mysterium* in the letter points to the typological connections made in Geoffrey's poem, while the letter's reference to the story of the expulsion of the moneylenders from the Temple accords closely with Geoffrey's concern with simony in his versification of the Maccabees.[372]

Poleg's arguments are persuasive, but do not account for the fact that Geoffrey's poem on the Maccabees does not deal with the founding of the Temple by any means—an aspect explicitly associated with the hypothetical *liber* mentioned by Geoffrey in his letter. Moreover, the language used in describing this subject matter in the letter is almost identical with the programmatic statement near the beginning of Achard's poem:

---

[368] Hiestand 2003, p. 53–54.

[369] Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Laud. misc. 406 (late 12th, early 13th c.).

[370] Rome, BAV, MS Reg. lat. 150 (late 12th c.).

[371] Poleg in GA, Macc, pp. 22–23.

[372] See, for instance, *misticam . . . sententiam* in GA, Macc, 110, but also the *dona mistica* in GA, Ios, 421 and *munera . . . mistica* in l. 432. The principal passage on simony occurs in GA, Macc, 214–240.

Quante semper dignitatis Templum Dei fuerit,
Qua de causa quove loco vel quis hoc fundaverit,
Nullus legens libros regum ignorare poterit.[373]

No one who reads the Book of Kings can be ignorant of the great dignity always possessed by the Temple of God, or why, where, and who founded it.

These remarkable resemblences alone would suffice to prove that, at the very least, Geoffrey had Achard's poem in mind when he wrote his letter (whether he revised it or not). However, even the episode of Christ expelling the moneylenders from the Temple, which is referred to in the letter and indicates for Poleg a connection with Geoffrey's concern for "buyers" and "sellers" (*emptores* and *venditores*) of spiritual goods, finds a more literal parallel in Achard's poem.[374] Achard, who diligently paraphrased and versified all biblical episodes that took place in or concerning the various Jewish Temples, also relates this particular episode, and even quotes the same verse from Matthew as Geoffrey does in his letter.[375] This particular biblical episode, moreover, is so closely tied to the Temple that it need not require any particular justification for its inclusion (as Poleg claims), since it would have been one of the episodes that came most readily to mind as an example of its connection to the gospels and the life of Christ.[376] This is made abundantly clear by the fact that by 1165 the same quotation from this episode that appears

[373] AP, 33–35.

[374] GA, Macc, p. 22. The relevant passage in Geoffrey's versification of the Maccabees occurs in the digression in ll. 214–240. Although Geoffrey's use of the phrases *emptores* and *venditores* resembles the *ementes* and *vendentes* mentioned in the story in Mt. 21:12–13 and in Geoffrey's letter, there is no reference to the story of the expulsion of the moneylenders in the passage in Geoffrey's poem.

[375] Mt. 21:13: *domus mea domus orationis vocabitur*. This is itself a quotation from Is. 56:7.

[376] See for example the reference to this story in RF, 55; JW, 283; WT, 1.15.46.

in both Achard's poem and Geoffrey's letter was inscribed below a painting of Christ inside the *Templum Domini*.[377]

Finally, despite Poleg's claims to the contrary, a direct parallel to the *mysterium* mentioned in Geoffrey's letter appears in Achard's poem.[378] Toward the end of the poem, Achard apologizes for the fact that his poem cannot treat in detail all of the *mysteria* that took place in the Temple:

> Multa sunt et mira valde, que in templo dominus
> Signa fecit docuitque coram senioribus.
> Sed sufficiat dixisse perpauca de pluribus;
> Non presumpsit enim nostra tenuis scientia
> tot et tanta salvatoris scribere misteria.[379]
>
> There are many great miracles that the Lord performed in the Temple and showed to the elders. But let it suffice to have spoken about just a few of the many; for my slight knowledge does not presume to write about so many great mysteries of the Savior.

In sum, the nearly identical phrases in Achard's poem and Geoffrey's letter indicate that Achard's poem most likely accompanied the letter. In fact, there is no reason on the basis of the letter alone to suppose that either of Geoffrey's own poems accompanied it. On the other hand, it would make sense for him to want to add to the prestige of his gift by adding further poems to a production that was originally directed to another patron. This suggestion is further corroborated by the timeline of the composition of the poems: as indicated by the designation of the poet as *prior*, both poems as well as the letter to Geoffrey of Anjou were written in the same short

[377] JW, 119–129; Theo 22–24. See also the discussion in Schein 1984, p. 183.

[378] Poleg in GA, Macc, p. 22.

[379] AA, 678–682.

period. Moreover, if all three poems accompanied the letter, this would account for the fact that all three poems are found circulating together in twelfth-century manuscripts from France.[380]

The manuscript evidence may provide a further clue to support the suggestion that Geoffrey conceived of the three poems as a unified production. Although scholars have been aware of the existence of ten lines of dactylic hexameters dealing with the founding and destruction of the Temple at the end of the three poems ever since Lehmann made a brief mention of them, they have not received any scholarly attention.[381] These verses were probably composed by Geoffrey rather than Achard, since they appear only at the end of Geoffrey's poems, and are absent from the one manuscript that contains only Achard's poem. The poem deals with the foundation of the Temple by Solomon, its destruction by Nebuchadnezzar, and the destruction of the subsequent Temple by Titus. The poem therefore manages to achieve a kind of unity between the three poetic productions, so that—if Geoffrey did indeed author these verses—the presence of this poem would strongly suggest that he intended for both his poems and that of his predecessor to circulate together from the very beginning.

In general, Geoffrey's first poem follows the structure of 1 Maccabees, presenting a versification of 1 Macc 1–16 with episodes of 2 Maccabees inserted at appropriate moments, most notably the corruption of the priesthood in 2 Macc 3–5 and the persecutions instituted by

[380] There is some manuscript evidence that suggests that Geoffrey's first poem circulated separately at some point: the fragment discovered by Poleg contains the poem's last 41 lines, which are immediately followed by another text (see Poleg's description of the manuscript: GA, Macc, p. 17). It is possible, therefore, as Poleg suggests, that Geoffrey sent his versification of the Maccabees with the letter and not that of Josephus. However, the fact that there is a lack of rubrication and explicit indicates that the text may have been excerpted—at the very least, it does not provide compelling evidence that the poem ever gained wide circulation separate from the other two poems (unlike Geoffrey's versification of Josephus).

[381] AP, p. 299.

Antiochus in 2 Macc 6–7.[382] Unlike Achard's poem, Geoffrey does not open with any kind of prologue or introduction, preferring rather to begin with a versification of the opening of 1 Maccabees. After the stage for the story of the Maccabean revolt is set by the narration of Alexander's conquest of the Levant, the poet states that his intentions are to "to abbreviate in a short book the many battles of the Maccabees that they fought," being a versification of the events described in the canonical 1 and 2 Maccabees.[383] The abbreviation, however, serves a further purpose, as Geoffrey explains:

> Ammonemus hoc carmine lectores ut sollicite
> Perpendant, quam nefarium sit contra sanctum spiritum
> Nunc temporis per pretium ambire sacerdotium.[384]
>
> With this poem I urge the readers to consider carefully how unlawful it is, and in opposition to the Holy Spirit, at this moment in time to attempt to acquire the priesthood through purchase.

The poem is therefore chiefly concerned with combating the practice of simony—that is to say, the buying and selling of spiritual goods and ecclesiastical offices. This dual purpose of abbreviation and providing a warning against simony is made explicit at the very end of the poem:

> Digesta est hystoria sub brevitate maxima
> Nam plura pretermisimus de multis pauca diximus.
> Et nostra est intentio de symonie vitio
> Ex his libris ostendere quod ab antiquo tempore

[382] GA, Macc, 31–213 and 269–353. Geoffrey writes verses of 8+8 syllables, either to be construed as 16-syllable verses with internal or leonine rhyme, or as rhyming couplets of 8 syllables each. The placement of the accent is not fixed, although the rhymed syllables tend to correspond. This metrical scheme, which allowed Geoffrey a great amount of flexibility in versifying the narratives of the Maccabees and the *Jewish War*, corresponds to a few hymns attributed to Matthew of Vendôme: see the discussion in Norberg 2004, pp. 120–121.

[383] GA, Macc, 27–30.

[384] GA, Macc, 214–216. See also the discussion of this passage in Chapter 3.8.

Exortum est a Symone et post a quodam Iasone.[385]

> The history has been treated with the utmost brevity, for I have omitted much and spoken but little about many things. My intention is to show through these books that the vice of simony arose in ancient times, from Simon and afterward from a certain Jason.[386]

Apart from the books of the Maccabees, the poem contains echoes of liturgical phrases that would have been sung frequently at the *Templum Domini*, while the poet also relates the biblical material to the *Templum Domini* more directly through phrases commonly used in Marian worship.[387] Most striking in this regard is the description of the mother of the seven brothers standing still (*stabat mater immobilis*) in the face of Antiochus' persecution. Her lack of grief, as she rejoices that her martyred sons persevered in their faith, contrasts with the Virgin Mary weeping outside Christ's tomb, which later became the subject of a celebrated hymn.[388] Considering that the *Templum Domini* was dedicated to the Virgin Mary, the connection drawn between the two figures would certainly have resonated with its community.

Furthermore, Geoffrey mentions and claims to paraphrase two authorities in different digressions. The first digression of the poem occurs early on, when Geoffrey announces that he will divert from his main narrative for a moment in order to provide excerpts from a book of Augustine against heretics, particularly the "error of Simon [the Benjamite]."[389] The digression relates two different *exempla*: The first exemplum deals with the sacred flame of the Jewish Temple, which was miraculously preserved under water during the Babylonian Captivity and

---

[385] GA, Macc, 1148–1152.

[386] Referring to Simon the Benjamite, an overseer of the Temple who attempted to induce Apollonius to rob the Temple's treasury (2 Macc 3), and to the high priest Jason, who promoted a policy of Hellenization (2 Macc 4).

[387] GA, Macc, 18–19.

[388] GA, Macc, l. 348; John 20:11.

[389] GA, Macc, 104–143.

was extinguished only after Jason purchased the priesthood.[390] The second exemplum gives a moral or tropological interpretation of the story of Potiphar, who is said to have become a eunuch upon purchasing Joseph.[391] Both of these *exempla* are intended by Geoffrey to indicate the futility of purchasing spiritual goods or offices.

Nowhere in the works of Augustine are these *exempla* found, however. Eyal Poleg persuasively showed that the probable source was a passage in Alger of Liège's *Liber de misericordia et iustitia* ("Book on compassion and justice"), containing a passage with highly similar phrasing that is attributed to Augustine.[392]

The other authority invoked by Geoffrey is Gregory the Great, who appears in the third and final digression of the poem.[393] The poet claims to paraphrase from Gregory's *Moralia in Iob* ("Moral interpretations of Job") an interpretation of the stories of both Joseph and Judas Maccabeus: as soon as they rely on human rather than divine aid, they are deprived of all divine assistance. The moral of the story, as Geoffrey pithily puts it, is:

> Est ergo bonum ponere in deo iusto iudice
> Spem nostram non in homine vel in auro Arabie.[394]
>
> It is good, therefore, for us to place our hope in God the just judge, but not in man or the gold of Arabia.

[390] GA, Macc, ll. 111–31.

[391] GA, Macc, ll. 132–42.

[392] GA, Macc, p. 21. The text can be found in *PL*, vol. 180, col. 951, 3.42. Of course it is also a possibility that Geoffrey and Alger used the same (now lost) source.

[393] GA, Macc, 798–812. The second digression occurs in 214–240.

[394] GA, Macc, 811–812.

Geoffrey invokes the authority of the celebrated pope, liturgist, and exegete Gregory the Great, although the passage in question cannot be found anywhere in the *Moralia in Iob*, or any other of his works—and here, as in the case of Pseudo-Augustine, we may be dealing with an as yet unidentified spurious work of Gregory the Great. Although Geoffrey's precise reference here is uncertain, he appears to allude to ongoing arrangements for a political alliance, possibly with the Turks in Damascus or Aleppo. Such alliances were not unheard of during this time: for example, in 1115 Prince Roger of Antioch had forged an alliance with Damascus, as described by Walter the Chancellor,[395] while in 1140, King Fulk struck a brief alliance with the Damascenes against Zengi, atabeg of Mosul. According to William of Tyre, the Franks were offered a sizeable sum of gold to protect the city.[396]

All in all, as Geoffrey's introduction, conclusion, and digressions indicate, the abbreviation of the books of the Maccabees seems to have had a distinct purpose. Still, the versification of significant episodes of the Bible in Achard's poem—including the opening of 1 Maccabbees—would have set an important precedent for Geoffrey.[397] The same can also be said for Achard's versification of an episode from Josephus' *Jewish War*, which may have set a precedent for Geoffrey's versification of this work, to which we shall presently turn.

Unlike the versification of the Maccabees, the versification of Josephus' *Jewish War* opens with a programmatic statement:

Continuare volumus	quedam que dicit Iosephus
Cum his que iam superius	de Machabeis scripsimus,
Nam libri septem Iosephi	civitatis excidii

[395] WC, 1.2.6.

[396] WT, 15.7.

[397] 1 Macc 1–4 is versified in AP, 532–569.

Consequenter incipiunt	ubi libri deficiunt
Qui digerunt fortissima	Machabeorum prelia.
Iudeorum pontifices	et Romanorum principes,
Quos describit prolixius	idem hystoriographus,
Videtur satis utile	brevi stilo percurrere,
Ut quivis possit facile	legentium cognoscere
Qui, quot, vel quales fuerint,	qui vel quibus successerint,
Donec per Tytum Cesarem	subversa est Ierusalem.[398]

> I wish to follow the things that I already wrote above on the Maccabees with certain things that Josephus narrates, for the seven books of Josephus on the destruction of the city begin where the books that relate those exceedingly brave battles of the Maccabees leave off. It seems to me quite useful to briefly go through the priests of the Jews and the emperors of the Romans, whom the same historiographer describes at length, in order that any reader might easily know who, how many, or what kind of persons they were, who and whom they succeeded, until Jerusalem was sacked by Emperor Titus.

In this poem Geoffrey aims to follow his abbreviation of the Maccabees with that of Josephus' *Jewish War*, which he views as a continuation of the biblical books. He hopes that a brief historical overview of the various high priests until the destruction of the Temple by Titus in 70 AD will benefit readers. Geoffrey uses the phrase *brevi stilo* ("with a brief pen") to describe his poetic activity, and identifies his audience as readers, in contrast to Achard's references to oral poetic performance.[399]

As is demonstrated both by the abbreviated version of Fulcher of Chartres' history by Bartolf of Nangis and the *Historia Nicaena* commissioned by Baldwin III, there was a need for relatively short, memorable texts that dealt with the local history of Jerusalem and its environs, for use, perhaps, in the instruction of princes and other members of the royal court, as well as of (in the case of Geoffrey and Achard) the canons of the *Templum Domini*. In addition to the avowed practical aims of both Achard and Geoffrey, a Latin poem was by definition not devoid of literary pretension, and a Latin versification of a text so closely tied to the local history of

[398] Ll. 1–11. I have recently prepared the first critical edition of this poem: J. Yolles, *De septem libris Iosephi*, ed. J. Yolles, "Geoffrey, prior of the *Templum Domini*, *On the seven books of Josephus*," *Crusades* 13 (2014), pp. 77–118 (henceforth GA, Ios).

[399] This point was first made by Eyal Poleg: GA, Macc, p. 14.

Jerusalem must be viewed as part of a careful strategy to solicit patronage—either from local rulers such as King Baldwin I or II, or from those in the West who wished to associate themselves with the Holy Land for reasons of prestige, such as Count Geoffrey of Anjou.[400]

That association with Jerusalem was particularly prized is clear from the example of Geoffrey of Anjou: after his father Fulk of Anjou ascended to the throne of Jerusalem in 1131, Geoffrey frequently identified himself in charters as "Geoffrey, count of Anjou, son of the king of Jerusalem."[401] Association with the kingdom of Jerusalem by means of patronage would have been an opportunity to increase his social standing and cultural capital, and one may assume that Prior Geoffrey's solicitations were successful, based on the increased relations between the *Templum Domini* and the court of Anjou, as demonstrated by the existence of a letter dating to ca. 1140 from the canons of the *Templum Domini*, in which one of their fellow canons is recommended to the count in return for his inclusion in their prayer services.[402]

Unlike the versification of the Maccabees, where it is quite clear where Geoffrey acquired much of his source material, there are a few problems in determining the precise version of Josephus' text used by Geoffrey in his versification of the *Jewish War*. Given the accolades Geoffrey received from William of Tyre for his Greek fluency (being indeed the only Frank to receive such praise from William), it is tempting to imagine Geoffrey working directly

[400] For the career of Geoffrey of Anjou, see J. Bradbury, "Geoffrey V of Anjou, Count and Knight," in C. Harper-Bill and R. Harvey (eds.), *The ideals and practice of medieval knighthood III: papers from the fourth Strawberry Hill conference, 1988* (Woodbridge, 1990), pp. 21–38.

[401] See e.g., J. Chartrou, *L'Anjou de 1109 à 1151: Foulque de Jérusalem et Geoffroi Plantegenêt* (Paris, 1928), "Pièces justificatives," nos. 46–47, 49, 53–54, 57. I am grateful to Mark Blincoe from California Baptist University for pointing this out to me, who has a forthcoming article on this matter.

[402] Chartrou 1928, "Catalogue," no. 134.

from the Greek original.[403] A close look at Geoffrey's poem and the available Latin translations of Josephus reveals, however, that Geoffrey was following these closely—to such an extent, in fact, that it seems unlikely that he ever had the Greek text in front of him.[404]

There were two such translations in the Middle Ages: the first is a fourth-century translation that was attributed to one Hegesippus (which may or may not be a corruption of Josephus via Josippus), comprising a somewhat abbreviated revision of Josephus' text into five books, with a notable Christian slant.[405] The other translation also dates to the fourth century, and was often (most likely erroneously) attributed to the prolific translator of Greek works Rufinus, which is much more faithful to the original text.[406] As I will demonstrate elsewhere, there is sufficient evidence to suggest that Geoffrey may have consulted both translations. In a context of medieval composition and the practicalities involving the simultaneous consultation of multiple codices (or the awkward flipping back-and-forth within one codex), one might perhaps imagine that Geoffrey had access to a text of Ps.-Rufinus that was glossed or interpolated with Ps.-Hegesippus.

Whatever the case may be, there is more than adequate evidence for the presence of both translations in the Latin East of the twelfth century: they are both mentioned by William of Tyre as authorities in his description of Jerusalem, while a twelfth-century catalogue of codices owned

[403] WT, 15.21.11–12, 18.24.6–7. For this observation, see the remarks of Robert Huygens on the first of these passages, as well as Hiestand 2003, pp. 50–51.

[404] In a forthcoming publication I intend to discuss Geoffrey's reliance upon Latin translations more extensively.

[405] Ps.-Hegesippus, *Hegesippi qui dicitur historiae libri quinque* I–II, ed. V. Ussani, CSEL 66 (Vienna, 1932–1960); *PL*, vol. 15, cols. 1961–2206.

[406] For a discussion of the authorship, see H. Schreckenberg and K. Schubert, *Jewish historiography and iconography in early and Medieval Christianity* (Assen, 1992), pp. 71–73.

by a library in Nazareth lists four and a half quires of *Egissipus*, which may refer to Ps.-Hegesippus.[407]

In a few rare instances, Geoffrey shows signs of incorporating other source materials in addition to that of Josephus. For instance, the narrative of Herod the Great's life is interruped by a digression on the story of the Nativity, in which Geoffrey offers an allegorical interpretation of the gifts of the Magi that draws on the allegorical exegesis of the commentaries of Ambrose and Jerome.[408] Geoffrey interrupts the narrative for another digression on the captivity and execution of John the Baptist at the hands of Herod Antipas, which closely follows the language of the gospels in describing Jesus' baptism.[409]

With these references to the Bible, Geoffrey's practical aim of presenting his material with the utmost clarity comes to the fore. In so doing, he manages to place the events and persons of Josephus' narrative within a biblical context that would have been more familiar to his audience. For instance, Geoffrey explains that Herod Antipas is the one before whom Christ was brought, while the mention of the Roman Emperor Tiberius is clarified with a reference to

---

[407] WT, 8.2.18. J.S. Beddie, "Some notice of books in the East in the period of the Crusades." *Speculum* 8:2 (1933), pp. 240–242. See also the corrections in P. Lehmann, "Von Nazareth nach Erfurt," *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen* 50 (1933), pp. 483–4, as well as the comments in B.Z. Kedar, "On books and hermits in Nazareth's short twelfth century," in M. Yazbak and S. Sharif (eds.), *Nazareth: archaeology, history and cultural heritage* (Nazareth, 2012), pp. 43–53. For a discussion of the entry of *Egissipus* in this catalog, see *Rorgo Fretellus de Nazareth et sa description de la Terre Sainte: histoire et edition du texte*, ed. P.C. Boeren (Amsterdam, 1980), pp. 89–93, who argues that the author meant is one Eugesippus, who composed an eleventh-century *descriptio Terrae Sanctae*. Note, however, that this argument rests on Boeren's argument that Rorgo Fretellus was an archdeacon in Nazareth, a position argued against by R. Hiestand, "Un centre intellectuel en Syrie du Nord? Notes sur la personnalité d'Aimeri d'Antioche, Albert de Tarse et *Rorgo Fretellus*," *Le Moyen Âge* 101 (1994), pp. 7–36.

[408] See GA, Ios, 411–447; Ambrose, *Expositio evangelii secundam Lucam* 2.619, *De viduis* 5.29.6; Jerome, *In evangelii Matthaei commentarium* 1.5.

[409] GA, Ios, 485–489; Mt 3:16–17; Mark 1:9–11; John 1:32–33.

the Gospel of Luke.[410] Similarly, the three persons called Herodes are differentiated by Geoffrey for the reader's benefit with a reference to Acts.[411]

Finally, on a single occasion Geoffrey refers his reader to a secular text: after alluding to Julius Caesar's return to Rome from Gaul and the subsequent civil wars, the curious reader is directed to consult the poet Lucan for further information on the matter.[412]

One manuscript has been particularly instrumental in assigning titles to Geoffrey's two poems, as it gives the incipit for all three poems as *Incipit opus Gaufridi prioris de templo super libros Machabeorum* ("The work of Prior Geoffrey of the Temple on the Books of the Maccabees begins").[413] This has led Eyal Poleg, who edited Geoffrey's versifcation of the Maccabees, to give it the title *On the books of Maccabees*.[414] Likewise I have adopted this manuscript's incipit for Geoffrey's versification of Josephus to title the poem *De septem libris Iosephi* ("On the seven books of Josephus").[415] It should be noted, however, that two manuscripts give the title of the poem as a "Continuation (*continuatio*) of the Old and New

---

[410] GA, Ios, 490: *Herodes idem ipse est ad quem Christus directus est*; GA, Ios, 500–501: *sicut in evangelio / secundum Lucam legimus*.

[411] See GA, Ios, 641–642: *Nam quem Agrippam Iosephus, hunc Lucas noster medicus / Herodem regem nominat, ut nobis liber indicat / ipsius quem de Actibus Apostolorum legimus.*

[412] GA, Ios, 292–295.

[413] Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Laud. misc. 406. Geoffrey's two poems survive in a total of eight manuscripts; these include three manuscripts that contain both poems in addition to the poem of Achard of Arrousaise: Besançon, Bibl. mun., MS 187 (late 12th c.); Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Laud. misc. 406 (late 12th, early 13th c.); Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS 603 (late 12th, early 13th c.). There is also one short twelfth-century fragment of Geoffrey's first poem: Saint-Omer, Bibl. mun., MS 776, f. 65r (late 12th c.), identified by Eyal Poleg; see the description in GA, Macc, pp. 17–18. A further three manuscripts containing only Geoffrey's second poem are extant, as well as a short fragment: Carpentras, Bibl. mun. (Inguimbertine), MS 168, f. 73v–82v (late 12th c.); Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland, MS 6121, f. 18r–25r (late 12th c.); Cambridge, Emmanuel College, MS 1.3.3 (James 56), f. 128r–139v (15th c.); London, British Library, MS Royal 8 F.ix, f. 1v (A) (12th c.). For descriptions of these manuscripts, see my edition of the third poem: Yolles in GA, Ios, pp. 80–84.

[414] GA, Macc, 22–23.

[415] The incipit reads: *Incipit tertius de septem libris Iosephi*.

Testament."[416] However, this title is probably derived from the opening words of the poem, in which the poet announces that he will continue his versification of the Maccabees with an abbreviation of Josephus.[417]

3.4 *Carmen Buranum* 51a

One of the poems in the famed thirteenth-century collection from Benediktbeuern known as the *Carmina Burana* may well have been composed in the Latin East.[418] The poem is copied immediately after *Carmen Buranum* 51 (*Debacchatur mundus pomo*), though it is clearly a separate poem. It consists of three strophes each followed by a refrain.[419] The poem (*Imperator rex Grecorum*) opens with a description of a Byzantine emperor preparing for warfare. The refrain consists of macaronic, part-Greek part-Latin verses with liturgical resonances appearing to be a variation on the liturgical formula of the *trisagion* or "thrice holy," a doxology in which

[416] These are the manuscripts from Edinburgh and Cambridge listed above, of which the former gives the title as *Continuatio veteris et novi testamenti*, while the latter offers *Continuacio novi et veteris testamenti*. As I have argued more extensively in my edition, there is strong evidence to suggest that the fifteenth-century manuscript from Cambridge was copied directly from the late twelfth-century manuscript from Edinburgh (see Yolles in GA, Ios, pp. 84–85).

[417] GA, Ios, 1–2: *Continuare volumus quedam que dicit Iosephus / cum his que iam superius de Machabeis scripsimus*.

[418] This was first suggested in B.Z. Kedar, "Intellectual activities in a holy city: Jerusalem in the twelfth century," in B.Z. Kedar and R.J. Zwi Werblowsky (eds.), *Sacred space: shrine, city, land. Proceedings from the international conference in memory of Joshua Prawer* (London and Jerusalem, 1998), pp. 127–139 (repr. in Kedar 2006, no. ix), at p. 135 and note. The poem in question is *Carmina Burana*, ed. A. Hilka and O. Schumann, vol. 1, part 1 (Heidelberg, 1930), 51a. The poem in this edition will henceforth be abbreviated as CB 51a. The poem is also printed in Schmuck 1954, pp. 110–111; Spreckelmeyer 1987, p. 13; Szövérffy 1992–1994, vol. 3, p. 84; K.P. Harrington and J. Pucci, *Medieval Latin*, 2nd ed. (Chicago, 1997), pp. 591–592. For an extensive commentary, see Wentzlaff-Eggebert 1960, pp. 57–58, and especially Spreckelmeyer 1974, pp. 76–80; see also the notes in CB 2.1, pp. 111–112; Harrington and Pucci 1997, pp. 591–592; Hartl 2009, pp. 85–86.

[419] The stanzas are composed in rhythmical verse with trochaic cadence, consisting of four lines each with a syllabic pattern of 8p. The refrain, with the exception of the opening *ayos* (i.e., *hagios*, or "holy"), consists of four lines with a syllabic pattern of 7pp.

praise is offered to God, reserved in Western liturgy for Good Friday.[420] The second half of the refrain is mostly Latin, which flows neatly into the second strophe and its focus on King Amaury, who is described as a *miles fortis* ("valiant knight") and as a *rex communis nostre sortis* ("king of our shared heritage"), whose past victories against the "Turks" in Egypt are lauded.[421] The third and final strophe unites the first two in a jubilant outburst at this new-found alliance:

> Omnis ergo Christianus
> Ad Egyptum tendat manus!
> Semper ibi degat sanus,
> destruatur rex paganus![422]
>
> Let every Christian, therefore, stretch forth his hand toward Egypt! Let him always live safely there,[423] but may the pagan king come to ruin!

The Greek elements, the references to military campaigns in Egypt, the alliance between a Byzantine emperor, and the general tenor of optimism place this poem within a very specific historical context. Amaury had led successful expeditions against the Fāṭimid rule in Egypt in the years 1163/4 and 1168, and after establishing an alliance with Manuel Komnenos, he expected to find similar success in a subsequent campaign in 1169, which, however, failed miserably at the siege of Damietta. Presumably, then, the poem was composed in the wake of the success of 1168, and almost certainly before the campaign of 1169.

---

[420] Note that Walter the Chancellor informs us that the Antiochene army recited a Latin translation of the *trisagion* before entering the First Battle of Tall Danith (WC, 1.5.6): *Sancte Deus! Sancte fortis, sancte et inmortalis, miserere nobis!*

[421] For this interpretation of *sors*, rather than as "fate," see Spreckelmeyer 1974, p. 79. A similar usage of the word can be found in the Ripoll hymn (strophe 6), in which the First Crusade is described as an effort to make the Holy Sepulcher part of the crusaders' *proprie . . . sortis* ("our own heritage").

[422] CB 51a, strophe 3.

[423] I follow here the interpretation of Spreckelmeyer (1974, p. 79), who argued against Hilka and Schumann (CB 2.1, p. 112), that there is no change of subject back to Amaury, but rather that *omnis Christianus* remains the subject.

As Kedar suggested, the poem may have been commissioned by Amaury, perhaps as a propaganda piece leading up to a new campaign into Egypt.[424] Joseph Szövérffy commented on the poem's "rare 'ecumenical' spirit," and classified it as a "'shortened' form of a historical song with 'exhortation.'"[425] Especially the characterization of Amaury as a "king of our shared heritage" calls to mind the shared liturgical celebrations of both Greek Orthodox and Catholic Christians side by side at the Church of the Holy Sepulcher, and the poet is clearly keen to portray Amaury as king over all Christians residing in Jerusalem.

One final argument for placing the poem in a Levantine rather than a European context is the parallel epigraphic evidence that survives from the same period: the macaronic nature of the poem and the context of the alliance between Amaury and Manuel Komnenos recall the dual inscriptions found in the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem. The two inscriptions—one Latin, one Greek—acknowledge both Amaury and Manuel as benefactors to the church's restorations made in the period 1167–1169.[426]

3.5 Albert of Tarsus, *Plange, Syon, et Iudea*

[424] Kedar 1998, p. 135.

[425] Szövérffy 1994, vol. 3, p. 84.

[426] See De Sandoli 1974, no. 260, pp. 197–199; L.-A. Hunt, "Art and colonialism: the mosaics of the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem (1169) and the problem of 'Crusader Art,'" *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 45 (1991), pp. 69–85; J. Folda, "Crusader art in the twelfth century: reflections on Christian multiculturalism in the Levant," *Mediterranean Historical Review* 10 (1995), pp. 80–91; Folda 1995b, pp. 347–364; A. Jotischky, "Manuel Comnenus and the reunion of the churches: The evidence of the conciliar mosaics in the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem," *Levant* 26 (1994), pp. 207–224. For further discussions of Manuel Komnenos' patronage in the Levant during this period, see A.M. Weyl Carr, "The mural paintings of Abu Ghosh and the patronage of Manuel Comnenus in the Holy Land," in J. Folda (ed.), *Crusader Art in the Twelfth Century* (Jerusalem, 1982), pp. 215–244; see especially MacEvitt, who discusses the mosaics within the context of the political and ecumenical alliance between Amaury and Manuel: C. MacEvitt, *The crusades and the Christian world of the East: rough tolerance* (Philadelphia, 2008), pp. 157–161.

The final poetic composition that falls within our geographical and chronological limitations is a lament, most likely composed in November 1187 by Albert, archbishop of Tarsus (an archbishopric of the patriarchate of Antioch) and chancellor of Antioch, who had been sent as an emissary by Bohemond III of Antioch to William II of Sicily to solicit aid for the crumbling Crusader States.[427]

Although little evidence about the person of Albert now remains, he must have been a figure of some standing, as we possess five charters that were issued by him, and as he is referred to by Bohemond III of Antioch as *venerabilem virum Tharsensem archiepiscopum, Antioceni principatus cancellarium* ("a venerable man, archbishop of Tarsus and chancellor of the principality of Antioch") and *virum discretum et honestum in utriusque iuris apicibus, sed et in rebus ecclesiasticis sufficienter eruditum* ("a discrete and honest man, sufficiently educated in the subtleties of canon and secular law, as well as in ecclesiastical affairs"), indicating that Albert had studied canon and secular law as well as theology in Europe—not unlike William of Tyre.[428] The last charter issued by Albert dates to March 1191, but there is evidence that he may have lived well into the thirteenth century: Rudolf Hiestand suggested that an archbishop of Nazareth, of whom two letters are extant from the years 1204 and 1206, and who is only referred

[427] Walther, no. 14145. Edited by C. Blume in *AH*, vol. 33, p. 315, no. 265, where it is titled *De excidio Hierosolymorum* (this edition will henceforth be abbreviated as AT). See also the editions in Schmuck 1954, pp. 128–131, KL 16 (with commentary); Spreckelmeyer 1987, pp. 20–22; Szövérffy 1994, vol. 3, pp. 92–93. For commentary and discussion, see Wentzlaff-Eggebert 1960, pp. 174–178; Spreckelmeyer 1974, pp. 219–227; Hartl 2009, pp. 118–125; and see especially the discussion in R. Hiestand, "'*Plange, Syon et Iudea*' — Historische Aussage und Verfassersfrage," *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch* 23 (1988), pp. 126–142. On the life and career of Albert, see Hiestand 1994, pp. 16–19; RC, p. xc.

[428] See Hiestand 1994, pp. 16–19. The letter is *RRH*, no. 663, edited in R. Röhricht, "Amalrich I., König von Jerusalem (1162–1174)," *Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Instituts für Geschichtsforschung* 12 (1891), pp. 432–493, Appendix I, at 484–485

to by his first initial, "A.," be identified with Albert of Tarsus.[429] If this is true, then Albert continued to play an influential role in the Crusader States of the Levant, even when they were largely reduced to the coastal area in the thirteenth century.

The poem is a hymn in ten strophes lamenting the recent calamities that had befallen the Crusader States, such as the Battle at the Horns of Ḥaṭṭīn (July 4, 1187) and the fall of Beirut (August 6, 1187).[430] A powerful lament, the poem's exceptional thematic unity has been remarked upon, as the first word of the first strophe (*plange*, "mourn") and the first word of the last (*lacrimas*, "tears") pithily manage to capture the woeful topic at hand.[431] The opening strophe addresses the personified Zion and Judea, casting their defeat at the hands of paganism as a defeat against their long-standing biblical foes Idumea, Egypt, the Edomite Amalek, and the Canaanites. The second strophe continues the development of pagan foes, now also including Greek paganism with a learned reference to Medea as a feminine symbol of paganism, and concludes with a lament of the loss of the Ark to the Philistines. The third strophe mentions Christianity explicitly for the first time (*Nomen Christi blasphematur*, "the name of Christ is blasphemed"), which is allegorized as an abandoned and disconsolate Rachel. [432] The strophe

[429] Albert's last charter from 1191 is *RRH*, no. 695. Hiestand 1994, pp. 16–18. The letters are *RRH*, no. 797, edited in Röhricht 1891, pp. 489–491; *RRH*, no. 812, edited in J. Vincke, "Der Eheprozess Peters II. von Aragón," *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kulturgeschichte Spaniens* 5 (1935), p. 164, no. 1.

[430] The lament consists of ten strophes of rhythmical poetry of eight verses each, and it is found copied at the end of an eleventh-century manuscript containing Jerome's letters, now in Salzburg, by a thirteenth-century scribe, with the addition of musical notation in the form of neumes: Salzburg, St. Peter, MS a. IX 20. On the neumes, see the sparse comments in Spreckelmeyer 1987, p. 69. The syllabic patterns are: 4x8p, 3x7pp, 1x6p, with end rhyme resulting in AAAABBBA. The first four verses and the final verse of each strophe, moreover, have a trochaic cadence. A shorter, abbreviated version of this hymn in four strophes and a different opening (*Lugent Sion et Iudaea*), which leaves out the more topical material in the second half of the poem, is copied in a thirteenth-century manuscript from Zwettl: Zwettl, Bibl. des Stiftes MS 262, f. 2r. For an edition, see *AH*, vol. 21, pp. 165–166, no. 236 and Schmuck 1954, p. 131, KL 16a. I follow here the dating of Schmuck and Hiestand (1988, p. 127), rather than that of the *Analecta hymnica*, which dates the hand to the twelfth century.

[431] Spreckelmeyer 1974, p. 225; Hiestand 1988, p. 127.

[432] AT, 3.2. A reference, as Spreckelmeyer (1974, p. 221) points out, to Jer. 31:15.

ends with the horrific imagery of the Christian people being slaughtered like some sort of pagan sacrifice. The fourth strophe portrays the defeat of Christianity by paganism by way of an allegory of *Alathia* (i.e., *alētheiā*, "truth") versus *Pseustis* ("falsehood"), in which Truth has her hair shorn like a slave and Christ's gold is trampled by Falsehood.[433]

The fifth strophe has the Christians of the Latin East pleading to passersby for assistance, continuing in the sixth strophe, which makes an appeal to all (presumably Christian) kings of the world. The seventh strophe then apostrophizes the "king of Egypt" (presumably Saladin), and ends with a prayer to God to give heed to their prayers, which extends into the eight strophe. The two final strophes turn away from the general lament and the intricate biblical and allegorical references to address the specific political and military upheavals that have given rise to such lamentation. As Rudolf Hiestand has persuasively argued, in sequence are addressed the death of Bishop Rufinus of Acre in defending the relic of the Holy Cross on July 4, 1187, the captivity of Guy of Lusignan, king of Jerusalem, and Bernard, bishop of Lydda, at the disastrous Battle at the Horns of Ḥaṭṭīn (July 4, 1187); finally, the fall of Beirut on August 6, 1187 is mentioned in the last strophe.[434] The poem ends with the following words:

> Suscepit Sicilia
> In misericordia
> Lacrimas Tharsensis.[435]
>
> Sicily has taken in the tears of the [archbishop] of Tarsus.

[433] The rare form *pseustis* should really be the feminine form of *pseustēs*, "deceiver," but since the character of the same name who figures in the *Ecloga Theoduli*, where these characters are borrowed from (see below in Chapter 2), is clearly a male figure, it should be interpreted as the abstract noun—much in the way that Latin *poetria*, properly "poetess," comes to be used for the abstract "poetry" in the Middle Ages (and hence the English word).

[434] Hiestand 1988. I follow Hiestand's interpretation of *littensis* as *Lyddensis* (1988, p. 130).

[435] AT, 10.6–8.

These final lines have led to the suggestion that the lament was composed by Albert, archbishop of Tarsus, who was probably sent on a mission to William II of Sicily in order to bring aid to the foundering Crusader States.[436] This evidence may be combined with the letter of Bohemond III of Antioch (see above), which mentions that Albert was sent out as an ambassador, and which, given the references to the siege of Jerusalem, must be dated to after September 18, 1187 (beginning of the siege), but before October 2 (fall of Jerusalem). Albert would have arrived at William's court in Sicily in early to mid-October, whereupon he may have composed his lament as part of a mission that was designed to elicit pathos—but before the news of the fall of Jerusalem could have reached Sicily in early November.

An alternative theory of authorship was proposed by Peter Christian Jacobsen, who suggested reading *Thyrensis* for *Tharsensis*, so that the author would be the archbishop of Tyre rather than Tarsus.[437] Jacobsen points out that there is no evidence that Albert of Tarsus was sent to Sicily, while Joscius or Josias, archbishop of Tyre, is known to have stopped over in Sicily in his flight to France. Moreover, the fact that the lament quotes from Walter of Châtillon (see below), indicates for Jacobsen that it was not composed in Sicily, but rather in northern France.[438] The assumption is that an archbishop of Tarsus is unlikely to have had access to recent literature originating from Western Europe, but there is no basis for this assumption. Even if manuscripts of Walter's work had not been brought over to the Latin East, this does not rule out

[436] Hiestand 1988, pp. 132–136, building on Wentzlaff-Eggebert's suggestion (1960, p. 174, followed in Spreckelmeyer 1974, p. 225) that the final two lines refer to the poet in the third person.

[437] P.C. Jacobsen, "Die Eroberung von Jerusalem in der mittellateinischen Dichtung," in D. Bauer, K. Herbers, N. Jaspert (eds.), *Jerusalem im Hoch- und Spätmittelalter: Konflikte und Konfliktbewältigung—Vorstellungen und Vergegenwärtigungen* (Frankfurt am Main 2001), pp. 335–365, at p. 361 n. 52.

[438] Jacobsen 2001, p. 363.

an oral transmission of Walter's short, memorable poems, at a time when there was constant traffic between Western Europe and the Levant.

For the present, we will adhere to the manuscript's reading, which speaks for Albert of Tarsus' authorship. Whoever the author was, however, he displays great dexterity in reworking his source materials into this short lament. The figures of *Alathia* and *Pseustis*, for instance, are clearly indebted to the *Ecloga* of Ps.-Theodulus, a popular ninth- or tenth-century schooltext.[439] The first strophe, moreover, borrows from Abelard's *Planctus David* ("David's lament").[440] The fourth strophe, as mentioned, borrows a line from one of the lyric poems of Walter of Châtillon.[441]

4. PILGRIM GUIDES

Ever since Jerusalem was established as a popular destination for Christian pilgrims in the fourth century, there have been travel accounts written in Latin that describe the journey to Jerusalem.[442] The earliest such accounts—those of the anonymous traveler from Bordeaux and of

[439] This observation was first made in a few comments on the poem in Manitius, vol. 3, p. 997. See also Spreckelmeyer 1974, p. 222 n. 543. The text can be found in *Theoduli Ecloga*, ed. J. Osternacher (Urfahr, 1902).

[440] L. Weinrich, "'Dolorum solatium' – Text und Musik von Abaelards Planctus David," *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch* 5 (1968), pp. 59–78, no. 70–72. On the borrowing in *Plange, Syon, et Iudea*, see Spreckelmeyer 1974, p. 220 n. 532; Jacobsen 2001, pp. 362–363.

[441] *Die gedichte Walters von Chatillon*, ed. K. Strecker (Berlin, 1925), 12.3.7. See also Spreckelmeyer 1974, p. 222 n. 544; Jacobsen 2001, p. 363.

[442] The most useful recent overviews of pilgrim literature associated with the Holy Land can be found in O. Limor, "'Holy journey': Pilgrimage and Christian sacred landscape," in O. Limor and G.G. Stroumsa (eds.), *Christians and Christianity in the Holy Land* (Turnhout, 2006), pp. 321–353; A. Graboïs, *Le pèlerin occidental en Terre sainte au Moyen Âge* (Paris, 1998)—note especially the chronological list of pilgrim guides in "Appendix I," pp. 211–214. Still important as a typology for the various kinds of pilgrim and travel literature of the Middle Ages is J. Richard, *Les récits de voyages et de pèlerinages*, Typologie des sources du Moyen Âge Occidental 38 (Turnhout, 1981). See also his more recent English introduction to travel literature in "Travel literature," tr. G.E. Gingras, in Mantello and Rigg 1996, pp. 682–687.

Egeria—represent travel diaries of a personal character that describe not only the places visited, but also the author's impressions, usually from a first-person perspective.[443]

A related genre of writings originated in the same period, consisting of a less personal and more distanced approach to the pilgrimage sites of the Holy Land, offering not so much a travel narrative but rather a "sacred geography," in which the key biblical associations of each site are briefly touched upon, thereby impregnating the landscape with meaning and allowing it to be read as a sort of text.[444] The most important early representative of this type is Jerome's *De situ et nominibus locorum Hebraeorum* ("On the location and names of Jewish places"), a reworking of Eusebius' *Onomasticon* ("Guide to names").[445]

Although there does not appear to have been a major break in the pilgrimage to the Holy Land from Western Europe since the fourth century, the Frankish conquest of Jerusalem led to a surge of pilgrims in the early twelfth century.[446] These pilgrims were best served by the drier, usually more compact descriptions of the holy places, as evidenced by the large number of anonymous texts *de locis sanctis* ("on the holy places").[447] These pilgrims in turn, however,

[443] For the former: ed. P. Geyer and O. Cuntz, *CCSL* 175 (Turnhout, 1965), pp. 1–26; for the latter: ed. A. Franceschini and R. Weber, *CCSL* 175 (Turnhout, 1965), pp. 37–90 and 93–103.

[444] Limor 2006, p. 324.

[445] Jerome, *Liber locorum*, ed. E. Klostermann, *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte*, vol. 3.1 (Leipzig-Berlin, 1904). This edition presents Eusebius' *Onomasticon* and Jerome's reworking in facing pages.

[446] Limor 2006, pp. 344–345.

[447] For a clear overview of the various anonymous pilgrim guides of the early twelfth century, see I. Shagrir, "The guide of MS Beinecke 481.77 and the intertwining of Christian, Jewish and Muslim traditions in twelfth-century Jerusalem," *Crusades* 10 (2011), pp. 1–22, at 5–9.

while building on these *descriptiones*, might leave behind more personal *itineraria*, such as the narratives of Saewulf, John of Würzburg, and Theoderich.[448]

As most of these impersonal *descriptiones Terrae Sanctae* are transmitted anonymously, their date and place of composition are difficult to determine. The majority of these texts, therefore, will not be discussed, since they cannot be considered to reflect the Latin culture of Outremer. One of these *descriptiones*, however, is known beyond reasonable doubt to have been authored by a resident of the Latin East: Rorgo Fretellus.

4.1 Rorgo Fretellus, *Descripcio cuiusdam de locis sanctis*

Only a small handful of evidence regarding the life of Rorgo Fretellus survives: the oldest concerns a charter issued by Joscelin of Courtenay, then prince of Galilee, on February 14, 1119, and signed by a *Rorgo Fretellus Galilee cancellarius* ("Rorgo Fretellus, chancellor of Galilee").[449] Two years later, on July 6, 1121, a charter of Bernard, bishop of Nazareth, is signed by a *Rorgo Fretellus capellanus Nazarenae ecclesiae* ("Rorgo Fretellus, chaplain of the church of Nazareth").[450] It would seem, then, that the Rorgo Fretellus who wrote a *Descripcio de locis sanctis* ("Description of the holy places") had risen to the rank of chancellor of Galilee and chaplain of Nazareth by the early 1120s. Given that one of the addressees of Rorgo's work, Bishop Henri Zdik of Olomouc, is known to have made a pilgrimage to the Holy Land in 1137–1138 (see below), what became of Rorgo in the years before he wrote his work?

---

[448] *Peregrinationes tres: Saewulf, John of Würzburg, Theodericus*, ed. R.B.C. Huygens, *CCCM* 139 (Turnhout, 1994).

[449] *RRH*, no. 87; but see Hans Mayer's comments on this charter, who remarks that the charter displays unusual and amateurish language, suggesting that either the document may be a forgery or that Rorgo was not trained as a member of the chancery: Mayer 1977, pp. 330–332; see also M. Rheinheimer, *Das Kreuzfahrerfürstentum Galiläa* (Frankfurt, 1990), p. 179.

[450] *RRH*, no. 97; Mayer, *Bistümer*, pp. 333, 335–336.

A clue is found in one of the manuscripts, in which the author appears as *Rorgo Antiocenus dyaconus* ("Rorgo, deacon of Antioch").[451] Manuscripts of the so-called "Count.-R.-version" (see below), moreover, present the author as *Fretellus . . . archidiaconus Antiochie* ("Fretellus, archdeacon of Antioch"). By the time Rorgo Fretellus wrote his work, he must have relocated from Galilee to Antioch in northern Syria, which is supported by the fact that in 1140 one *Raynaldus* replaced him as chaplain of Nazareth.[452] P.C. Boeren, who produced the first critical text of this work,[453] viewed this as unacceptable, especially given the fact that two charters from the 1150s–1160s list a *Rorches* or *Rorgus* of Nazareth.[454] As Hans Eberhard Mayer was quick to point out, however, this person is listed among the laity and cannot be identified with Rorgo Fretellus.[455]

Further evidence of Rorgo's association with Antioch is provided by a colophon that follows the text in a number of manuscripts:

> Quod tibi presentat genuit quem Pontica tellus
> Archidiaconus Antiochenus Rorgo Fretellus.[456]

---

[451] Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, MS 369 (14th c.).

[452] *RRH*, no. 148; Bresc-Bautier, no. 81.

[453] *Descripcio cuiusdam de locis sanctis*, ed. P.C. Boeren, *Rorgo Fretellus de Nazareth et sa Description de la Terre Sainte: histoire et édition du texte* (Amsterdam, 1980), pp. x–xiii. This edition will henceforth be referred to as RF. For a discussion that outlines all of the problems associated with this edition, see *Peregrinationes tres*, pp. 18–19.

[454] The first is Rozière, no. 143; *RRH*, no. 278; Bresc-Bautier, no. 36; *Diplomata*, no. 184; it is dated to 1152. The second is Rozière, no. 143; *RRH*, no. 435; Bresc-Bautier, no. 141, where it is dated to 1167. Boeren (RF, p. xi), however, argues that it should be dated to 1154–1157, but see the comment in Bresc-Bautier, p. 274 n. 1, where 1163 is determined to be the earliest possible date.

[455] H.E. Mayer, review of Boeren's edition in *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 38 (1982), p. 632. See also Bresc-Bautier, p. 401: "Ce personnage connu en 1152–[1154–1157], ne peut être le même que Rorgo Fretellus; c'est manifestement un laïc, qui souscrit au milieu des autres témoins."

[456] RF, p. 66. Edoardo D'Angelo (RC, p. lxxxix n. 291) makes the important observation that this colophon bears great similarity to the epigrams that preface both books of Walter the Chancellor's *Bella Antiochena*, writing in Antioch some fifteen years before Rorgo, which may provide further evidence linking Rorgo to Antioch: *Exstitit hic*

This is presented to you by one whom the Pontic land bore, Rorgo Fretellus, archdeacon of Antioch.

Boeren, convinced on somewhat dubious grounds that Rorgo or his family came from the region of Poitou, rejected the authenticity of this colophon as the literary fantasy of a scribe with a fondness for Ovid.[457] Rudolf Hiestand later argued extensively that the phrase *Pontica tellus* does not refer to Pontus on the Black Sea, but to the county of Ponthieu in Picardy, adducing as evidence a charter of the priory of Saint-Georges d'Hesdin in which a Rorgo is mentioned as having set off, along with his two siblings Robert and Hugo, as well as his father Hugo Fretellus, for the Holy Land sometime in the period 1111–1119.[458] While his siblings reappear in the charters some years later, this Rorgo disappears from the cartulary, indicating that he may have stayed in the Holy Land.

If this Rorgo Fretellus can be identified with our author, we may summarize the little information about his life as follows: coming to the Holy Land sometime before 1119, Rorgo stayed behind and eventually became chancellor of the prince of Galilee and chaplain of the church of Nazareth. For unknown reasons he then moved to Antioch sometime before 1137–1138, where he wrote the first recension of a pilgrim guide after having become a deacon there;

---

victor, Galterius indicat auctor / *Antiochenorum dominus Rotgerius et dux* and *Princeps valde probus Rogerius Antiochenus* / *qualiter occubuit, Galterius hic recitavit*.

[457] RF, pp. viii and 66–67. Boeren (RF, pp. viii–ix) argued that the use of the term *quinto miliario* by Rorgo Fretellus is reflective of Poitevin dialect, in which *quinta* can refer to a *banlieue*. As Hiestand (1994, p. 25), rightly points out, however, the term is by no means used as such in Rorgo's text, in which continuous references to various milestones appear.

[458] Another manuscript has *Punica tellus*, i.e., Phoenicia. Hiestand 1994, pp. 23–26; for the charter, see R. Fossier, *Cartulaire-chronique de Saint-Georges d'Hesdin* (Paris, 1988), p. 101, n. 142.

shortly afterward, Rorgo was promoted to archdeacon and wrote a second recension of his work. After that, Rorgo disappears from the record.[459]

Rorgo's work survives in three recensions, two of which were composed by him. The first recension dedicates the work to the Bohemian bishop Henri Zdik of Olomouc, who made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem first in 1123 and again in 1137–1138.[460] After meeting the Augustinian canons of the Holy Sepulcher, he was so impressed with their piety that he decided to found a convent of canons in Strahov, near Prague. Rorgo's preface indicates that the bishop had made a pilgrimage *corrigendi causa, immo examinandi si quid expiandum notari posset in te* ("for the purpose of correction, nay, to examine closely if anything warranting expiation can be found within yourself")—that is to say, for the remission of sins, as is also corroborated by a later chronicle.[461] We can further gather that Rorgo presented the text to the bishop before his return to Olomouc, and intended for it to be not only a safeguard for the return journey, but also a proof of his pilgrimage before the congregation and before God on Judgment Day.[462]

The manuscript that Henri Zdik carried back with him to Bohemia does not survive, but it was read and copied by the canons of his newly-established community, later to become Premonstratensians, as three manuscripts find their provenance among Premonstratensian communities.[463]

---

[459] He is probably not to be identified with one *Rorgo Acconensis episcopus*, who is recorded as attending a church council in Acre in 1148, since this Rorgo was a follower of Patriarch Fulcher of Jerusalem. See T. Eck, *Die Kreuzfahrerbistümer Beirut und Sidon im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert auf prosopographischer Grundlage* (Frankfurt am Main, 2000), p. 131 n. 163.

[460] On Henri Zdik, see RF, pp. xiv–xvii; Kirstein 2002, pp. 271–272; F. Petit, *Spirituality of the Premonstratensians: the twelfth and thirteenth centuries*, tr. V. Szczurek (Trappist, Ky. etc., 2011), pp. 96–97.

[461] RF, 2; for the chronicle, see RF, p. 6 n. 7.

[462] RF, 3.

[463] London, British Library, MS Add. 38112, ff. 121v–123v (1160–1164); Douai, Bibl. mun., MS 882, ff. 35v–48r (1162–1173); Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibl., MS 369, ff. 48r–52r (14th c.). A further six manuscripts are

The second redaction was also made by Rorgo and dedicates the work to a *Domino R. Dei gratia Toletano* (alternatively: *Toledano* or *Tholotano*) *comiti*, that is to say, to a count whose name starts with the letter "R" and is from Toledo.[464] Five manuscripts give the name of the addressee as some form of *Rodricus*, while three of these manuscripts, in addition to another three manuscripts, end this redaction with the following leonine dactylic hexameter: *Scripto completo consul Rodrice valeto* ("Now that the text is finished, farewell consul Rodricus").[465]

Only manuscripts of the later redaction (see below) present the name in the preface consistently as some variant of *Raimundus*. All of these omit the valedictory verse, except for one manuscript, which, despite presenting the addressee as a *Raimundus*, still preserves the valediction with the name *Rodricus*. It would appear, therefore, that later traditions may have conflated the addressee (whose name was probably already reduced to the initial at this point) with the famous figure of Count Raymond IV of Toulouse—a misidentification that persisted into the eighteenth century.[466] Boeren, too, sought to identify the addressee with a count of Toulouse, although he himself admits that, even when the name *Raimundus* is presented, the toponym is always a variant of *Toletanus* and therefore consistently refers to Toledo—not

---

extant, giving a total of nine manuscripts, no fewer than four of which can be dated to the twelfth century: Montpellier, Faculté de Médecine, MS 39, f. 1r–15v (1153–1160); Rome, BAV, MS Reg. lat. 712, f. 72r–84r (late 12th c.); Amiens, Bibl. mun., MS 84 (Fonds L'Escalopier 4961), f. 13r–17r (13th c.); Reims, Bibl. mun., MS 1414, f. 54r–63r (late 13th c.); Berlin, Deutsche Staatsbibl., MS lat. qu. 291, f. 61r–66r (14th c.); Paris, Bibl. de l'Arsenal, MS 1100, f. 33v–45r (1418).

[464] The manuscript evidence for the second redaction bears much similarity to that of the first, being transmitted in ten manuscripts: Troyes, Bibl. mun., MS 294, f. 157v–163v (12th c.); Cambrai, Bibl. mun., MS 360 (341), f. 153v–157r (late 12th c.); Paris, BnF, MS lat. 18108, f. 107 (late 12th c.); Berlin, Deutsche Staatsbibl., MS lat. qu. 686, f. 158v–160r (13th c.); London, British Library, MS Harley 5373, f. 53v–59v (early 13th); Montpellier, Faculté de Médecine, MS 142, f. 174r–181v (after 1227); Paris, BnF, MS lat. 16331, f. 163v–170v (13th c.); Oxford, Bodl.lib., MS Canonic. Miscellan. 220, f. 26v–30r (14th / 15th c.); Berlin, Deutsche Staatsbibl., MS lat. f. 198, f. 268r–277r (15th c.); Wroclaw, bibl. de l'Université, MS 262, f. 64r–69v (15th c.).

[465] RF, p. 64.

[466] J.D. Mansi in *S. Balluzii Miscellanea historica*, vol. 1 (Lucca, 1761), pp. 434–440.

Toulouse, as maintained by Boeren, who preferred the unattested *Tholosanus*.[467] Boeren was convinced that the later redaction made at the papal Curia preserved the best text, and on this account probably insisted on the reading of *Raimundus* as opposed to *Rodricus*, choosing to identify the adressee, however, not with Raymond IV or the late-twelfth century Raymond VI, but with Raymond V. This led Boeren to date this redaction to the year 1148, when the then fourteen-year old Raymond V is supposed to have accompanied his father Alphonse Jourdain to Jerusalem.[468] Hiestand, however, pointed out that, apart from the objections to this identification as posed by the manuscript evidence, there are further problems: Rorgo writes in his preface to one who has come *de longe remotis Hyspaniarum finibus* ("from distant parts of Spain") in order to take refuge in the East on account of the sins he committed—hardly an appropriate address for a fourteen-year-old boy from Toulouse.[469] Instead, Hiestand proposes to identify the addressee with Rodrigo González, count of Toledo, who stayed in Jerusalem probably in the years 1137–1141, and after a brief return to Spain in 1141 remained in the Latin East.[470] If this identification is correct, it means that Rorgo's second redaction dates from the same period as the text addressed to Henri Zdik.

The third and final redaction did not originate with the author, but was conducted by Cardinal Nicolas Rosselli of Aragon in 1356 at the papal Curia on the basis of the second redaction. The intent here was clearly to produce a stripped-down version of the text that could be used for a general audience; it would be more likely, therefore, that Rosselli, far removed from the twelfth-century author, decided to suppress those elements that referred to the original's

[467] RF, p. xx and n. 38.

[468] RF, pp. 68–71 and 76–78.

[469] Hiestand 1994, pp. 27–30; RF, pp. 53–54.

[470] Hiestand 1994, pp. 29–31.

author's identity, such as the colophon, rather than that manuscripts of an earlier tradition invented these as "legendary" materials.[471] This redaction was to prove enormously popular, representing with well over forty extant manuscript witnesses the most widely distributed text of all the Latin works from Outremer within our period.[472]

A discussion of the sources utilized by Rorgo Fretellus is notoriously difficult, considering that the majority of the text does not represent an original composition, but rather a reworking of pre-existing pilgrim guides and geographical treatises. The most important of these is Jerome's *De situ et nominibus locorum Hebraeorum* (see above). A contemporary anonymous treatise on the holy places, known as the *Descriptio locorum circa Hierusalem adiacentium* ("Description of the places situated around Jerusalem"), although produced independently of Rorgo's text, shares much of the same source material, making it likely that both made use of the same lost geographical treatise, itself heavily indebted to Jerome.[473] Rorgo's second redaction, in turn, was heavily utilized in the pilgrim narratives of John of Würzburg and Theoderich, the former of whom may have meant Rorgo Fretellus when he acknowledged his source:

> Scio equidem iam dudum ante tempora moderna haec eadem loca non tantum in civitate prefata [i.e., Jerusalem], sed etiam longe extra posita a quodam viro reverendo in scripta redacta fuisse. [474]

[471] Boeren fails to take into account that, while some manuscripts of the first two redactions are of later date, they represent earlier redactions than that made by Cardinal Rosselli. Textual critics must at all times avoid the fallacy of *codex recentior deterior*.

[472] For a discussion of the chief representatives of this redaction, see RF, pp. 80–83. The *editio princeps* of this redaction was made by J.D. Mansi, in: *S. Balluzii Miscellanea historica*, vol. 1 (Lucca, 1761), pp. 434–440.

[473] For a discussion, see *Jerusalem pilgrimage*, pp. 12–15. For a discussion on the issue of the elusive figure of "Eugesippus," thought to have written a geographical treatise in 1040, as a possible source for Rorgo, see RF, pp. 86–93.

[474] JW, 27–29. See Huygens' comments in *Peregrinationes*, pp. 18–19. Alternatively, John may have meant Jerome.

> I am aware that before the present time these same places—not only those in the aforementioned city, but also those situated much farther away—were set down into writing by a certain venerable man.

Given the nature of the genre, one must be careful in commenting on Rorgo's use of language and style, as one cannot be certain that the passage in question is not derivative in some way. There is no question about the authenticity of the prefaces, however. Both prefaces take particular care to establish a close connection between scripture, the geographical places that are associated with it, and the addressees. The addressees are told to read the city of Jerusalem as a text, interpreting it allegorically as signifying paradise, and the Knights Templar as allegories of the Maccabees, based on a quotation from Bernard of Clairvaux's treatise on the newly-founded knightly order.[475] Although Rorgo's prose is anything but classicizing, he employs an appropriately periodic style at the opening of his works, featuring no fewer than seven subordinate clauses before introducing the main verb, managing to include a jingling rhyme now and then.[476]

5. SERMONS

Although medieval sermons preaching the crusades in Western Europe have received significant scholarly attention, the same cannot be said for sermons that were produced and delivered in the Latin East.[477] Before discussing the extant sources, let us review some of the general characteristics of the early medieval sermon. Sermons up to the beginning of the thirteenth

[475] RF 1, 1 and 2, 2; Bernard of Clairvaux, *Liber ad milites Templi sive de laude novae militiae*, ed. J. Leclercq, *Opera*, vol. 3 (Rome, 1963), pp. 213–239, at p. 221.

[476] RF 1, 2: *expavisti . . . abhorruisti . . Emmanuhel . . . Israel*.

[477] See especially the work of P.J. Cole, *The preaching of the crusades to the Holy Land, 1095–1270* (Cambridge, MA, 1991) and C.T. Maier, *Preaching the Crusades: mendicant friars and the Cross in the thirteenth century* (Cambridge, 1994).

century are commonly subdivided into the *homelia*, or the exegetically-based approach that draws its themes from a central pericope in a sequential fashion, and the *sermo* proper, which constitutes a more thematic approach.[478] By the twelfth century, monastic sermons had grown to be more complex, usually featuring the following structural elements: (1) a preliminary *lectio*; (2) the naming of the liturgical occasion for which the sermon is delivered; (3) the principal theme, with several senses of exegesis; (4) exhortation; (5) secondary theme; (6) exhortation; (7) final prayer or doxology.[479]

By the fourth century, a stational liturgy was established in Jerusalem in which the congregation participated in a procession through the city on special occasions, in effect extending the church across the entire city, and pausing at certain significant locations or stations to read apposite passages from the gospels or to sing hymns.[480] Perhaps as early as the year 1100 or 1101, the anniversary of the conquest of Jerusalem on July 15 had been instituted as a feast day of the church of Jerusalem; at some point (and certainly by the 1130s) it had become customary for both clergy and the laity to take part in a procession from the Holy Sepulcher to the *Templum Domini* every year on this feast day, thereby incorporating recent events of the First Crusade into established Jerusalemite liturgical traditions.[481] After reciting prayers in front of the

[478] For a general introduction to medieval sermons, see B.M. Kienzle and D.L. D'Avray, "Sermons," in Mantello and Rigg 1996, pp. 659–669.

[479] B.M. Kienzle, "The twelfth-century monastic sermon," in B.M. Kienzle (ed.), *The sermon* (Turnhout, 2000), pp. 271–323, at p. 285.

[480] For a general treatment of the Jerusalemite stational liturgy, see S. Verhelst, "The liturgy of Jerusalem in the Byzantine period," in O. Limor and G.G. Stroumsa (eds.), *Christians and Christianity in the Holy Land* (Turnhout, 2006), pp. 421–462.

[481] Charles Kohler pointed out that, although William of Tyre spoke of the institution of the feast as early as 1099 (WT, 8.24.26–35), the feast may not have been celebrated until a few decades later, as no earlier historian mentions it. See *Sermo domini Fulcheri de Ierosolimitana civitate quomodo capta est a Latinis*, ed. C. Kohler, "Un sermon commémoratif de la prise de Jérusalem par les coisés, attribué a Foucher de Chartres," *Revue de l'Orient latin* 8 (1900–1901), pp. 158–164, at p. 158. Hagenmeyer (FC, p. 78), on the other hand, argued for a date of 1100 based on the exuberant comments made by Raymond of Aguilers that seem to imply the institution of a feast day (RA, p.

Templum Domini, the procession would proceed toward the northern part of the city walls, where Godfrey of Bouillon had first entered the city, whereupon a sermon would be read by the patriarch of Jerusalem.[482] Two such sermons have come down to us.

5.1 The sermon in the Ripoll manuscript: *Pensate, karissimi*

The first sermon is found in the same late twelfth-century manuscript from Ripoll that has been discussed above in relation to the hymn (*Hierusalem, letare*) that follows it.[483] The text was first edited by John France, who thought it belonged to the preceding historical account, which compiles various eyewitness reports on the capture of Jerusalem.[484] Amnon Linder was the first

---

151): *Nova dies, novum gaudium, nova et perpetua leticia laboris atque devotionis consummatio, nova verba nova cantica, ab universis exigebat*. *Hęc inquam dies celebris in omni seculo venturo, omnes dolores atque labores nostros gaudium et exultationem fecit . . . Hęc dies quam fecit Dominus, exultemus et letemur in ea . . . Hęc celebrabitur dies, idus iulii, ad laudem et gloriam nominis Dei . . . in hac die cantavimus officium de resurrectione, quia in hac die ille qui sua virtute a mortuis resurrexit, per gratiam suam resuscitavit*. Folda, on the other hand, suggests that, although the earliest traces of the procession do not appear until the 1130s, the feast may have been instituted by 1101, a year after the death of Godfrey of Bouillon. See J. Folda, "Commemorating the Fall of Jerusalem: remembering the First Crusade in text, liturgy, and image," in N. Paul and S. Yeager (eds.), *Remembering the Crusades: Myth, image, and identity* (Baltimore, MD, 2012), pp. 125–45, at p. 126. For similar processions on other feast days in Frankish Jerusalem, see S. Schein, *Gateway to the heavenly city: crusader Jerusalem and the Catholic West (1099-1187)* (Burlington, VT, 2005), pp. 101–102.

[482] Reconstructions of this procession are largely based on the so-called Barletta Breviary (sometimes called a *rituale*), first edited in C. Kohler, "Un Rituel et un Bréviaire du Saint-Sepulcre de Jérusalem (XIIe-XIIIe siècle)," *ROL* 8 (1900–1901), pp. 389–430, reprinted in *Mélanges pour servir à l'histoire de l'Orient latin et des croisades* (Paris, 1906), vol. 2, pp. 330–340. An edition of the breviary based on a more reliable manuscript can be found in A. Linder, "The liturgy of the liberation of Jerusalem," *Mediaeval Studies* 52 (1990), pp. 110–131. A description of the procession can also be found in JW, 190–191, and see also the discussion of the procession in A. Schönfelder, "Die Prozessionen der Lateiner in Jerusalem zur Zeit der Kreuzzüge," *Historisches Jahrbuch* 32 (1911), pp. 578–598; J. Prawer, *The Crusaders' kingdom: European colonialism in the Middle Ages* (New York, 1972), p. 176–177; Schein 1984, p. 185; K. Elm, "La liturgia della Chiesa latina di Gerusalemme nella epoca delle crociate," in M. Rey-Delqué (ed.), *Le Crociate. L'Oriente e l'Occidente da Urbano II a San Luigi 1096–1270* (Rome, 1997), pp. 243–245; Kedar 1998, p. 130; A. Linder, "A new day, new joy: the liberation of Jerusalem on 15 July 1099," in *L'idea di Gerusalemme nella spiritualità cristiana del Medioevo: atti del Convegno internazionale in collaborazione con l'Istituto della Görres-Gesellschaft di Gerusalemme* (Vatican City, 2003), pp. 46–64; and the discussion on Jerusalemite breviaries more generally in Dondi 2004, pp. 149–150 and 158–159.

[483] Paris, BnF, MS Lat. 5132.

[484] France 1988, pp. 651–654.

to argue that these texts are in fact two distinct and entirely unrelated texts, but copied without separation by a careless scribe.[485]

The sermon was most likely composed in the early twelfth century, and would have been delivered by the patriarch of Jerusalem before the congregation as part of the celebrations commemorating the capture of Jerusalem in 1099—in the year 1100 at the earliest.

The structure of the sermon is quite clear: it opens with an address to the general congregation (*Pensate karissimi*, "Consider, dearest ones"), which is asked to recall the sacrifices made by those who participated in the First Crusade.[486] It soon becomes clear that the main audience for the patriarch consists of the nobility, as he praises their sacrifices above all, considering them to be of greater significance than the sacrifices of less wealthy participants.

The opening address leads into the next section of the sermon, which speaks to the Jews (*vos autem miseri Iudei*, "but you, miserable Jews"), pausing to relish at length the despair of the Jews at ever reconquering Jerusalem.[487] Their continued belief in the arrival of a Messiah is mocked, then developed theologically as pertaining rather to the arrival of the Antichrist, supported by paraphrases from Isaiah and Daniel. The patriarch then explains that the crusaders who now possess Jerusalem are the true Israelites and inheritors of Abraham.

At this point the preacher turns to his true audience, whom he addresses as *militum flores* ("flowers of the knighthood"), who are exhorted to rejoice at having reached their goal, and

[485] Linder 2003, pp. 59–62. The sermon in this edition will henceforth be abbreviated as Ripoll sermon.

[486] Ripoll sermon, p. 59; this entire section is highly reminiscent of the pathos-filled description of crusaders leaving behind their families and possessions in FC, 1.6. See for a recent discussion of this passage E. Santinelli-Foltz, "'. . . quand le mari quitta son épouse si chérie . . .' (Foucher de Chartres) De celles qui restent pendant la Première Croisade," in J.-C. Herbin and M.-G. Grossel (eds.), *Croisades?: approches littéraires, historiques et philologiques* (Valenciennes, 2009), pp. 195–211.

[487] Ripoll sermon, p. 60.

described as pilgrims who are at last able to visit freely the holy places of the Lord's nativity, baptism, passion, resurrection, and ascension.[488]

In the final section, Jerusalem is apostrophized in connection with the festive occasion (*Letare, Iherusalem*, "Rejoice, Jerusalem").[489] The ceremony is described as *sollempnitas hec generalis victorie* ("this commonly shared celebration of victory"), to be celebrated by the "true Jews"—that is to say, the crusaders.[490] The sermon ends with a doxology of Christ, and a call to the congregation to take part in the jubilant hymn that follows.

The structure of the hymn roughly follows that of the twelfth-century monastic sermon, albeit in a simplified form. All of the main elements (the naming of the liturgical occasion, exegesis of biblical passages in relation to the central theme, the exhortation, and the doxology) are present. What sets the sermon (as well as the following hymn) apart, however, is the unique nature of the occasion at hand: what is being celebrated here is not a traditional feast day for which readings from the bible would be at hand, or a saint's feast day whose acts might be read to the congregation. Instead, a recent historical event is at the center of the festivities. This explains the historical focus at the start of the sermon and throughout the hymn, as well as the reading of a passage of Fulcher of Chartres in the sermon of Ps.-Fulcher (see below).

The author of this sermon shows himself to be a more than capable writer with a distinctive style: notable features include the marked preference for the gerund, used a grand total of seventeen times in this short sermon. Moreover, the author knows well how to construct a rhetorical show-piece, with frequent use of anaphora, asyndeton, rhyme and assonance, and

[488] Ripoll sermon, p. 61.

[489] Ripoll sermon, p. 62.

[490] Ripoll sermon, p. 62.

parallelism.[491] The author is at his best when riling the crowd up in his imagined address of the Jews, who are apostrophized as *vos autem miseri Iudei, vos, inquam miseri* ("But you miserable Jews—you, I say, miserable Jews") and are treated to a volley of rhetorical questions.[492] Nor does he shy away from employing vivid—perhaps too vivid—imagery, as in the following passage:

> Ve vobis, qui abiecta Christiane religionis margarita amplexamini stercora! Sicut enim cibus cum fuerit comestus ad nichilum redigitur, ita observationes typice, que erant necessarie ad significandum Christi adventum, post aparitionem veritatis facte sunt nausee et fastidium generantes potius quam mentis stomachum[493] recreantes. Sed ad nostros dirigendus est sermo, quia vestra exhortatio sit aspidi surde et obturanti aures suas revolutione caude, hoc est memoria conversationis transacte et conglutinatione delectationis terrene.[494]
>
> Woe to you, who reject the pearl of the Christian faith and embrace dung! For just as when food is digested it is reduced to nothing, so did the typological observations, which were necessary for signifying the advent of Christ, become nausea after the appearance of truth, producing revulsion rather than providing relief to the mind's stomach. But let us direct the sermon to our own congregation, since an exhortation to you is like one to a deaf viper, blocking off its own hearing with the waving of its tail—that is, the memory of a past way of life and the swallowing of earthly delight.

Few of the texts under discussion capture as well as this the fervor the First Crusade and its living memory among those who had taken part in it.[495]

---

[491] E.g., Ripoll sermon, p. 59: *quanta . . . quanta* (anaphora); *magna devotio, firma in Christo fidutia, quando affectus carnalis sic contempnitur, vita presens ita despicitur, dum futura appetitur* (asyndeton); *contempnitur . . . despicitur . . . appetitur . . . videtur . . . pensetur . . . probeatur . . . adhibeatur* (rhyme and assonance); Ripoll sermon, p. 60: . . . *magis cumulet quam alleviet, magis augeat quam minuat* (parallelism).

[492] Ripoll sermon, p. 60.

[493] For this phrase, compare Gregory the Great, *Homeliae in Evangelia* 2.22.8.195: *Carnes ergo agni cum lactucis agrestibus sunt edendae, ut cum corpus Redemptoris accipimus, nos pro peccatis nostris in fletibus affligamus, quatenus ipsa amaritudo paenitentiae abstergat a mentis stomacho perversae humorem vitae*.

[494] Ripoll sermon, p. 61.

[495] Linder's (2003, p. 57) appreciation of this sermon is *à propos*: "This sermon is a veritable jewel. It breathes the air of the First Crusade, reflects on contemporary issues—the ontology of the crusade and the pilgrimage, the particular role of the knightly class, the distinctions between rich and poor, eschatological hopes and fears, the historical and the religious significance of the Liberation of Jerusalem in the ongoing conflict between Ecclesia and Synagoga."

5.2 Ps.-Fulcher, *Sermo de Ierosolimitana civitate quomodo capta est a Latinis*

The second sermon is also found in a single manuscript, being a collection of six distinct parts dating from the eleventh to the twelfth centuries, mostly containing saints' lives and a few sermons.[496] Ps.-Fulcher's sermon is found in the third part and contains, in addition to the sermon, the lives of St. Florentinus and Hilarius, written in a different hand.[497] The second leaf of the sermon has been removed and inserted into the second part of the manuscript.[498] The sermon as it is preserved in this manuscript can be dated on the basis of paleographical grounds to the middle or second half of the twelfth century.[499] The sermon breaks off mid-sentence, although it seems that not much of the sermon was lost, which appears to draw to a conclusion as it breaks off. However, it is not improbable that a hymn may have a followed the sermon, just as one followed the sermon from the Ripoll manuscript.[500] Indeed, the rhyming prose at what is presumably the end of the sermon seems to indicate a transition to a song.

The manuscript is not an autograph, since it contains several copying errors that were later corrected: in l. 29 of f. 319r, *crucibus in pannis suis quod est consutis signum* ("with crosses

---

[496] Paris, Bibl. Mazarine, MS 1711, f. 336 and 319. The catalogue dates this section of the manuscript to the twelfth century more generally; see A. Molinier, *Catalogue des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Mazarine* (Paris, 1885), vol.2, pp. 180–186, the sermon is no. 59. The sermon was edited by Charles Kohler (Kohler 1900–1901a), whose edition will henceforth be abbreviated as *Sermo Fulcheri*. See also the reprint in *Mélanges pour servir à l'histoire de l'Orient latin et des croisades* (Paris, 1906), vol. 2, pp. 279–285.

[497] The sermon was copied by the same hand that copied Jerome's life of St. Paula, a Roman matron who came to the Holy Land on a pilgrimage and established a convent: this is no. 58 in the catalogue (Molinier (ed.) 1885, vol. 2, p. 185), although the fact that the two hands are the same is not observed. Apart from very similar letter forms, the identical ruling is a strong indication of this. It may be possible, therefore, that this text, which would have held resonances with an audience in the Latin East (St. Paula's tomb is in the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem) was also available in Jerusalem.

[498] The second half is found at f. 319.

[499] So also Kohler in *Sermo Fulcheri*, p.159.

[500] This was suggested by Amnon Linder: Linder 2003, p. 58.

sewn onto their clothing, which is a sign"), the phrase *quod est* should follow, and has been corrected by separating lines, demonstrating that this is not an autograph, but a copy. Additional evidence is provided by the incorrect month used to date the Liberation of Jerusalem (June instead of July), as well as a nonsensical calendrical notation: *idibus in kalendis iunii sub tempore messis* ("on the ides, on the kalends of June, at the time of harvest"?).[501] If this sermon truly was delivered in Jerusalem at the Feast of the Liberation Jerusalem, it is inconceivable that such mistakes would have been made.

In the manuscript, the sermon bears the title *Sermo domini Fulcheri de Ierosolimitana civitate quomodo capta est a Latinis* ("The sermon of Fulcher on how the city Jerusalem was captured by the Latins"), and Kohler surmised that, given the long quotations from the history of Fulcher of Chartres in the sermon, a scribe had attributed the sermon to Fulcher of Chartres by mistake, even though within the text it is clear that the preacher delivering the sermon is quoting from Fulcher, for he introduces one such quote with *Fulcherius dicit* ("Fulcher says").[502] Given the dating of the manuscript to the mid-twelfth century or later, it is also a possibility that the patriarch in question who delivered this sermon was the homonymous Patriarch Fulcher (1146–1157)—perhaps, as has been suggested, on the fifty-year anniversary of the Liberation of Jerusalem (1149), on which the Church of the Holy Sepulcher was reconsecrated.[503]

The sermon opens with an address to the congregation (*fratres dilectissimi*, "dearest brothers"), a doxology of God, and the naming of the liturgical occasion (*Celebremus ergo*

[501] *Sermo Fulcheri*, p. 163.

[502] *Sermo Fulcheri*, p. 163.

[503] Pringle, *Churches*, vol. 3, no. 283, p. 21. For the reconsecration of the church, which receives a mention in an ordinal produced in the scriptorium of the Holy Sepulcher ca. 1153–1157, see Dondi 2004, p. 170.

solennitatem, "let us celebrate, therefore, the feast").[504] Just as in the hymn *Hierusalem, letare*, the sermon begins with a reflection on the long years during which Jerusalem was in pagan hands, personifying the city as a slave who has now been liberated.[505] The preacher goes even further, however, by personifying the very streets and various neighborhoods of the city as participating in the jubilation. Quotations from Jeremiah are then followed by a paraphrase of Fulcher on the destructions the city has suffered over the years, with a particular mention of the Roman emperors Vespasian and Titus who perpetrated the most recent sacking.[506] Long quotations from Luke and Isaiah are followed by Fulcher's jubilant outbursts on the conquest of Jerusalem at the end of the first book of his history.[507] The preacher then casts the First Crusade as the small, insignificant Christian West rising up against the mighty pagan East:[508]

> Insurrexit enim Occidens contra Orientem, popellus contra gentem multam, Europa contra Asiam, immo Affricam, sed fides contra perfidiam. Nos muniti fide, illi velantur errore. Nos crucis Christi caractere insignimur fronte et mente. Commovit fides gentem nostram, et secure inceperunt viam. Nulla parentum pietas potuit fideles detinere quin irent Ierusalem Deo illam expugnare.[509]

> For the West rose up against the East, an insignificant rabble against a multitude, Europe against Asia, nay Africa, faith against paganism. We were bolstered by our faith, but they were shrouded in their error. We marked ourselves with the mark of Christ's cross, both on our forehead and in our heart. Faith is what moved our people, and they set off of on their way without care. No familial duty could keep the faithful from going to Jerusalem in order to conquer it for God.

---

[504] *Sermo Fulcheri*, p. 163.

[505] Ripoll hymn, strophe 1–2.

[506] FC, 3.30, at *Sermo Fulcheri*, p. 161.

[507] FC, 1.29–30, at *Sermo Fulcheri*, pp.161–162.

[508] Compare for this concept RC, 1594–1595: *Totus Occidens, quantus quantus est, in ortu pugnat*.

[509] *Sermo Fulcheri*, p. 162.

The crusade is dramatized for the benefit of the congregation, in an epic battle between the underdog that is the European West and the horde of unbelievers from Asia and Africa. The addition of the African continent draws on popular medieval visualizations in world maps, in which the world is divided into three continents: Asia (at the top), Europe (on the left), and Africa (on the right), resulting in the so-called T-O map.[510] In other words, the battle is between Europe vs. the rest of the world. Unlike the sermon from the Ripoll manuscript, one gets the distinct impression that the preacher is not addressing an audience that was directly involved in the First Crusade: the congregation has to be reminded of the valor of *gens nostra* ("our people"), whose actions are referred to in the third person.

Then follows a lengthy quote from Fulcher concerning the many sacrifices made by the crusaders—the same passage that was alluded to in the earlier sermon.[511] The same passage from Isaiah is then quoted that formed the basis for the hymn and the Introit to the Liberation Mass.[512] This is followed by yet another quote from Fulcher—though this time it is properly attributed (with rubrication in the manuscript): *Fulcherius dicit: hęc omnia oculis nostris vidimus* ("Fulcher says: all of this we have seen with our own eyes").[513] This passage is important not only for eliminating Fulcher of Chartres' authorship, but also because the preacher uses Fulcher as an authority to his claim that Isaiah's prophecy was fulfilled in the conquest of Jerusalem during the First Crusade. The effect of using Fulcher as an authority is that the distance between the

[510] For a discussion of medieval maps within the context of the crusades, see B.Z. Kedar, "Reflections on maps, crusading, and logistics," in J.H. Pryor (ed.), *Logistics of warfare in the age of the crusades: proceedings of a workshop held at the Centre for Medieval Studies, University of Sydney, 30 September to 4 October 2002* (Aldershot, 2006), pp. 159–183.

[511] FC, 1.6 and Ripoll sermon, pp. 59–60.

[512] Is. 66:18–20.

[513] FC, Prol. and 1.8.33, at *Sermo Fulcheri*, p. 163.

preacher's audience and the participants in the First Crusade is acknowledged and emphasized: Fulcher had the benefit of bearing eyewitness to these wondrous events, while current audiences are required to turn to his writings in order to learn of this history. The fact that these historical writings could play such a vital role in the religious life is remarkable.[514]

Toward the end of the sermon, the preacher pauses to reflect—in yet another quotation from Fulcher—on the wonder of so many linguistically and culturally diverse peoples coming together to participate in the endeavor of liberating the Holy Land.[515] The sermon concludes with a florid description of the date on which the city was captured, and so brings the sermon to a close by returning to the liturgical occasion. The congregation is exhorted to pray and give thanks at the *Templum Domini* and the Holy Sepulcher—fitting as the two central locations of the procession on this feast day. However, the fact that the *Templum Domini* is mentioned explicitly here—and indeed before the Holy Sepulcher—while it was not mentioned in the earlier sermon points again to a later dating, as the *Templum Domini* did not gain prominence as a site of worship until a few years after the end of the First Crusade.[516] The sermon concludes with a call to the congregation to celebrate the occasion, breaking off mid-sentence.

Although the sermon has been faulted for its lack of originality and coarse style, it bears vivid testimony to the religious life of Frankish Jerusalem toward the middle of the twelfth century, and especially to the important role played by crusader historiography as the repository of cultural memory and identity.[517]

---

[514] See also the liturgy of the Feast of the Liberation of Jerusalem, dating to the period 1127–1149, which contained at least nine lessons taken from Fulcher's history; see Linder 1990, esp. p. 128.

[515] FC, 1.6, 9–10, at *Sermo Fulcheri*, p. 163.

[516] Graboïs 1996, pp. 232–233.

[517] *Sermo Fulcheri*, p. 160; FC, pp. 78–79.

6. Monastic literature

Given its central place within Christianity, the Holy Land had long exerted a strong pull on those who wished to lead the monastic life, so that by the twelfth century a plethora of various monastic communities had been established there.[518] The First Crusade saw an influx of Western monks into the Holy Land and the founding of new monastic communities by them. Such communities would have required not only access to existing biblical and liturgical texts, but also the production of new texts, such as homilies or biblical exegesis. Moreover, as time went on, it would have grown increasingly more important to establish oneself within the monastic, ecclesiastic, and political landscape of the Holy Land. A prime strategy to accomplish this goal would have taken the form of composing institutional histories to document miraculous events. In the medieval West, such events were frequently associated with the relics of saints, which gave rise to accounts of *inventio* (discovery of a saint's relic) and *translatio* (the transfer of a relic to an institutional context of veneration).[519] Although the remains are few, the extant literary sources provide a picture of a rich and vibrant monastic culture in the Latin East during the twelfth century, particularly in the figure of Gerard of Nazareth.

6.1 Gerard of Nazareth

[518] For overviews, see Y. Hirschfeld, "The monasteries of Palestine in the Byzantine period," in Limor and Stroumsa 2006, pp. 401–419; B. Bitton-Askelony and A. Kofsky, "Monasticism in the Holy Land," M. Stone, R. Ervine and N. Stone (eds.), *The Armenians in Jerusalem and the Holy Land* (Leuven, 2002), pp. 1–17.

[519] For overviews of the genre, see R. Aigrain, *L'hagiographie. Ses sources, ses méthodes, son histoire* (Paris, 1953); P. Geary, *Furta sacra: thefts of relics in the Central Middle Ages* (Princeton, NJ, 1978); M. Heinzelmann, *Translationsberichte und andere Quellen des Reliquienkultes* (Turnhout, 1979); T.J. Heffernan, *Sacred biography: saints and their biographers in the Middle Ages* (New York and Oxford, 1988, repr. 1992).

A representative of monastic and eremitic writings is Gerard of Nazareth, bishop of Laodicea (Latakiyya) in Syria from ca. 1140 to 1161.[520] Like many writers of the Latin East, Gerard's earlier life remains a mystery, and it is unknown whether he was a native or made his way over from the West. However, later sources that preserve fragments of his works introduce him as a native of Galilee who took up residence near Nazareth as a Benedictine monk.[521] He is mentioned by William of Tyre as one of the participants in the synod that took place in Antioch on November 30, 1140, during which Ralph of Domfront was deposed from the Antiochene patriarchate, to be replaced with Aimery of Limoges.[522] William paints a lively picture of Antiochene ecclesiastical politics, relating that all the various members of the provincial clergy in the vicinity of Antioch were present, each supporting different factions, and according to William, Gerard was among Ralph's opponents.[523]

No record of Gerard's activities is found for the following two decades until the year 1158. In that year, Reynald of Châtillon, prince of Antioch, came to Mamistra (Mopsuestia, today Adana) in Cilicia to reconcile with the Byzantine emperor Manuel Komnenos after raiding Cyprus. William, who relates the event, mentions specifically that Gerard accompanied Reynald to his meeting with the Byzantine emperor.[524] Although William presents the occasion as a humiliating defeat for Latin Christendom (prejudiced, no doubt, by the fact that one of the

[520] The earliest discussion of Gerard within the cultural landscape of the Latin East can be found in Prutz 1883, p. 453.

[521] Kedar 1983a, p. 71.

[522] WT, 15.16.11: *De provincia autem Antiochena, quoniam viciniores erant, affuerunt universi, quorum varia nimis et abinvicem dissona errant desideria . . . Geraldus Laodicensis* [*episcopus*].

[523] *Ibid*.

[524] WT, 18.23.42–43: *Usus ergo domesticorum consilio, assumptis ex eis pro arbitrio nonnullis, domino quoque Geraldo venerabili Laodicensium episcopo sibi facto itineris consorte, in Ciliciam . . . ad urbem Mamistram pervenit*.

conditions called for an Orthodox patriarch to reside in Antioch), one may gather from Gerard's involvement that he was experienced in dealing with sensitive political and ecclesiastical affairs involving the Orthodox Greeks.

Despite William's condemnations of the outcome, Gerard's career did not suffer from his role in the proceedings at Mamistra; on the contrary, that same year, or perhaps the year after, his name is found as a witness to two royal charters issued by Queen Melisende.[525] Both charters concern the donation of convents, and Gerard appears prominently in first and second place in the witness lists. The final record of Gerard is in a charter issued by Baldwin III in 1161 in Nazareth, where he figures third in the list of witnesses.[526] As his name disappears from the record after this, Gerard probably died not long after 1161.

No complete work of Gerard survives, but in 1983 Benjamin Kedar brought to light a number of important fragments and summaries of his works, preserved among later writings.[527] The longest fragment is of a work titled *De conversatione servorum Dei* ("Concerning the life of God's servants"), or alternatively titled *De conversatione virorum Dei in Terra Sancta morantium* ("Concerning the life of the men of God that dwell in the Holy Land"), which describes monastic communities on the Black Mountain north of Antioch as well as hermits living in Galilee in the 1130s.[528] A short passage of this text was copied by Philip Ribot, a

[525] *Diplomata*, vol. 1, nos. 194 and 196.

[526] *Diplomata*, vol. 1, no. 263.

[527] "Gerard of Nazareth: A neglected twelfth-century writer in the Latin East: A contribution to the intellectual and monastic history of the Crusader States," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 37 (1983), pp. 55–77 (repr. in Kedar 1993, no. iv). See also the recent resume of this article, which incorporates new findings and a critique of scholarship on Gerard: B.Z. Kedar, "The Latin hermits of the Frankish Levant revisited," in M. Montesano (ed.), *Come l'orco della faba. Studi per Franco Cardini*, (Florence, 2010), pp. 185–202

[528] The fullest treatment of this work is in A. Jotischky, *The Perfection of Solitude. Hermits and Monks in the Crusader States* (University Park, PA, 1995), pp. 17–46.

fourteenth-century Carmelite, while a long fragment was printed in the sixteenth century by the Magdeburg Centuriators, a group of Lutheran church historians.[529]

Another fragment survives of a work that presumably dates from the same period, titled *Vita abbatis Eliae* ("The life of Abbot Elias"). This text, a hagiography of Elias of Narbonne, abbot of Palmaria in Galilee, further indicates Gerard's close association with monastic circles.[530]

Another fragment is preserved of a work titled *De una Magdalena contra Graecos* ("On the one [Mary] Magdalene against the Greeks"). The text constitutes an exegetical treatise propounding the common Western view that identifies Mary of Bethany with Mary Magdalene, and with a number of unnamed women that feature in the gospels, over against the Orthodox contention that these are all separate persons. As bishop of Laodicea, which had a sizeable Orthodox minority, this issue would have been real and pressing at the feast of Mary Magdalene, while the work may also have been related to a lost homily that Gerard reportedly wrote for the convent of St. Mary of Bethany, titled *Ad ancillas Dei apud Bethaniam* ("To the maidservants of God in Bethany").[531] In the context of pilgrimage, this convent in Bethany would have had much to gain from being associated with the popular figure of the Magdalene. Gerard's treatise would

---

[529] Three other Carmelites preserve the first sentence of this passage: see Kedar 1983a, pp. 57–58. For a discussion of the relation between Gerard of Nazareth and the Carmelite Order, see A. Jotischky, "Gerard of Nazareth, John Bale and the Origins of the Carmelite Order," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 46:2 (1995), pp. 214–236

[530] For this abbey, see the discussions in Kedar 1983a, pp. 70–71; B.Z. Kedar, "Palmarée, abbaye clunisienne au XIIe siècle en Galilée," *Revue Bénédictine* 93 (1983), pp. 260–269; R. Hiestand, "Palmarea—Palmerium: Ein oder zwei Abteien in Galiläa im 12. Jahrhundert?," *ZDPV* 108:2 (1992), pp. 174–188. For a critique of Hiestand's identification see Pringle, *Churches*, vol. 2, pp. 154–155.

[531] Kedar 1983a, pp. 63–64. Andrew Jotischky emphasized Kedar's suggested connection of the exegetical treatise with the lost homily: A. Jotischky, "The Frankish Encounter with the Greek Orthodox in the Crusader States. The Case of Gerard of Nazareth and Mary Magdalene," in M. Gervers and J.M. Powell (eds.), *Tolerance and Intolerance. Social Conflict in the Age of the Crusades* (Syracuse, NY, 2001), pp. 100–14; an earlier version of this article can be found in A. Jotischky, "Gerard of Nazareth, Mary Magdalene and Latin relations with the Greek Orthodox in the crusader East in the twelfth century," *Levant* 29 (1997), pp. 217–226.

then have performed an important role in reestablishing this connection amid strong competition for pilgrims.

The remaining work of Gerard of which a small fragment has come down to us is titled *Contra Salam presbyterum* ("Against the priest Sala"), or alternatively *Girardus episcopus Laodicensis contra Salam philosophum Grecum vel Cretum* ("Gerard, bishop of Laodicea, against Sala, a Greek or Cretan philosopher").[532] The Centuriators noted that Gerard wrote to attack a priest who had presumed to dedicate cemeteries (a privilege beholden to bishops), and suggested that the priest Sala may have been associated with the Order of the Knights Templar, which clashed increasingly with both secular and ecclesiastical authorities as it arrogated an increasing number of privileges. Jotischky, instead, saw this work as being directed against a Greek Orthodox priest, using the evidence provided by the alternative title, as well as—more persuasively—the comment by the Centuriators that another affront committed by Sala had been to introduce a Greek bishop against Gerard in Laodicea, which strongly suggests a context of Latin-Greek polemic rather than one directed against the Knights Templar.[533]

What was the extent of Gerard's education? He was described by the Centuriators as "educated in Sacred writings, a remarkable philosopher and rhetorician, learned in both Greek and Latin," an assessment that can be corroborated by a study of the sources he utilizes in the long fragment from his exegetical work *De una Magdalena contra Graecos*.[534] Gerard shows himself to be well versed in the patristic works on the subject by Jerome, Augustine, and Ambrose, as well as the medieval authorities Gregory the Great, the Venerable Bede, and

[532] This alternative title was found by Jotischky (1997, p. 223) in a manuscript containing the works of John Hornby, a fourteenth-century English Carmelite.

[533] Jotischky 1997, p. 222.

[534] Kedar 1983, p. 71.

Anselm of Laon.[535] The catalogue of books belonging to the church of Nazareth and dating to the twelfth century lists three of the authors quoted by Gerard, while it is worth pointing out that Jerome's letter to Hedybia (also quoted by Gerard) is found quoted in a mid-twelfth century manuscript once belonging to the church of Sidon.[536] The availability of these texts in the Latin East demonstrates that, if Gerard was indeed a native of Galilee (as claimed by the Centuriators), he would not have needed to travel to Europe to receive an education—or at least, not in order to produce the works that have come down to us.

6.2 *Inventio patriarcharum* I

As was the case with the *Templum Domini* and the Priory of Mount Sion, by 1112 a community of Augustinian canons had taken up residence in Hebron, in the sanctuary known as the *Ḥaram al-Khalīl*.[537] Below it was the Cave of Machpelah, said to house the tombs of the Patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, along with the Matriarchs Sarah, Rebekah, and Leah. Originally the site of Jewish worship, it continued to be a place of prominence under Muslim rule, as it was

---

[535] Jerome, *Adversus Iovinianum* and *Epistula* 120 (*Ad Hedybiam*); Augustine, *De consensu evangelistarum*; Ambrose, *Expositio Evangelii secundum Lucam*; Ps.-Ambrose, *Sermo de Salomone*, which may have been written by Gregory of Elvira—see Kedar in GN, p. 75 n. 12; Gregory the Great, *Homiliae in Evangelia*; Bede the Venerable, *Homelia Evangelii*; Anselm of Laon, *Enarrationes in Matthaeum*. Since Gerard only mentions "Anselm," it is unclear whether Anselm of Laon or of Canterbury is meant, but Kedar (1983, p. 76 n. 20) also suggests Anselm of Canterbury's *Oratio ad Mariam Magdalenam* as a possiblity. Whereas the relevant passage in Anselm of Laon (*PL*, vol. 162, col. 1490) voices many of the same arguments as Jerome, Anselm of Canterbury's work (*PL*, vol. 158, cols. 1010–1012) does not deal with the issues at hand.

[536] The observation that the Erfurt catalogue contains some of the books used by Gerard was made by Kedar in GN, pp. 64–65, p. 76 n. 23. For the catalogue, see Beddie 1933; Lehmann 1933; and most recently Kedar 2012. The Sidon manuscript in question is Rome, BAV, MS lat. 1345, with the quotation occurring on fol. 29v. See the description in M.R. Tessera, "Dalla liturgia del Santo Sepolcro alla Biblioteca di Sidone: note sulla produzione libraria latina di Oltremare nel XII-XIII secolo," *Aevum. Rassegna di scienze storiche, linguistiche e filologiche* 79 (2005), pp. 407–415, at 414–415.

[537] Hamilton 1980, p. 77 n. 4.

used as a mosque by the tenth century.[538] Six cenotaphs had been placed within the *Ḥaram* as early as the time of Egeria toward the end of the fourth century, but it would appear that by the twelfth century the location of the original tombs had been lost from memory, and so their rediscovery by the Augustinian canons in 1119 represented a momentous event for the community of Hebron.[539]

As it happens, no fewer than three Latin accounts detailing the *inventio* have come down to us: the first was discovered by Paul Riant in 1884, and provides the longest treatment of the event, while most likely also representing the oldest account which is most closely connected with the community of Hebron.[540] It is written by an anonymous author who addresses the canons of Hebron, by whom he had been commissioned to write the account.[541] Warmund, the Latin patriarch of Jerusalem, is referred to as being deceased, placing the *terminus post quem* of this account at 1128; a further *terminus* can be found in the use of the past tense in reference to

---

[538] For the history of the *Ḥaram al-Khalīl*, see the monumental work of L.H. Vincent, E.J.H. Mackay, F.M. Abel, *Hébron: le Haram el-Khalîl: sépulture des patriarches* (Paris, 1923), 2 vols. See also Pringle, *Churches*, vol. 1, no. 100.

[539] As preserved in a passage from Peter the Deacon, *Liber de locis sanctis*, ed. R. Weber, *CCSL*, vol. 175, pp. 93–98, 252–278.

[540] P. Riant, "Invention de la sépulture des Patriarches Abraham, Isaac et Jacob à Hébron le 25 juin 1119," *AOL* 2 (1884), pp. 411–421. It was later edited by him in *RHC Oc*, vol. 5, pt. 1, pp. 302–314. All three texts have now been edited in a modern critical edition by R.B.C. Huygens, "Inventio Patriarcharum," *Crusades* 4 (2005), pp. 131–155, henceforth abbreviated as *Inventio*, with the use of Roman numerals to differentiate between the three treatises. An English translation of the first treatise based on Riant's edition can be found in B.E. Whalen, "*The Discovery of the Holy Patriarchs*: Relics, ecclesiastical politics and sacred history in twelfth-century crusader Palestine," *Historical Reflections* 27:1 (2001), pp. 139–176. There are four manuscripts of this text extant today, the oldest of which comes from Anchin and dates to shortly after 1200: Douai, MS 851, f. 93v–103v (shortly after 1200), mentioned and excerpted in *Analecta Bollandiana* 20 (1901), p. 406, 412–422). A third of the text was printed for the first time in 1780, on the basis of a copy of a now lost manuscript of Saint-Martin of Tournai: *Acta Sanctorum*, October 9, vol. 4 (Brussels, 1780), pp. 688–690, nos. 533–543. The copy is Brussels, *Collectanea Bollandiana* 162, ff. 53–60. This copy was used by Riant in conjunction with a fourteenth-century manuscript now in Leiden: Leiden, Universiteitsbibl., MS Voss. lat. 4° 125, ff. 195r–205v. Another copy of the same lost manuscript was made in the same period and now resides in Paris: Paris, Sainte-Geneviève, MS 693 (17th c.).

[541] *Inventio* I, 1–2: *fratres karissimi qui Cariatarbe estis, vestris volens parere iussionibus opus michi iniunctum incipere nequaquam distuli . . .*

Baldwin of St.-Abraham (the Frankish name given to Hebron), lord of Hebron, whose last mention is in 1136.[542] The author writes that the relics are still venerated by pilgrims to his day, and he claims to have been able to interview Odo and Arnulf, the two canons who first discovered them—all of which suggests that the account was written well before 1187, and most likely toward the end of the 1130s.[543]

The second account represents an abbreviated version of the first; it was most likely made at a later date, and will not concern us here.[544]

The third account was discovered in 1896 by Charles Kohler, and presents a version of the events that differs significantly from that in the first two accounts.[545] It is a third of the length of the first account and gives a different year in which the discovery took place, which it describes less in terms of a communal effort, but rather as the result of a number of visions of the Patriarch Abraham to an unnamed monk from the monastery of St. Martin in Tours.[546] In fact, none of the canons of Hebron nor their prior are mentioned by name, while the conflict between Patriarch Warmund and the canons of Hebron, who are forced to return the relics to their original resting place, is passed over entirely.

---

[542] For Warmund, see: *Inventio* I, 398–399: . . . *sancte recordationis Guarmundo patriarche, qui tunc temporis illic preerat* . . . For a discussion of the dating, see *RHC Oc*, vol. 5, pt. 1, p. lxiv. For Baldwin, see: *Inventio* I, 300; *Diplomata*, vol. 1, no. 135. For more extensive discussion of the career of Baldwin of St.-Abraham, see H.E. Mayer, "Die Herrschaftsbildung in Hebron," *ZDPV* 101:1 (1985), pp. 64–81.

[543] *Inventio* I, 420–421 and 24–25, respectively. Whalen (2001, p. 145), argues instead for a date nearer to 1168, when the church of Hebron was elevated to an episcopal see, not taking into account that the canons Arnulf and Odo, who are presented as still alive in the text, would likely have long since passed away.

[544] *BHL*, no. 10. It is found in a single manuscript: Lille, MS 450 (second half 13th c.), from Loos-Notre-Dame, ff. 57r–58v (second foliation). It was first edited by P. Riant in *RHC Oc*, vol. 5, pt. 1, pp. 314–316; it resembles the first account to such an extent that it was relegated to the *apparatus criticus* by Huygens.

[545] C. Kohler, "Un nouveau récit de l'invention des Patriarches Abraham, Isaac et Jacob à Hebron," *ROL* 4 (1896), pp. 477–502. The text was edited anew in Huygens 2005, pp. 150–155. The only manuscript witness is Avranches, MS 130 (second half 13th c.), ff. 79v–81v.

[546] *Inventio* II, 5–6.

In all appearances, this account was likely written at a later date, and there is nothing in it that would suggest that it was written in the Crusader States. It has been pointed out that the absence of any reference to the institutional struggles between the canons of Hebron and the patriarch of Jerusalem, as well as the reference to an *Ebronica ecclesia* ("church of Hebron"), would indicate that the account was written after the elevation to a bishopric in 1168, but before the conquest of Saladin in 1187.[547]

The text may have been composed as a school exercise of variation and rhetorical embellishment, which was made on the basis of the older account.[548] However, given the significant departures in terms of style, content (most notably factual differences such as the dating of the events), and purpose, another hypothesis has been proposed. The differences, Kaspar Elm suggests, would indicate the existence of another source altogether; moreover, the abundant use of rhyme throughout the account (especially toward the end), may suggest that the account was based on a rhythmical poem describing the events, of the sort produced by Achard of Arrouaise and Geoffrey the Abbot in Jerusalem.[549] Until further evidence surfaces, however, we will restrict our discussion to the first account.

The author begins his account with a lengthy introduction, in which he—in a typical example of the medieval *Niedrichkeitstopos*—professes his doubts about whether his meager talents will be up to the task entrusted to him by the canons of Hebron, proceeding to ask for their prayers. He then prefaces the following account by identifying his chief sources: the oral account of two canons, Arnulf and Odo, who were intimately involved in the events, as well as a

[547] Elm 1997, p. 338.

[548] Kohler 1896, pp. 490–494; followed by Vincent et al. 1923, p. 168.

[549] Elm 1997, pp. 335–338.

Greek monk from Mount Sinai, later identified as one John, who related to him the history of the sanctuary under Theodosius. A short summary follows, intended to remind readers of the various biblical associations of Hebron, and the biblical authority for the claim that the tombs of the Patriarchs lie in Hebron.[550] This leads into a detailed description of the *Ḥaram*, with the explicit purpose of indicating the difficulty of reaching the patriarchal tombs below, which consequently could not have been found without the aid of a divine miracle.[551] The author proceeds to provide a brief history of the sanctuary and the Levites, who safeguarded the site until their persecution at the hands of the Roman Emperors Titus and Vespasian (in that order, oddly enough). He pauses at some length to dwell on the horrors suffered by the Christians, who took up the protection of the Cave of the Patriarchs after the Jews had been driven away. The Christians are assisted by an ecumenical body of clergy of various confessions, united in their willingness to lay down their lives for the sake of protecting the relics.[552]

Now follows the account of the Greek monk, which constitutes a lengthy digression on the efforts of the Emperor Theodosius II (408–450) to uncover the tombs of the Patriarchs, which ultimately prove to be in vain. The story is dramatized considerably and even contains direct speech. The author concludes this section by again naming the Greek monk from Sinai as his source, this time also mentioning that he was named John, and adding a Syrian priest (or a priest named *Syrus*).[553] The author explains why it was necessary to include their account:

---

[550] *Inventio* I, 28–30: *Beatos igitur patriarchas Abraham, Isaac et Iacob in Ebron civitate Iudee . . . sepultos fuisse cum uxoribus suis nullus fidelium ambigit qui plene et studiose librum Geneseos legerit.*

[551] *Inventio* I, 53–55: *. . . ut, cum mirificam difficultatem ipsius [sc. loci] audierint, beatos patriarchas non sine divino miraculo repertos esse fateantur*.

[552] *Inventio* I, 95–98: *Et convenerunt ad eos diversi ordinis multi Christiani, episcopi, presbiteri, diacones, subdiacones . . . parati etiam corpora sua tradere propter deum ad supplicia . . .*

[553] *Inventio* I, 234–236: *Hec . . . a quodam Iohanne montis Synai monacho et a quodam Siro sacerdote, religiosis ut videbantur viris, nobis sub veritate testificata sunt*.

> Que ideo huic operi inseruimus, ut cum patriarcharum ossa, que a tantis et tam religiosis viris, immo a C iam transactis generationibus non potuerunt inveniri, a Latinis inventa esse audieritis, aperte intelligatis quantam benivolentiam creator omnium deus eis plus quam ceteris gentibus exibuerit, et insuper ut resipiscant et peniteant qui dicunt civitatem Ebron metropolim non esse. Qui si Eusebio Cesariensi et Christi confessori Ieronimo Iosephoque credere nolunt, his saltem, que in grecis voluminibus, ut scripsimus, continentur assentiant.[554]

> These things we have included in this account, so that when you hear that the bones of the Patriarchs, which could not be discovered by so many and such religious men—indeed, over the course of one hundred generations—were discovered by the Latins, you might clearly understand the extent of the benevolence that God, creator of all, has bestowed upon them, more than upon the other peoples, and also in order that those who claim that Hebron is not a metropolis may become sensible and repent. And if they do not wish to believe Eusebius of Caesarea, and Jerome, confessor of Christ, and Josephus, let them at least agree with what is found in Greek books, as we have copied them.

It is important for the author to establish that the tombs have remained inviolate since antiquity, and that the Frankish Christians—and specifically the Augustinian canons of Hebron—have been chosen by God to rediscover them. The importance of the institutional context is first raised here: as will be discussed below, the aspirations of the clergy of Hebron at elevating their church to an episcopal see provided a key motive for the composition of this account.

Eager to arrive at the true subject matter of his treatise—the *inventio*—the author provides only a brief résumé of the centuries that followed since Theodosius, when Hebron had come under Muslim rule. In order to preserve the sanctity of the site, the author unusually emphasizes the veneration and respect that the Jews, who had been granted the favor of being custodians of the site, accorded it.[555] Reaching the period of crusader rule, the author contrasts this with the despoiling of the site at the hands of Peter of Narbonne, archbishop of Apamea (though he is left unnamed by the author). The section ends with a brief mention of the founding of the convent of Augustinian canons at Hebron.

---

[554] *Inventio* I, 236–243.

[555] Inventio I, ll. 256–266.

The remainder of the treatise deals with the discovery of the tombs—an event for which the canons are presented as having prayed for with some zeal, and above all Arnulf and Odo, the author's oral source of information and the main characters of the account. One afternoon in the summer of 1119, one of the canons (a scribe, our author tells us) was resting near the cenotaph of Isaac when he felt a cool breeze coming from below. Noticing an aperture, he proceeded to measure the depth by lowering a piece of lead attached to a string. After acquiring permission from the lord of Hebron, Baldwin of St.-Abraham, and with assent of the entire community of canons—the author is careful to specify—excavations of the site were set underway.

When the canons finally succeeded in penetrating to the lower caverns and found the tombs, the prior immediately departed to Jerusalem to ask the patriarch—for the church of Hebron was under his authority—to bring the bones up to the surface where they could be labeled and displayed for veneration. When Patriarch Warmund reneged on his promise to attend the festive occasion, the community decided to proceed without him. Two years passed, when certain individuals urged Warmund to prevail upon the canons of Hebron to return the relics to their original resting place. There, we are told, they are still venerated to this day.

Who authored this account, and for what purpose? Without a name, the precise identity of the author remains unknown, but the text may provide some clues. Firstly, the author was not present at the events he describes, for he relies upon the accounts of others and writes that God "deigned to reveal to you the bodies of the saints"[556]; in fact, he was probably not even one of the canons of the community of Hebron, as throughout there is a sense of distance: the text opens with an address to "dearest brothers, who are in Hebron," and tends to refer to this community with possessive pronouns of the second person plural rather than the inclusive first person, and

[556] *Inventio* I, 22–21: . . . *Redemptoris nostri . . . qui sanctorum corpora vobis revelare dignatus est* . . .

refers to Hebron with demonstratives indicating distance, speaking of "there" and "that place" rather than "here."[557] On the other hand, the author must have been closely connected with the canons of Hebron, given that he was able to interview the two main witnesses Arnulf and Odo in person and that the community entrusted him with his task. The author may have been a regular canon himself, as he addresses the canons of Hebron consistently as *fratres* ("brothers"), and shows that he had detailed knowledge of the customs of regular canons.[558] Moreover, it may be significant that, when describing the Muslim occupation of Jerusalem, the only sacred site mentioned by the author is the *Templum Domini*, which could be an indication that the author was associated with it.[559]

Whoever the author was, he was a highly literate writer who understood the institutional concerns of the canons of Hebron. As the church of Hebron lacked the prestige associated with the *Templum Domini* and Mount Zion in Jerusalem, the author understood how persuasive a historicized account of *inventio* would be, in which the discovery of the tombs of the Patriarchs signified God's election of the Latin Christians who had taken up residence there above all others who had tried to find them before and failed. Such an account could provide a theological basis on which the church could claim its place among the pilgrim destinations, in the same way that Gerard of Nazareth provided an exegetical foundation for Bethany to become a pilgrim destination. This would bring with it distinct material advantages, and rather than hand them over to the distant patriarch in Jerusalem, or to the local lord of Hebron, the canons sought to make

[557] *Inventio* I, 1–2: . . . *fratres karissimi qui Cariatarbe estis* . . . For possessive pronouns in the second person plural, see e.g., *Inventio* I, 1–2 and 7. For demonstratives denoting distance, see e.g., *Inventio* I, 44–45: *Non inconvenienter ergo veteres locum illum Cariatarbe . . . appellare voluerunt . . .*

[558] See especially *Inventio* I, 282–283: . . . *sicut mos est Regularium canonicis post meridiem in lectulis suis quescentibus . . .*

[559] *Inventio* I, 251–253: *Irrumpentes igitur barbari obtinuerunt totam regionem illam et Ierusalem civitatem . . . sacerdotes quoque eorum possederunt Templum Domini, quod erat in ea, et civitatem Ebron.*

the case that, like Bethlehem and Nazareth, the dignitity of their sanctuary was so great as to warrant the elevation to an episcopal see.[560] Understandably, Patriarch Warmund was not too keen to acquiesce in such a loss of potential revenue.[561] Ultimately, however, the canons' bid proved to be successful, for precisely their association with the relics of the Patriarchs is mentioned by William of Tyre as the reason for the church's elevation in 1168.[562]

Although it would be impossible to ascertain the direct influence of this particular text, traces of the same story can be found in three separate Jewish authors of the twelfth century, in the accounts of the pilgrims Benjamin Tudela, Petaḥiyah of Regensburg, and Jacob b. Nathaniel Cohen, as well as the contemporary Arabic accounts of Ḥamza b. Asad al-Tamimī and 'Alī al-Harawī.[563]

7. Non-literary Latin texts

The following discussion concerns texts that, for a variety of reasons, are more difficult to fit under the heading of belletristic production, including scientific texts and translations into Latin of scientific and medical texts. As these texts are important for the overall picture of cultural development in the Latin East, I will make a few remarks about the surviving evidence.

---

[560] In fact, the canons are described as fearful that Baldwin of St.-Abraham might want to enter the caves before them, to see if there is any gold or silver to be had; see *Inventio* I, 366–367: . . . *ne forte Balduinus, eiusdem loci defensor, illuc thesaurum auri vel argenti esse suspicaretur* . . .

[561] For a fuller discussion of the relations between Warmund and Hebron, see Kirstein 2002, pp. 215–218.

[562] WT, 20.3.12–14: . . . *Ebronensis quoque intuitu servorum dei, quorum memoria in benedictione est, Abraham videlicet, Ysaac et Iacob, eadem tunc primum dignitate* [sc. *cathedrali prerogativa*] *meruit insigniri*.

[563] For the Jewish reception, see H. Guthe, "Die Untersuchung des Patriarchengrabes in Hebron im Jahre 1119," *ZDPV* 17 (1894), pp. 236–248, at pp. 245–247; E. Reiner, "A Jewish response to the Crusades: The dispute over sacred places in the Holy Land," in A. Haverkamp (ed.), *Juden und Christen zur Zeit der Kreuzzüge* (1999), pp. 209–231, at 222–231. For the Arabic reception, see Riant 1884, pp. 412–413; Riant 1895, p. lxiv; Vincent et al. 1923, pp. 166–167; H. Busse, "Die Patriarchengräber in Hebron und der Islam," *ZDPV* 114:1 (1998), pp. 71–94. For the reception in general, see Pringle, *Churches*, vol. 1, pp. 226–229.

7.1 Stephen of Antioch

One Stephen of Antioch, also known as Stephen of Pisa (who calls himself "student of philosophy" or "philosopher"), translated the *Kitāb al-malakī* ("The royal book"), a popular mid-tenth century medical text, from Arabic into Latin, giving it the title *Regalis dispositio* ("The royal disposition"), and mentioning explicitly that he translated the work in the year 1127 with the help of two scribes named Alduinus and Pancus.[564] He also wrote the *Medicaminum omnium breviarium* ("Compendium of all medicine"), comprising a glossary of medical terms taken from *De materia medica* ("Materials of medicine") of the ancient Greek physician Dioscorides, supplemented with their Arabic and Latin equivalents, and was likely also responsible for a cosmological work titled *Liber Mamonis in astronomia* ("Book of Mamon on astronomy" (?)), drawing extensively on both Greek and Arabic sources.[565] The same Stephen also supervised the copying of a manuscript of the Ps.-Ciceronian *Rhetorica ad Herennium* ("Rhetorical work addressed to Herennius"), as indicated by the colophon.[566] This Stephen is called "Stephen the Treasurer," and may be identified with the treasurer of the church of St. Paul who, as an extant record indicates, was given a house in Antioch between 1126 and 1130 by Bernard, patriarch of

[564] C. Burnett, "Stephen, the disciple of philosophy, and the exchange of medical learning in Antioch," *Crusades* 5 (2006), pp. 113–129, at p. 114; see also C. Burnett, "Antioch as a link between Arabic and Latin culture in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries," in A. Tihon, I. Draelants, and B. van den Abeele (eds.), *Occident et Proche-Orient: contacts scientifiques au temps des croisades*, (Louvain-la-Neuve, 2000), pp. 1–78, at p. 6; reprinted with corrections in *Arabic into Latin in the Middle Ages: the translators and their intellectual and social context* (Farnham, 2009), article IV. I await the forthcoming book of Michele Campopiano, which will deal in depth with Pisan-Levantine relations in the High Middle Ages.

[565] As Burnett points out, the preface indicates that the work was intended for an audience in Sicily and Salerno; see Burnett 2006, pp. 122–123. For the *Liber Mamonis in astronomia*, see Burnett 2000, pp. 10–11. The text is extant in only one manuscript, now Cambrai, Bibl. Mun., MS 930, and believed to be an autograph of Stephen himself. The translation of the title (in particular the identity of the *Mamon* referred to) is as yet unclear.

[566] See the discussion in Chapter 2, section 3.

Antioch.[567] Finally, Stephen was likely involved in the first Latin translation of the *Almagest*, a cosmological work by Ptolemy, as is evidenced by certain similarities of style, vocabulary, and an alphanumeric system of numbering shared with the other works of Stephen.[568]

7.2 A note on translations into Latin

Although no large-scale movement was set underway in the Crusader States such as there was in Toledo, Salerno, and later at the court of Frederick II in Sicily, a number of important texts were translated from Greek and Arabic that found their way to the West from Antioch. Aimery of Limoges, patriarch of Antioch, played an important role in establishing Antioch as a center for translation of both Greek and Arabic texts.[569] He gave to Pope Eugenius III a manuscript containing John Chrysostom's homilies on Matthew, which were subsequently translated by the Pisan scholar Burgundio[570]; Aimery may have procured a copy of the works of Theodore Abū Qurra, a Syrian theologian, for Hugh Etheriano, another renowned scholar from Pisa.[571] This same scholar translated for Patriarch Aimery a treatise on the Procession of the Holy Spirit, upon

---

[567] Hunt 1950, pp. 172–173. Like Fulcher, who, as Epp claims (1990, p. 27), may also have been a *thesaurarius*.

[568] Dresden, Landesbibl., MS Db. 87, ff. 1–71 (13th c.).

[569] See for a thorough discussion Hiestand 1994, pp. 7–36; see also more generally "Der lateinische Klerus der Kreuzfahrerstaaten: geographische Herkunft und politische Rolle," in H.E. Mayer and E. Müller-Luckner (eds.), *Die Kreuzfahrerstaaten als multikulturelle Gesellschaft: Einwanderer und Minderheiten im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert* (Munich, 1997), pp. 43–68, at 46–47; B. Hamilton, "Aimery of Limoges, Latin patriarch of Antioch (c. 1142 – c. 1196), and the unity of the Church," in *East and West in the medieval Eastern Mediterranean*, vol. 1, ed. K. Ciggaar and M. Metcalf (Leuven, etc. 2006), pp. 1–12. The *Fazienda de ultra mar*, a Castilian paraphrase of the Old Testament, which also contains portions of Rorgo Fretellus' pilgrim guide, has been erroneously attributed to Aimery of Limoges; see the comments in Minervini 2001, p. 632.

[570] For Burgundio's preface, see P. Classen, *Burgundio von Pisa: Richter-Gesandeter-Übersetzer* (Heidelberg, 1974) pp. 50–61. For evidence of similar movements of a slightly later date, see the Bodleian MS Hunt. 202, containing Latin annotations to a medical Arabic text of Abū Sahl al-Masīḥī. The manuscript dates to the end of the twelfth century and is discussed in E. Savage-Smith, "New evidence for the Frankish study of Arabic medical texts in the Crusader period," *Crusades* 5 (2006), pp. 99–112.

[571] Burnett 2000, pp. 5–6.

the receipt of which Aimery promptly requested the translation of a further three texts, as their correspondence informs us: John Chrysostom's homilies on the Pauline Epistles, the *acta* of the Nicene Council, and a Byzantine chronicle, which may have been the work of John Zonaras.[572] Finally, Aimery was a patron of the Armenian Nerses of Lampron, who translated Gregory the Great's *Dialogi* and the *Rule of St. Benedict* into Armenian.[573]

8. Coda: Latin orientalism and writings of problematic provenance

The survey presented thus far concerns texts which scholars are generally certain were composed in the Latin East. Before moving on, however, I would like to touch briefly upon two texts whose provenance has been debated, and which cannot (at least given the current state of the evidence) be securely located one way or another.

8.1 *Sortes Regis Amalrici*

In 1959, Mirella Brini Savorelli edited a popular twelfth-century text on divination, which she called the *Experimentarius* based on the manuscript evidence and attributed to Bernard Silvestris, whose name appears in a preface.[574] Earlier, however, Charles Homer Haskins had already determined that Bernardus Silvestris was at most a compiler, given that the compiler identifies one portion of the text as having been written by *benignissimi regis Amalrici medicus*

[572] Jotischky 1995, p. 226; K. Ciggaar, "Manuscripts as intermediaries. The Crusader States and literary cross-fertilization," in K. Ciggaar, A. Davids, and H. Teule (eds.), *East and West in the crusader states: context, contacts, confrontations: acta of the congress held at Hernen Castle in May 1993* (Leuven, 1996), pp. 131–151, at 134–137; Jotischky 1997, p. 223. For the letter, see *PL*, vol. 202, cols. 229–232.

[573] See the comments of Edoardo D'Angelo in RC, p. lxxxviii.

[574] M. Brini Savorelli, "Un manuale di geomanzia presentato da Bernardo Silvestre da Tours (XII secolo): l'*Experimentarius*," *Rivista critica di storia della filosofia* 14 (1959), pp. 283–342.

("the physician of the most kind King Amaury").[575] An improved edition appeared in 1977 by Charles Burnett, who isolated the main text from later accretions and titled it the *Sortes Regis Amalrici* ("Predictions of King Amaury").[576]

The text occurs in numerous manuscripts in somewhat different forms, but generally consists of a series of 28 questions pertaining to daily life, the answers to which the text provides through a set of detailed instructions, including lunar mansions (divisions of the ecliptic circle), divinatory tables, and predictions in rhythmic (though sometimes quantitative) hexameters. The text contains references to the reign of King Amaury (1163–1174), and gives an account of his campaign against the Kurdish lieutenant Shīrkūh that would place the composition around the year 1164.[577]

Benjamin Kedar then suggested identifying the author with a known Arabic physician in the service of Amaury named Abū Sulaymān Dāwūd.[578] In response to this suggestion, Burnett performed a thorough analysis of the sources used by the author and determined that, unlike the works of Stephen of Antioch, this work was probably not based directly on Arabic sources but rather drew on earlier materials (some that had been translated into Latin from Greek sources

[575] Haskins 1927b, pp. 135–137. On the discussion of authorship, see also M.T. Donati, "È ancora verosimile l'attribuzione dell'*Experimentarius* a Bernardo Silvestre?" *Medioevo* 12 (1986), pp. 281–344.

[576] C. Burnett, "What is the *Experimentarius* of Bernardus Silvestris? A preliminary survey of the material," *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge* 44 (1977), pp. 79–125.

[577] So C. Burnett, "The *Sortes regis Amalrici*: An Arabic divinatory work in the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem?," *Scripta Mediterranea* 19–20 (1998–1999), pp. 229–237, at 232, where he argues against Haskins's proposed date of 1167 (1927b, p. 136).

[578] First in E. Kohlberg and B.Z. Kedar, "A Melkite physician in Frankish Jerusalem and Ayyubid Damascus: Muwaffaq al-Din Ya'qub b. Siqlab," *Asian and African Studies* 22 (1988), pp. 113–126, at 114 (repr. in Kedar 1993, no. XII), and elaborated in Kedar 1999, pp. 196–197. This attribution is followed in Minervini 2001, p. 638. On the career of this physician, see C. Cahen, "Indigènes et croisés. Quelques mots à propos d'un médecin d'Amaury et de Saladin," *Syria* 15 (1934), pp. 351–360, and more recently P.D. Mitchell, *Medicine in the Crusades: warfare, wounds, and the medieval surgeon* (Cambridge, 2004), p. 35, and S.B. Edgington, "Oriental and occidental medicine in the Crusader States," in C. Kostick (ed.), *The Crusades and the Near East: cultural histories* (London, 2011), pp. 189–215, at 200.

earlier in the Middle Ages) that were already available in the West. The fact that no Arabic source was utilized directly, combined with mistakes in the Arabic that it does contain, as well as the distorted version of the events surrounding Amaury's campaigns against Shīrkūh, led Burnett to believe that Abū Sulaymān Dāwūd cannot have been the author. Moreover, once all of the sources are accounted for and determined to have been available in the West, there is nothing that would necessarily require an origin in the Latin East. Although it is possible that the text represents the work of a Frankish physician of Amaury, Burnett does not exclude the possibility that "[t]he 'doctor of King Amaury' could be a fiction, added to lend a touch of exoticism to the divinatory text."[579]

More recently, Justin Stover has suggested identifying the elusive compiler with Master Walter le Pruz, who on several occasions successfully predicted celestial events.[580] Following Burnett, he rejects Savorelli's identification of the compiler with Bernardus Silvestris as a later misattribution. Instead, he points out the important connection between Walter le Pruz and Matthew Paris, a monk at St. Albans, who narrates some of Walter's feats, and probably knew him personally. A group of manuscripts containing the *Sortes* are products of the scriptorium of St. Albans, which allows for the hypothesis that the collection of *Sortes* and related texts, in the form that we have them today, are the result of Walter's compilation, who endeavored to provide himself with texts useful for celestial prognostication.[581] This does not preclude an Eastern origin

[579] Burnett 1998–1999, p. 237. See also C. Burnett, "Humanism and orientalism in the translations from Arabic into Latin in the Middle Ages," in A. Speer and L. Wegener (eds.), *Wissen über Grenzen: Arabisches Wissen und lateinisches Mittelalter* (Berlin, 2006), pp. 22–31. Earlier, Burnett had pointed out evidence that medieval readers added exoticizing elements to the *Sortes*, even going so far as to describe the Frankish king Amaury as a king of the Persians. See Burnett 1977, p. 94: *liber de 28 iudiciis, diversarum scilicet questionum Almericy regis Persarum*.

[580] I am exceedingly grateful to Justin Stover for sending me a draft of his forthcoming article in the *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* (2015).

[581] For recent studies of the St. Alban manuscripts, see A. Iafrate, "'Si sequeris casum, casus frangit tibi nasum': la raccolta delle sorti del ms Ashmole 304," *Aevum* 85 (2011), pp. 457–488; *eadem*, "The workshop of Fortune: St

for the *Sortes*, however: in fact, a marginal comment from the hand of Matthew himself declares that he received a work of William of Tyre from Peter des Roches, bishop of Winchester, upon his return from a pilgrimage to the Holy Land in 1231.[582] It is not far-fetched to suggest that Peter also brought with him a version of the *Sortes* from the Latin East (which may or may not originally have been authored by a physician of King Amaury, who may or may not be identified with Abū Sulaymān Dāwūd).

8.2 The letter of Prester John

The great twelfth-century historian Otto of Freising recounts in his *Historia de duabus civitatibus* ("History of the two cities") a fascinating exchange with Hugh, bishop of Jabala (in modern-day Lebanon), whom he met in Rome in 1145.[583] The bishop told Otto about a Nestorian king and priest named John, who lived *in extremo Oriente* ("the far East"), said to be descended from the wise Magi of the gospels. This Prester John, as he has since become known, waged war against the Medes and Persians and wished to assist the church of Jerusalem in her defense against the pagans. Whatever Hugh's sources were, and regardless of whether there ever was a historical figure to which that of Prester John can ultimately be traced, a mysterious letter began to circulate some twenty years after Otto's encounter. This letter was directed to the Byzantine Emperor Manuel Komnenos, and claimed to have been sent by a *Presbiter Iohannes de Indya*

Albans and the *sortes* manuscripts," *Scriptorium* 66 (2012), pp. 55–87; *eadem*, "Of stars and men: Matthew Paris and the illustrations of MS Ashmole 30," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 76 (2013), pp. 139–177.

[582] *Historia Anglorum*, ed. F. Madden, Rerum Britannicarum Medii Aevi scriptores 44, vol. 1 (London, 1866), p. 163. See also the discussion in Huygens 1964, pp. 323–324.

[583] Otto of Freising, *Chronik, oder, Die Geschichte der zwei Staaten*, tr. A. Schmidt, ed. W. Lammers (Berlin, 1960), 7.33.

("Prester John from India").[584] The letter deals extensively with the fabulous wonders of the kingdom of Prester John, and would become the equivalent of an instant best-seller. There has been long and frequent debate about the authorship of the letter, but most scholars agree that the letter was written by someone from Western Europe, perhaps even by someone connected with the court of Frederick Barbarossa, such as Rainald of Dassel.[585] Others, however, have emphasized the role of the Latin East and of Hugh of Jabala in particular, suggesting instead that the letter be considered within the context of the Crusader States.[586] Given the inconclusive state of the evidence, the matter must remain a *non liquet*. Yet even if the letter was not composed in the East, the attempts to appear as such bear testimony to the phenomenon of a "medieval orientalism," and a conception of the East as exotic.

[584] The most recent edition is *Die "Epistola presbiteri Johannis" lateinisch und deutsch: Überlieferung, Textgeschichte, Rezeption und Übertragungen im Mittelalter: mit bisher unedierten Texten*, ed. B. Wagner (Tübingen, 2000). A full-length study of the letter of Prester John, including its origins and cultural context, can be found in W. Baum, *Die Verwandlungen des Mythos vom Reich des Priesterkönigs Johannes: Rom, Byzanz und die Christen des Orients im Mittelalter* (Klagenfurt, 1999). See also the useful collection of older studies in C.F. Beckingham and B. Hamilton (eds.), *Prester John, the Mongols, and the Ten Lost Tribes* (Aldershot, 1996).

[585] See especially B. Hamilton, "Prester John and the Three Kings of Cologne," in H. Mayr-Harting and R.I. Moore (eds.), *Studies in medieval history presented to R.H.C. Davis* (London, 1985), pp. 177–191 (repr. in Beckingham and Hamilton 1996, no. VII).

[586] Minervini 2001, pp. 639 and 642; Edoardo D'Angelo in RC, p. lxxxix.

Part II: Latin literature and Frankish culture in the East

Introduction: The problem of cultural identity in the Latin East

As the crusaders approached Antioch and began the siege in the winter of 1098, news of their arrival rapidly spread throughout the Levant. The Seljuk Sultanate in Baghdad in particular decided to keep a close watch on this unprecedented expedition, and sent out spies to learn more about the invading army's character (*mores*), military prowess (*virtus*), and goal (*propositum*).[1] Disguising themselves as Greeks, Armenians, and Syrians, the spies hoped to move undetected among the crusaders. They did so, William of Tyre writes, by mimicking their language (*verborum idioma*), behavior (*mores*), and appearance (*habitus*)—some of the constituent elements of what, in the mind of a twelfth-century author writing a Latin chronicle in Tyre, made up what we would call "culture." The Franks in turn decided to deceive the spying Turks by pretending to have a very different set of cultural norms and values, tricking them into believing that the Franks are cannibals who eat their captured enemies. The rumor, according to William, quickly makes its rounds even in the furthest reaches of the East (*Oriens*).

William's own retelling of the story was intended to spread, not just throughout the East, but also (and especially) to the West. From an abundance of earlier sources, both Latin and Byzantine, we know that at least one major instance of cannibalism did in fact take place in the crusader army that year, and quite likely before that as well.[2] William's discomfiture with this aspect of the First Crusade is not unique among chroniclers, but his is the most sophisticated act

[1] This anecdote is told by William of Tyre: WT, 4.23. On espionage and misinformation during the First Crusade, see S.B. Edgington, "Espionage and military intelligence during the First Crusade, 1095–99," in S. John and N. Morton (eds.), *Crusading and warfare in the Middle Ages: realities and representations. Essays in honour of John France* (Farnham, 2014), pp. 75–85.

[2] For an exhaustive overview of the sources and an insightful discussion, see J. Rubenstein, "Cannibals and crusaders," *French Historical Studies* 31:4 (2008), pp. 525–552.

of rewriting history.[3] Anyone who had encountered other accounts asserting that the crusaders committed acts of cannibalism would conclude, after reading William, that the crusader's ruse had proven so effective as to fool Western chroniclers. What I wish to highlight with this passage is the relationship between cultural identity and literary texts, and how literature can be used to shape perceptions, both of other cultures and one's own.

But let us first take a step back and survey the general scholarly tendencies on the subject of culture in the Crusader States. In 1883, Hans Prutz published a ground-breaking study that first attached any significance to the Crusader States in their own right, with particular attention to the cultural milieu therein.[4] Arguing that these states played a vital role in transmitting Arabic science and philosophy to the West (albeit in an altered form), Prutz drew a detailed picture of the culture of Outremer, paying attention not only to the social and economic circumstances, but also to the arts and the intellectual life. The body of evidence on which Prutz drew was largely based on textual materials, supplemented by his own observations of landscape and architecture during travels to Syria and Lebanon in 1874. He tried to show, through the texts, that a culture had developed in Outremer, distinct from Western Europe and influenced by surrounding Levantine cultures.

Prutz's line of enquiry did not find many followers, and more than a hundred and thirty years later, his treatment of the culture of Outremer is the fullest yet. Instead, the framework provided by Emmanuel Rey, a French scholar who published a study on the "Frankish colonies of Syria" in the same year, was to be decisive for crusade studies, both for the model it proposed

[3] Note, in a similar instance of whitewashing, that the cannibalism described in Josephus' *Jewish War*, often viewed as an earlier parallel to the cannibalism of the First Crusade, is omitted in Geoffrey's versification, even though his predecessor, Achard of Arrouaise, did include it (AP, ll. 715–740).

[4] Prutz, *Kulturgeschichte der Kreuzzüge* (Berlin, 1883). For discussions about the influence of Prutz on the field of crusade studies, see Kedar 1999.

and the opposition it elicited in the twentieth century.[5] For Rey, the idea of a Frankish colony provided a historical basis for the growing French presence in Syria. His survey of the intellectual culture of the Levant tried to paint a vivid picture of "indigenous" intellectualism—without distinguishing between local Christians and Muslims—resulting in profound intellectual developments that were transmitted by the Franks to the West. Although Prutz and Rey shared some of the same assumptions and conclusions concerning the transmission of Arabic science and philosophy to the West, Rey dispensed with any attempts to provide evidence for the Franks' assumed role as cultural and intellectual mediators, limiting himself to a few brief remarks on James of Vitry.[6]

As European imperialism was dismantled and became subject to criticism, the scholarly inquiries of Rey and others were abandoned; the essential colonial framework, however, persisted.[7] Instead of arguing for cultural and intellectual integration in the Frankish Levant, R.C. Smail, Joshua Prawer, and others depicted a system of cultural segregation in which a Frankish political urban minority governed a subjugated rural populace of indigenous Christians and Muslims.[8] In his influential restatement of the issues at stake, titled *The Latin kingdom of*

---

[5] E. Rey, *Les colonies Franques en Syrie aux XIIe et XIIIe siècles* (Genève, 1883). The first scholar to describe the Crusader States as colonies in some detail was W. Heyd, "Die Kolonien der römischen Kirche in den Kreuzfahrer-Staaten,"*Zeitschrift für historische Theologie* 16 (1856), pp. 258–328.

[6] Rey 1883, pp. 185–188.

[7] See L. Madelin, *L'Expansion française: de la Syrie au Rhin* (Paris, 1918); R. Grousset, *Histoire des croisades et du royaume latin de Jérusalem*, 3 vols. (Paris, 1934–1936); Cahen 1940, Runciman 1951–1954, and especially La Monte 1940–1941. The latter frames his discussion in a way that can at best be described as misconceived, claiming (p. 302), for instance, that "[t]he crusaders' states were the medieval equivalent of all the colonial empires of the present time; they were the America and Australia, the Asia and Africa of the Middle Ages."

[8] R.C. Smail, *Crusading warfare (1097–1193). A contribution to medieval military history* (Cambridge, 1956); J. Prawer, *The Latin kingdom of Jerusalem: European colonialism in the Middle Ages* (London, 1972). For a discussion of the problems involved in identifying the Crusader States as European colonies, see: "The crusading kingdom of Jerusalem—the first European colonial society?," in B.Z. Kedar (ed.), *The Horns of Ḥaṭṭīn* (Jerusalem, 1992), pp. 341–366. See for a more recent assessment of the issues R. Ellenblum, *Frankish rural settlement in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem* (Cambridge, 1998), pp. 4–38.

Jerusalem: European colonialism in the Middle Ages, Prawer depicted the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem as a European proto-colony without direct political links to a mother-country in Europe, and presented a picture of Frankish culture in the East as a severely limited, pale reflection of the intellectual and cultural developments in Europe. Judging from this bleak portrayal, one would conclude that, if the Franks of Outremer had an inner life, it was hardly worth knowing.[9]

Consequently, little effort was made to study the Latin literary sources that did survive, a situation that remained unchanged until the work of R.C. Schwinges, who shed new light on the intellectual background of William of Tyre and his history.[10] A decade later, a similar contribution to the life and work of Fulcher of Chartres was made by Verena Epp, who also performed a brief study outlining a number "nationalist tendencies" in the works of Fulcher of Chartres, Walter the Chancellor, and William of Tyre.[11] Although one could take issue with the use of terminology, her study was invaluable in demonstrating a set of shared cultural attitudes among Latin authors across Outremer.

Shortly afterward, Alan Murray wrote an essay that sought to move away from discussing the Latin East in such loaded terms as colonialism and nationalism; instead, he looked at the ways in which authors from the East themselves described their culture, and pointed out that they used particular literary and historical figures as rallying points in a process of self-identification,

[9] See Prawer's few bleak remarks on "intellectuals" at the end of his discussion of the arts in Outremer: Prawer 1972, p. 468.

[10] Schwinges 1977.

[11] Epp 1990; V. Epp, "Die Entstehung eines 'Nationalbewußtseins' in den Kreuzfahrerstaaten," *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 45 (1989), pp. 596–604. In spite of the use of terms such as "nationalism," this survey remains useful and deserves more attention than it has received.

thereby expanding on the approach taken by Epp.[12] He framed the discussion in terms of *ethnogenesis*, or the formation of peoples, and the literary claims thereof in a genre known as *origo gentis* ("origin of the people"), which he traced back to Cassiodorus and Jordanes.[13] Murray's approach, in turn, is not without its own set of problems. In adopting the framework of ethnogenesis, developed by Walter Pohl and other members of the Austrian School, Murray transposed a model used to analyze early medieval myths of kinship onto a set of texts that is not remotely comparable.[14] The large-scale migrations of entire peoples during Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages are a far cry from the unique expeditions we now call crusades, only a small number of whose participants decided to settle in the lands they conquered. More importantly, however, the crusades were not expeditions undertaken by a homogenous group, instead comprising participants from all over Europe.

More recently, in what could be considered an effort to remedy the lacuna that led to the discrepancies between the earlier models of Rey and Prawer, the tendency has been to regard the culture of the Crusader States in terms of multiculturalism and hybridity, and to study the extent

[12] Murray 1995. For a similar distancing from previous scholarship, see R. Hiestand, "*Nam qui fuimus Occidentales, nunc facti sumus Orientales*: Siedlung und Siedleridentität in den Kreuzfahrerstaaten," in C. Dipper and R. Hiestand (eds.), *Siedler-Identität. Neun Fallstudien von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart* (Frankfurt am Main, 1995), pp. 61–80. Murray's discussion of cultural "rallying points" can be compared with the enumerations in K. Elm, "Die Eroberung Jerusalems im Jahre 1099. Ihre Darstellung, Beurteilung und Deutung in den Quellen zur Geschichte des Ersten Kreuzzugs," in D. Bauer, K. Herbers, N. Jaspert (eds.), *Jerusalem im Hoch- und Spätmittelalter: Konflikte und Konfliktbewältigung—Vorstellungen und Vergegenwärtigungen* (Frankfurt am Main 2001), pp. 31–54; *idem*, "'O beatas idus ac prae ceteris gloriosas!' Darstelling und Deutung der Eroberung Jerusalems 1099 in den *Gesta Tancredi* des Raoul von Caen," in G. Thome and J. Holzhausen (eds.), *Es hat sich viel ereignet, Gutes wie Böses: lateinische Geschichtsschreibung der Spät- und Nachantike* (Munich, 2001), pp. 152–178.

[13] A more extensive study of *origo gentis* in the Frankish East (with particular emphasis on Antioch), and the role played therein by terms such as *Francus*, *Latinus*, and *Francigena* is currently underway by Timo Kirschberger of Göttingen University.

[14] See especially W. Pohl, *Die Awaren: ein Steppenvolk im Mitteleuropa, 567–822 n. Chr.* (Munich 1988). Murray has taken up the subject again more recently, and abandoned the *ethnogenesis* perspective in favor of a study comparing the Crusader States to European kingdoms and lordships: Murray 2011. Although the study discusses national identities during the crusade, the culture of Outremer is not treated.

of cultural (including literary and artistic) and linguistic borrowing.[15] While this approach has been extremely fruitful, a caveat should be made that we must account for a selection bias, given that, at least when it comes to the Latin literary works, the extant sources are not necessarily representative of what was produced in the Crusader States. Many of these sources survive precisely because of their interest to a Western medieval audience, which explains, for instance, why William of Tyre's history of Eastern rulers is now lost. More cultural borrowing must have taken place than the surviving Latin literature can provide evidence for. More comprehensive comparative study, taking into account the rich cultural diversity of the Levant, and particularly frequently neglected sources in non-Western languages, is certainly a desideratum.[16]

That is not the aim of the present study, however. My objective is not necessarily to uncover, in a positivistic sense, what the culture of the Frankish East "was actually like" (to paraphrase Leopold von Ranke).[17] Whereas Prutz, Prawer, and others sought to describe the

---

[15] J. Folda, "Crusader art in the twelfth century: reflections on Christian multiculturalism in the Levant," *Mediterranean Historical Review* 10 (1995), pp. 80–91; Kedar *passim*; K. Ciggaar, "Cultural identities in Antioch (969–1268): integration and disintegration—new texts and images," in M. Borgolte and B. Schneidmüller (eds.), *Hybride Kulturen im mittelalterlichen Europa: Vorträge und Workshops einer internationalen Frühlingsschule* (Berlin, 2010), pp. 105–122; A. Jotischky, "Ethnographic attitudes in the Crusader States: The Franks and the indigenous Orthodox people," in K. Ciggaar, A. Davids, and H. Teule (eds.), *East and West in the Crusader States: context - contacts - confrontations 3: Acta of the Congress held at Hernen Castle in September 2000* (Leuven, 2003), pp. 1–19. On linguistic aspects, see especially C. Aslanov, "Languages in contact in the Latin East: Acre and Cyprus," *Crusades* 1 (2002), pp. 155–181; *idem*, *Le français au Levant, jadis et naguère: à la recherche d'une langue perdue* (Paris, 2006); and *idem*, *Evidence of Francophony in Mediaeval Levant: decipherment and interpretation: MS Paris BnF copte 43* (Jerusalem, 2006); C. Tyerman, *God's war: a new history of the crusades* (Cambridge, Mass., 2006), pp. 225–240; MacEvitt 2008; A.V. Murray, "Franks and indigenous communities in Palestine and Syria (1099–1187): a hierarchical model of social interaction in the principalities of Outremer," in A. Classen (ed.), *East meets West in the Middle Ages and Early Modern times: transcultural experiences in the Premodern world* (Berlin, 2013), pp. 291–309. For a more comprehensive and methodological discussion, see B.Z. Kedar and C. Aslanov, "Problems in the study of trans-cultural borrowing in the Frankish Levant," in Borgolte and Schneidmüller 2010, pp. 277–285.

[16] Recent work by Andrew Jotischky in this regard is promising, especially "Pilgrimage, procession and ritual encounters between Christians and Muslims in the Crusader States," in K. Villads Jensen, H. Vogt, K. Salonen (eds.), *Cultural encounters during the crusades* (Odense, 2013), pp. 245–262. I await, moreover, Benjamin Kedar's forthcoming book that will address the broader cultural and intellectual dimensions of the kingdom of Jerusalem.

[17] On this quote, see P. Novick, *That noble dream: the 'objectivity question' and the American historical profession* (Cambridge, 1988), pp. 26–30, who argues that Ranke probably did not mean it as literally as generally assumed.

culture of Outremer, the artistic and literary output, the societal norms, its economy, and legislature, I intend to study how the texts themselves produce culture. I draw on the notion, as developed in cultural studies by Raymond Williams and others, of culture as a mode of generating meaning and ideas.[18] Rather than looking within a text to look for evidence of culture outside the text, I see the text itself as generating cultural meaning.

William of Tyre's tale of cultural mimicry reveals this concept in a remarkably clear manner: cultural identity is not a given but involves agency and performance. The performativity of culture as something that could be passed on through reports to others means that texts could possess a similar kind of cultural performativity: by formulating a set of notions of cultural selfhood, they do not describe but actively give shape to culture. In short, I am interested in how Latin literary works, as products by and for a literary and cultural elite, used and appropriated preexisting materials and developed strategies of their own for the purpose of constructing a Frankish cultural identity of the Levant. The literature from the Latin East provides a well-defined testing ground, in which we may be able to study how a medieval community used Latin literature to fashion a cultural identity within a very short time span.[19]

The texts under discussion, of course, are not treatises written with such purposes expressly in mind. A sermon may address the congregation by comparing its members to biblical personages, a pilgrim guide may associate a site with the classical past and call to mind events of the First Crusade, a poem may place a Frankish institution within a historical scope that elides Muslim history as well as the importance of a rival Frankish institution. Questions of cultural

---

[18] See the seminal work: R. Williams, *The Sociology of Culture* (Chicago, 1981), p. 208. For an excellent overview of the development of the concept of "culture," see F. Inglis, *Culture* (Cambridge, 2004), pp. 1–32.

[19] The Crusader States are particularly useful because they represent, to use the parlance of cultural theorists, "domains of difference." In other words, they are interstitial realms within which cultural values are negotiated. See H. Bhabha, *The location of culture* (London, 1994), pp. 1–18.

identity are often incidental, and frequently implied. This means that it is not very helpful to study what discursive terms were used by authors to frame what we would describe as "cultural identity": such explicit reflections are rarely applied reflexively to one's own culture, and more often to Others—hence why the culturally descriptive terms *mores* ("behavior") and *habitus* ("appearance") are used in William of Tyre's story above.

I propose therefore to extend and develop further some of Verena Epp and Alan Murray's lines of enquiry. Firstly, I would extend the discussion (which was limited to a few works of historiography) to include all works of Latin literature of the twelfth-century Crusader States, as discussed in the first part of this dissertation. Secondly, I would further develop their approach, not by merely being content to signal certain key figures or motifs, but by analyzing how the process of cultural construction and identification is constituted in these literary texts. Why do the motifs signaled by Epp, Murray, and others appear in these texts, what is their origin, and how are they developed over time?

In particular, I am interested in how the literary elite of the Latin East not only conceived of Frankish culture more generally, but also how institutions within the Crusader States sought to legitimize themselves. When I speak of "legitimation," I do not intend to imply that medieval authors were continuously anxious and insecure, and that legitimation was necessarily their only objective in writing. Rather, the phrase is shorthand to indicate one particular function of a text that consists in establishing and/or reinforcing a set of notions within a particular community. In a society in which access to reading and writing was more limited and largely beholden to an elite class, the potential force or *auctoritas* of any given text codifying such notions should not be underestimated.

Those who lived in the Crusader States saw themselves faced with a unique situation: there was no precedent for a Frankish king of Jerusalem, nor had there ever been a prince of Antioch, or had there been canons at the Dome of the Rock, which had newly been turned into a church called the *Templum Domini*. In a society where legal and political authority rested on the legitimacy provided by tradition, this was a troublesome state, and it did not take long for histories to be written or treatises to be composed that offered much-needed legitimation to the institutions from which they issued. What we will set out to do, is to consider all these surviving texts together—which, if at all, are usually treated separately from one another by scholars—and to regard them not as repositories of historical data for historians to draw on, but as constituting efforts to fashion a kind of cultural identity in the broader sense, and an institutional one (where this applies) in the narrower sense, where there had been none before. I mean this not necessarily in a concerted, ideologically-streamlined way, but I argue rather that the rhetorical strategies of the authors in question imply a set of assumptions, which we will try to expose and examine.

The concept of cultural memory and related notions may offer us a helpful theoretical framework in our study. This concept has its origins in the term "communal memory," which was coined by the French sociologist Maurice Halbwachs (1877–1945), a student of Émile Durkheim, and eventually came to be subsumed under the broader heading of "cultural memory," as theorized by Jan Assmann and others.[20] "Memory" in this sense is essentially a metaphor transferred from the individual cognitive process of remembering to a broader

[20] M. Halbwachs, *Les cadres sociaux de la mémoire* (Paris, 1925); *Idem*, *La topographie légendaire des Évangiles* (Paris, 1941); *Idem*, *La mémoire collective* (Paris, 1950); J. Assmann, "Kollektives Gedächtnis und kulturelle Identität," in J. Assmann and I. Hölscher (eds.), *Kultur und Gedächtnis* (Mainz, 1988), pp. 9–19; *Idem*, *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis: Schrift, Erinnerung und politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen* (Munich, 1992); J. Fentress and C. Wickham, *Social memory* (Oxford, 1992); J. Rodriguez and T. Fortier, *Cultural memory: resistance, faith & identity* (Austin, Tex., 2007); A. Erll and A. Nünning (eds.), *A companion to cultural memory studies* (Berlin/New York, 2010); J. Assman, *Cultural memory and early civilization: Writing, remembrance, and political imagination* (Cambridge, 2011).

community that uses the various mediums of text and art to define and reaffirm a cultural identity by referencing specific points in (perceived) history. The literary works from the Latin East can therefore be considered vehicles that transmit cultural memories—yet they are not value-neutral, for the selection and narrative presentation of such memories is determined by the author's agenda. Each text, therefore, reshapes and reconstitutes Frankish history and identity.[21]

To give structure to our study, we may begin by asking how the possibilities of Latin literature specifically, with its inherited baggage of classical and religious associations, were seized upon by authors writing in Outremer. The cultural dimensions discussed in chapters 2 and 3 are therefore, in a sense, temporal: how do authors present Frankish culture in relation to the classical and biblical past? The fourth and final chapter looks at the role of the perceived Frankish past, including the legend of Charlemagne, and moves from the temporal to the spatial, by studying how authors create constructs of East and West, and where they situate Outremer within these geographical and cultural constructs.

[21] See also the observation in A. Erll, "Cultural memory studies: an introduction," in Erll and Nünning 2008, pp. 1–15, at p. 7, that ". . . the past is not given, but must instead continually be re-constructed and re-presented."

2. Classical antiquity and the Latin East

> Wenn ich meinerseits und im voraus neue Vergleiche wagen und sagen darf, so möchte ich die lateinische Sprache im Mittelalter . . . den Blumen und Bäumen [vergleichen], die in fremdes Erdreich, unter einen der Heimat fernen, kälteren Himmel verpflanzt sind, viel von ihrer alten Natur einbüßen, aber trotzdem unter günstigen Umständen neue Farben und Formen hervorbringen . . .[1]

1. Introduction: medieval Latin literature and the classics

At first sight, a connection between classical antiquity and so quintessentially a medieval phenomenon as the Crusader States does not appear obvious to make, and one may well wonder with Tertullian what Athens has to do with Jerusalem. Indeed, why should classical literature play a role in the Crusader States? It is important to realize that, almost by definition, medieval Latin authors have always looked to classical antiquity: the use of the language itself represents an engagement with classical literature, history, and culture more broadly. For this reason, Latin was neither a living nor quite a dead language in the Middle Ages, inasmuch as it was a *Kunstsprache* that was adapted to suit practical needs and changing cultural contexts.

Grappling with the paradoxically protean and backward-looking nature that characterizes medieval Latin literature, some scholars resorted to outlandish comparisons and metaphors—the most famous being perhaps Ludwig Traube's comparison to a corpse, whose hair and nails continue to grow after death.[2] Taking issue with this unsavory depiction, Traube's student Paul Lehmann compared medieval Latin to repotted plants, speaking of "flowers and trees that have been transplanted into foreign soil, far away from their origin, under a colder sky; they lose much

[1] P. Lehmann, "Vom Leben des Lateinischen im Mittelalter," *Bayerische Blätter für das Gymnasialschulwesen* 65 (1929), pp. 65–82, repr. in *Erforschung des Mittelalters*, vol. 1 (Stuttgart, 1941), pp. 62–81.

[2] L. Traube, *Vorlesungen und Abhandlungen*, vol. 2 (Munich, 1911), p. 44. For a discussion of evaluations of medieval Latin in earlier scholarship, see J.M. Ziolkowski, "Towards a history of medieval Latin literature," in Mantello and Rigg 1996, pp. 505–536, at 506.

of their former nature, but in spite of this they produce, under the right circumstances, new colors and shapes."

It would not be a stretch to say that the Franks, Normans, and Provençals who settled in the Crusader States found themselves in a similar condition (albeit, perhaps, under a warmer clime), especially given that William of Tyre likens the newly-established Frankish society of Jerusalem to a *novella plantatio* ("new planting").[3] My point is that the issues at stake in determining how authors in the Crusader States conceived of their culture in relation to that of Europe are fundamentally not all that different from the problems involved in determining how medieval Latin literature more generally relates to classical culture. The study of crusader Latin literature is an important testing ground precisely because of this, the results of which have the potential to tell us much more about literary strategies of cultural self-definition more broadly in the Middle Ages. Just as the Franks continued to have cultural and political relations with Europe, so did the Latin works they produced maintain a connection with the classical past, most of all because of the way that Latin was taught in the Middle Ages by the reading of the classics as part of school curricula.[4]

Before proceeding, I should point out that the very notion of "classics" is problematic. The medieval understanding of the term, inasmuch as one may be allowed to generalize, was different from that of our own; as new texts became available and tastes changed over time, the

---

[3] WT, 9.5.3: *Regnavit autem anno uno, peccatis hominum id exigentibus ne diuturniore tanti principis solatio regni novella plantatio recrearetur et adversus ingruentes molestias reciperet consolationem.* For a similar passage, see 11.10.5: *Restabant enim adhuc in nostro littore quattuor rebelles, Beritum videlicet, Sydon, Tyrus et Ascalona, que nostrorum novelle plantationi multum oberant ad obtinendum incrementum.* See also the discussion of these passages in Epp 1989, p. 602. William seems to be using a metaphor that is indebted to the Psalms (144 (143):12): *Quorum filii sicut novellae plantationes in iuventute sua; filiae eorum compositae, circumornatae ut similitudo templi*.

[4] The notion of medieval Latin as *Traditionssprache* may be useful here, as propagated in R. Meister, "Mittellatein als Traditionssprache," in B. Bischoff and S. Brechter (eds.), *Liber floridus. Mittellateinische Studien* (St. Ottilien, 1950), pp. 1–9.

post-Renaissance canon of classical authors changed considerably.[5] The literary and cultural figures of authority, the *auctores*, that were included in medieval school curricula encompassed both "pagan" poets such as Virgil and Ovid, as well as Christian poets such as Sedulius or Prudentius, often featuring side by side without distinction. That is not to say, however, that medieval readers did not sense a tension between the values of the classical "pagan" and classical Christian authors, even if such sensibilities were inherited from patristic authors for whom such tension was more pressing and immediate.[6]

In spite of these tensions, and of late-antique attempts to replace classical literature with chastised, Christian equivalents (as propagated, for instance, in Augustine's *De doctrina Christiana*), classical literature maintained a powerful hold on medieval culture.[7] The written culture of antiquity was set up as a model of literary and artistic expression, and kings and emperors alike sought to associate themselves with classical conceptions of empire.

In the twelfth century the reception of classical culture reached a high point. As part of the general cultural revival of the long twelfth century, in which a self-conscious awareness of one's own time and culture in relation to that of antiquity forms one of the hallmarks of what has since been termed the "Twelfth-Century Renaissance," a renewed interest in antiquity arose, in

[5] See on this J. Ziolkowski, *Nota bene: reading classics and writing melodies in the early Middle Ages* (Turnhout, 2007), pp. 29–30. Seminal studies on medieval curricula remain: G. Glauche, *Schullektüre im Mittelalter. Entstehung und Wandlungen des Lektürekanons bis 1200 nach den Quellen dargestellt* (Munich, 1970); B. Munk Olsen, *I classici nel canone scolastico altomedievale* (Spoleto, 1991).

[6] On this topic, see the useful study of G.L. Ellspermann, *The attitude of the early Christian Latin writers toward pagan literature and learning* (PhD diss., Catholic University of America, 1949).

[7] A foundational and perhaps still the best treatment of the dynamic between classical culture, education, and medieval literature is that of E.R. Curtius, *Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter* (Bern, 1948), translated as *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, trans. W.R. Trask, Bollingen Series 36 (Princeton, 1973).

its history and culture.[8] A plethora of literary works devoted to classical themes was composed in this period, some of which made it into the school canon, such as the classicizing poems of Walter of Châtillon's *Alexandreis* or Joseph of Exeter's *De bello Troiano*, while in the same period such classically-themed vernacular works as the Old-Norse *Trojamanna-Saga* and Old French *Roman d'Eneas* were written.

While this phenomenon is well documented in the medieval West, to date there has been no attempt to study the reception of classical culture in the Latin literature of the Crusader States. As part of our larger study of literary culture of the Levant, this chapter will explore attitudes toward antiquity taken by authors of the Latin East, and what this tells us about how they viewed their own culture.

2. A SURVEY OF CLASSICAL LITERATURE IN THE LATIN EAST

Any study of cultural reception should begin by assessing the channels by which a culture would have been able to access another culture.[9] The selective availability of certain texts imposes a particular framework or lens through which a culture may be perceived. In our case, this means an overview of the classical texts available to medieval authors and readers more generally, and to those in the Latin East specifically. Although the reception of classical literature drew upon a variety of sources (both written and oral), which may not be a reflection of libraries of the Latin East, an overview of the evidence for these holdings will give an impression of literary tastes, of

[8] The scholarship on the Twelfth-Century Renaissance has by now assumed vast proportions; the best introduction is still Haskins 1927 and the essays in Benson, Constable, and Lanham 1982. A more recent overview with bibliography can be found in M. Otter, "Renaissances and revivals," in Hexter and Townsend 2012, pp. 535–552.

[9] The case for such an approach is eloquently made in P.L. Schmidt, "Rezeptionsgeschichte und die Überlieferungsgeschichte der klassischen lateinischen Literatur," in C. Leonardi and B. Munk Olsen (eds.), *The classical tradition in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance* (Spoleto, 1992), pp. 3–21.

the kinds of classical texts deemed suitable and important enough to read and copy. To date, no such overview exists, and while our evidence cannot provide a complete picture, it does provide conclusive evidence for the availability of certain texts.[10]

The catalogue of codices held by the community of canons of the church of Nazareth is a logical starting point. The catalogue, which dates to the end of the twelfth century and now resides in Erfurt, has been known for some time, though it has only recently received serious attention.[11] It lists a total of some 69 different works, several of which were available in multiple copies, but it has been noted that the library must have been more extensive than the catalogue leads us to believe.[12] Of these works, 43 are categorized as *de divinitate* ("pertaining to theology") and 26 *de gramatica* ("pertaining to language and literature").[13]

The selection of classical texts represents the tastes of contemporary continental cathedral libraries, with commonly-found school texts such as Persius, Sallust, Virgil, Lucan, Juvenal, and presumably the *Thebaid* and *Achilleid* of Statius (with at least one additional volume of the

[10] A similar overview of books available in thirteenth-century Outremer is provided in D. Jacoby, "Knightly values and class consciousness in the Crusader States of the Eastern Mediterranean," *Mediterranean Historical Review* 1 (1986), pp. 158–186.

[11] Erfurt, Stadtbücherei, MS Ampl. Q. 102. Modern catalogues describing the manuscript are: W. Schum, *Beschreibendes Verzeichniss der Amplonianischen Handschriften-Sammlung zu Erfurt* (Berlin, 1887), p. 361; T. Gottlieb, *Über mittelalterliche Bibliotheken* (Leipzig, 1890, repr. 1955), p. 154 n. 433; P. Lehmann, *Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge Deutschlands und der Schweiz*, vol. 2 (Munich, 1928), pp. 93–94, no. 198. The Nazareth catalogue was reprinted in Beddie 1933; see the corrections and remarks in Lehmann 1933. See also the discussions in Huygens 1964, pp.12–14; Minervini 1999, pp. 80–81; Tessera 2005; Kedar 2012.

[12] Kedar (2012, p. 48) pointed out that the manuscript containing the catalogue contains nine different works, only two of which are listed in the catalogue. One may assume, therefore, that whoever compiled the catalogue is likely to have overlooked other works as well. Huygens and Kedar both provide the number of volumes that the library possessed, coming to a grand tally of 102. The difficulty with this is that it is unclear in the catalogue where one volume ends and another begins, as not all of the works listed in the catalogue were contained in separate volumes. A good example of this problem are the entries *scintilarius* (a work by Bede) and the immediately following *pastoralis Gregorii*: both of these works are in fact contained in the codex that also has the catalogue.

[13] Different numbers can be found in Huygens (46:26) and Kedar (43:29), presumably resulting from a double count of some works; for example, I counted only once the gospels listed separately at the start of the catalogue and the later *textus iiii evangeliorum*.

Achilleid by itself).[14] There were also two volumes of Horace's poetry (supplied with glosses), although it is not specified whether this refers to the whole or only to parts of his corpus. The final classical poet is Ovid, whose *Epistulae ex Ponto*, *Heroides*, *Ars amatoria*, *Tristia*, and *Remedia amoris* were all represented—most in several copies.[15] As for classical prose, only Cicero's treatise *De amicitia* is listed. A number of texts dealing with the various liberal arts are also listed under the heading *De gramatica*, including unspecified works of Boethius and the grammarians Priscian and Donatus.[16] Finally, the catalogue lists, interspersed among the classical poets, the Christian Latin poets Prudentius, Sedulius, Prosper of Aquitaine, and Maximian.

Manuscripts known to have been produced in the Latin East, or which show signs of having been brought there for a period of time, offer another source of information for the availability of classical texts. These include a twelfth-century manuscript of Josephus' *Jewish War* in the translation of Ps.-Rufinus,[17] the copy of the Ps.-Ciceronian treatise *Rhetorica ad Herennium* that was made under the direction of Stephen of Antioch, probably in 1121,[18] as well as the codices, now in the Vatican Library, that bear a so-called *nota possessionis*, or mark of

[14] The phrase is *duo Stacii Achilleidos*, which could refer to one volume containing the two books of the *Achilleid*, or two volumes containing the *Achilleid* (Beddie 1933, p. 241).

[15] I am assuming that the item *duo Ovidii epistularum*, listed separately from *Ovidius de Ponto*, refers to the *Heroides*, although it is possible, as apparently interpreted by Huygens (1964, p. 14), that this represents merely another copy of the *Epistulae ex Ponto*. One may compare, however, the reference to *in epistolis* for Ovid's *Heroides* in the late eleventh-century Blaubeuren catalogue, in distinction from the item *de Ponto*: Glauche 1970, pp. 102–103.

[16] The latter is the final item in the catalogue; it was marked as illegible by Beddie, but recognized as *Donatuli* by Lehmann (1933, p. 484).

[17] Rome, BAV, MS lat. 2953; see *The Latin Josephus*, vol. 1, *The Antiquities: Books I–V*, ed. F. Blatt (Copenhagen, 1958), p. 95. The first folio of the manuscript contains specimens of Arabic writing which do not appear to make sense, and could therefore be *probationes pennae*.

[18] Milan, Bibl. Ambrosiana, MS E. 7 sup. See the discussion below in 2.3.

ownership, of the library of Sidon.[19] Six of these codices (and part of another codex) date to the twelfth century, and contain, among the numerous patristic, theological, homiletic, and exegetical texts, the *Excerpta Controversiarum* of Seneca the Elder.[20]

Indirect evidence may be sought among quotations of classical texts by authors known to have written in the Latin East. This evidence is less secure than that provided by catalogues and extant codices, since those who were trained in the West (the majority of our authors) may have quoted from memory. Furthermore, an isolated quotation from a given text may not necessarily mean that the author has read the text from which the passage was quoted, since anthologies and grammatical texts frequently served as storehouses of readily available quotations.[21] However, explicit references to large-scale quoting and excerpting of texts likely indicate that the author had the texts in question in front of him. A good example of this can be found in the third book of Fulcher's *Historia*, in which he identifies the source of his catalogue of animals of the Levant:

> Hoc autem, quod dixi tantillum, a Solino, exquisitore sagacissimo et dictatore expertissimo, prout valui, excerpsi.[22]

[19] For a description, see Tessera 2005, particularly pp. 413–414; A. Maier, "Die Handschriften der Ecclesia Sidonensis," *Manuscripta* 11 (1967), pp. 39–45; *eadem*, "Die Homiliare der 'Ecclesia Sidonensis,'" in *eadem*, Ausgehendes Mittelalter: gesammelte Aufsätze zur Geistesgeschichte des 14. Jahrhunderts, 3 vols. (1964–1977), vol. 1, pp. 289–292; *eadem*, "Noch einmal zu den Codices der 'Ecclesia Sidonensis,'" in *ibid.*, vol. 3, pp. 293–294.

[20] Rome, MS Vat. lat. 2220 (12th–13th c.). For a discussion of this manuscript, see J. Fohlen, "Un nouveau manuscrit de l'Eglise de Sidon à la Bibliothèque Vaticane (Vat. lat. 2220)," *Scriptorium* 38 (1984), pp. 302–304.

[21] See for this also the discussion on William of Tyre's use of classical literature in Edbury and Rowe 1988, pp. 32–34. I would dispute their contention, however, that lack of an attribution of a particular quotation implies less familiarity with the source; such is, in fact, often the practice among medieval Latin authors, who wrote for a literary coterie that was expected to recognize a clever allusion or apt quotation.

[22] FC, 3.49.17. Compare FC, 3.59.2. Similar quotations of Solinus occur in William of Tyre, e.g., 3.20.17–20. Solinus was an early third-century author of an encyclopedic work entitled *Collectanea rerum memorabilium* ("Collection of remarkable things") or *Polyhistor* ("Grand account"), who drew upon the works of Pliny the Elder and Pomponius Mela.

> This little bit that I have just spoken of I have excerpted, as best I could, from Solinus, an exceedingly insightful investigator and experienced author.

If the available evidence allows us to draw any general conclusions, it may be said that the Latin East in the twelfth century was no intellectual backwater.[23] Of the 21 principal authors to make up the twelfth-century school canon, as represented in the famous treatise by the German Benedictine monk Conrad of Hirsau (ca. 1075–1150), 15 are found in the catalogue of Nazareth.[24] Moreover, all of the classical authors in this list (with the exception of the Latin paraphrase of Homer's *Iliad*) are present: Cicero, Sallust, Lucan, Horace, Ovid, Juvenal, Persius, Statius, and Virgil—many of them in more than one copy. A closer comparison between the specific works mentioned by Conrad and the Nazareth holdings may yield further results. For instance, the fact that Conrad recommends, from among the vast corpus of Cicero's works, only the *De amicitia* and *De senectute* finds a parallel in the catalogue, as *De amicitia* is the only work of Cicero listed. On the other hand, one may contrast Conrad's attitude toward Ovid, among whose works only the *Fasti* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* are deemed suitable for a school audience—to the express exclusion of the *Metamorphoses* and the love poetry—with the catalogue of Nazareth, which contains not only the *Remedia amoris* but also the *Ars amatoria* (and perhaps the *Heroides*).

One may assume that the libraries of Nazareth and Sidon were not unique, and that similar holdings would have been available in Jerusalem, Bethlehem, Tyre, and Antioch, to say the least. Comparative study has shown that the holdings of Nazareth are in step with cathedral

[23] As opposed to the view of Christopher Tyerman in discussing the catalogue, who overlooks the significant number of classical texts listed. See Tyerman 2006, pp. 235–236.

[24] *Accessus ad auctores; Bernard d'Utrecht; Conrad d'Hirsau*, ed. R.B.C. Huygens (Leiden, 1970). For a translation and commentary, see *Medieval literary theory and criticism c.1100–c.1375: the commentary tradition*, ed. A.J. Minnis and A.B. Scott with D. Wallace (Oxford, 1991, rev. ed.), pp. 39–64. See also the discussion in Curtius 1973, p. 49.

libraries in Europe of the time, and even show a higher proportion of literary to theological texts than their counterparts.[25] In addition, the catalogue shows that there was traffic of manuscripts between institutions, as Augustine's *Retractationes* and Ps.-Augustine's *Enchiridion* were on lend to the cathedral library of Sidon. Furthermore, the fact that, especially among the literary texts, more than one copy was available (in the case of Prosper of Aquitaine, five copies), suggests their usage within a school context. Finally, the presence in Sidon of the Elder Seneca's *Excerpta Controversiarum* reflects tastes similar to Europe at the time, as this text saw a marked increase in popularity in the twelfth century.[26]

3. Excursus I: Stephen of Antioch and the copying of rhetorical texts

The manuscript now in the Bibliotheca Ambrosiana in Milan and bearing the shelf mark MS E. 7 sup. is an important witness to interest in copying classical texts in the Crusader States, and to Levantine intellectual activities more generally. It was copied in twelfth-century Antioch under the direction of Stephen of Antioch, the treasurer of the church of Antioch, as evidenced by the colophon at the end:

> Scribsit hunc rethoricorum librum [erasure of 3 or 4 letters][27] scriba Stephano. thesaurario antiochie. anno a passio(n)e d(omi)ni millesimo ce(n)tesimo uicesimo primo[28]

[25] Kedar 2012, pp. 48–50.

[26] See Munk Olsen 1991, pp. 89–90, who notes that 14 manuscripts of the *Excerpta Controversiarum* date to the twelfth century (with an additional 6 manuscripts containing extracts). On the textual transmission of this work, see M. Winterbottom, "The Elder Seneca," in L.D. Reynolds (ed.), *Texts and transmission: a survey of the Latin classics* (Oxford, 1983), pp. 356–357.

[27] Could this hide the name of Pancus, one of the two scribes mentioned in the *Regalis dispositio*, which was translated by Stephen of Antioch? The name could have been abbreviated as "Panc;" or "Panc9." For the colophon in the *Regalis dispositio*, see Burnett 2000, pp. 67–68.

[28] Milan, Bibl. Ambrosiana, MS E. 7 sup., f. 52r. The colophon is edited in R.W. Hunt, "Stephen of Antioch," *Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies* 2 (1950), pp. 172–3, and can also be found in Burnett 2000, pp. 9–10 (and see plate on p. 77). For the colophon and a brief discussion, see also F. Steffens, *Lateinische Paläographie: 125 Tafeln in Lichtdruck mit gegenüberstehender Transkription nebst Erläuterungen und einer systematischen Darstellung der Entwicklung der lateinischen Schrift* (Berlin, 1929), no. 83C and plate. The colophon has the unusual dating *a*

> ***, scribe to Stephen, treasurer of Antioch, wrote this book of the *Rhetorics* in the year 1121 since the Passion of the Lord.

The manuscript was therefore copied either in 1154, if one reckons from the death of Christ in 33, or in 1121, if one takes the dating as referring to the practice of beginning the year with Easter rather than Christmas. Although it is true that the colophon could have been copied along with the text by a later scribe, codicological and palaeographic features indicate a date of the twelfth century, so that the manuscript is most likely the one that was copied in Antioch.[29]

A peculiar feature in this manuscript, and in other texts and manuscripts associated with Stephen of Antioch, is the practice of alpha-numeric numbering—i.e., using letters of the alphabet rather than numbers, a practice Stephen may have adopted from Greek and/or Arabic.[30] In the manuscript of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, it has been noted that this method of numbering is used not only in the numbering of books, but also in counting the rhetorical figures occurring in book 4 (the letters are added in the margin by the same scribe who copied the main text).[31] It has gone unnoticed, however, that letters are also used to number the quires that make up the manuscript (also by the same hand of the main text). Intriguingly, the first letter that occurs (on folio 8v, the last folio of the first quire) is not ".a." as one would expect, but ".h." This means that seven quires originally made up this manuscript, which are now lost. If one assumes that all the quires making up the manuscript were prepared at the same time, and that therefore

---

passione domini but probably needs to be interpreted as reckoning from Christ's birth all the same, as suggested by Haskins (1927, p. 134); see also the discussion in Burnett 2000, pp. 67–69 with respect to a similar dating found in Stephen's *Regalis dispositio*, and Burnett's summary of his findings in Burnett 2006b.

[29] These include dry-point ruling, the use of the tironian note for *et* alongside the ampersand, large open lower lobe of g, and the occasional use of the so-called "e caudata."

[30] For further discussion, see Burnett 2000.

[31] This was first observed by R. Sabbadini, "Spogli Ambrosiani Latini," *Studi italiani de filologia classica* 11 (1903), pp. 165–388, at 272–276; see also Burnett 2000, pp. 63–64.

the missing quires feature the same number of folios per quire (8) and the same number of lines per folio (33), it is possible to estimate the approximate length of the text contained in the missing part: (8x2)x33x7=3696 lines.[32] Furthermore, if we assume that the same scribe who copied the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* also copied the text or texts preceding it, we can arrive at a more specific approximation by multiplying times the average number of words per line (about 9 words, including abbreviations), or roughly 33,264 words.

What text could this have been? If we consider the transmission of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, we discover that it was frequently copied together with Cicero's *De inventione*, often receiving the title *Rhetorica vetus* ("old rhetoric") in contradistinction to the *Rhetorica nova* ("new rhetoric") that was the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*.[33] This text contains 33,879 words and could very well have been the lost text copied in Antioch. This would add one further classical text to the list of those that were present in the twelfth-century Latin East.

4. Modernity vs. antiquity in the Latin East

A good place to begin our study of classical reception will be to look at statements made by authors from the Latin East that reflect explicitly on the relation between modernity and antiquity. Although authors' reflections on the interplay between inherited literary traditions and the products of their own age are found in abundance in classical Latin literature, not until Late

[32] The folios have been multiplied by two since they are written on both sides.

[33] See M. Winterbottom, "*De inventione*, and *ad Herennium*," in Reynolds 1983, pp. 98–100. The plural in the subscription (*hunc rhetoricorum librum*) cannot be used as evidence for the existence of multiple rhetorical texts in this manuscript, since it frequently occurs in titles of the *ad Herennium*, even when it occurs by itself. Presumably the noun *rhetorica* was construed as a neuter plural ("rhetorical topics"), rather than a feminine singular implying the noun *ars*. See for examples the exhaustive survey of eleventh- and twelfth-century manuscripts of Cicero in B. Munk Olsen, *L'étude des auteurs classiques latins aux XIe et XIIe siècles*, vol. 1 (Paris, 1982), pp. 135–320.

Antiquity was the neologism *modernus* formed to describe the latter.[34] In the period of renewed interest in classical culture of the twelfth century, the pitting of antiquity against modernity was a common literary trope that has become famous in the treatments of figures such as Hildebert of Lavardin, Bernard of Chartres, and John of Salisbury, whose general sentiment tends to be one of conservative pessimism and nostalgia for a golden age.[35]

Turning to the Latin East, we find similar reflections on modern and ancient culture, all occurring at prominent positions in prologues. It will be useful to discuss and compare these passages, beginning with Ralph of Caen's *Tancredus*:

> Debemus igitur summa ope niti et legere scripta et scribere legenda, quatinus, legendo vetera, scriptitando nova, hinc nos antiquitas egentes saciet, inde posteritatem saciati nutriamus egentem.[36]
>
> We ought to strive with every effort to read what has been written and to write what deserves to be read in order that, by reading ancient writings and by writing new ones, antiquity may satisfy us in our need, while we, having been satisfied, nourish posterity in its need.

Writing to his former schoolteacher Arnulf of Chocques, who instilled in him a love for the classics at an early age, Ralph indicates that he considers his own efforts to be on the same level as the classical literature he had read as a schoolboy in Caen, and clearly has hopes that his work

---

[34] Its first attested usage is by Pope Gelasius I (ca. 492–496): *Ad Rufinum et Aprilem episcopos*, ed. A. Thiel, *Epistolae Romanorum Pontificum Genuinae*, vol. 1 (Braunsberg, 1867), p. 389. Cassiodorus was the first to employ it in a literary context; see *Variae* 11.1.134.

[35] See Curtius 1973, tr. W.R. Trask, pp. 251–255, especially pp. 254–255: "The contrast between the 'modern' present and Pagan-Christian Antiquity was felt by no century so strongly as by the twelfth." A useful overview and critical discussion may be found in B. Stock, "Antiqui and moderni as 'giants' and 'dwarfs': a reflection of popular culture?," *Modern philology* 76 (1979), pp. 370–374; V. Epp, "Sicht der Antike und Gegenwartsbewußtsein in der mittellateinischen Dichtung des 11./12. Jahrhunderts," in H.-W. Goetz (ed.), *Hochmittelalterliches Geschichtsbewusstsein im Spiegel nichthistorischer Quellen* (Berlin, 1998), pp. 295–316; C.S. Jaeger, "Pessimism in the Twelfth-Century 'Renaissance,'" *Speculum* 78:4 (2003), pp. 1151–1183 (and see 1165–1166 for William of Tyre's positive assessment of the European masters with whom he studied); H.R. Jauss, "Modernity and literary tradition," *Critical inquiry* 31:2 (2005), pp. 329–364.

[36] RC, Prol. 1.6–9.

will one day become a "classic" in turn.[37] A learned reader such as Arnulf could not have failed to notice that these very words allude to the opening of Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae*: the call to read ancient texts, to absorb and rework them for the benefit of posterity is itself a play on an ancient text.[38] At once displaying his own cleverness and classical learning, Ralph demonstrates how classical literature can be appropriated for the purposes of modern literature. Similarly, when Ralph invokes the Holy Spirit as his muse in describing the siege of Antioch, he refers to himself as a *vates*, appropriating for himself the epic title of the prophet-poet in the classical tradition.[39] In the remainder of the Prologue, Ralph compares ancient poetic industry with modern slothfulness. The words are placed in the mouths of Bohemond and Tancred, but it is clear that they reflect the author's own sentiments:

> "Quoniam modernos segnicies perdit, cum priscis summa vatibus fuerit scribere voluptas. Et illi quidem adinventiones fabulosas ordiuntur, miliciae Christi victorias tacent hodierni: ignavum equidem pecus, et fucis astruendi!"[40]

> "How sloth ruins the modern generation, while for the ancient poets the greatest pleasure lay in composition! The ancient poets spoke only of fictional fables, but poets today ignore the victories of Christ's knights: slothful cattle, comparable to drones!"

In a maneuver typical of the time, Ralph bewails the paradox of modernity: antiquity possessed gifted poets eager to compose poetry, but did so only about pagan mythology; Ralph's age

[37] On Ralph's education at Caen under Arnulf, see Chapter 1, section 2.4.

[38] Sall., *Cat.* 1: *Omnis homines, qui sese student praestare ceteris animalibus, summa ope niti decet, ne vitam silentio transeant veluti pecora, quae natura prona atque ventri oboedientia finxit.*

[39] RC, 2470–2472.

[40] RC, Prol. 22–23. Cf. Virg., *G.* 4.168; *Aen*. 1.435.

possessed subject matter worthy to be put into verse, but lacked anyone willing to do so.[41] The *topos* of antiquity vs. modernity is a conceit intended to absolve Ralph from any accusation of pride for boldly arrogating to himself the lofty task of recording Tancred's deeds while at the same time drawing attention to that very fact. To further this goal, Ralph elsewhere in the Prologue coyly admits that his text "can hardly reach the heights of Virgil."[42]

A comparison of a different order appears in Walter the Chancellor's glum prologue to the second half of his history.[43] Although ancient historiographers described events that presented causes for both joy and sorrow, recent history is so tragic that it almost defies verbal and artistic expression.[44] Walter presents the calamity of the Battle of the Field of Blood in 1119 as a superlative tragedy, a history of which amounts to a *doloris dolorum ac totius infelicitatis elogium* ("account of sorrow of sorrows and utter misfortune"). As with Ralph, modernity presented subject matter unmatched by antiquity—but in this case it is unmatched in misery rather than glorious triumph. If Walter is by implication a more accomplished historiographer than his ancient counterparts for even attempting such an endeavor, it is but a small consolation.

Similar sentiments are found in William of Tyre, who had internalized many of the authors he read while studying the classics in Orléans. In the prologue to his unfinished twenty-third book, William despairs of recording the sorrowful events of recent history, which are so deplorable that they would be unfit as subject matter even for the proverbial bad poets Codrus

[41] For other examples, see J.M. Ziolkowski, "The Middle Ages," in C.W. Kallendorf (ed.) *et al*., *A companion to the classical tradition* (Malden, MA, etc., 2007), pp. 17–29.

[42] RC, Prol. 53–54: . . . *quippe cum haec vix Maronis pertingant vertices* . . .

[43] See the discussion and the quotation in Chapter 1, section 2.5.

[44] WC, 2 Prol. 1–2.

and Maevius mentioned in Virgil's *Eclogues*.[45] His hypothetical reader reminds him, however, that the ancient historiographers Livy and Josephus also faced such difficulties, yet dutifully described periods of joy and of sorrow alike:

> Sed quibus cordi est ut in eo, quod semel cepimus, nos continuemus proposito quique orant instantius ut regni Ierosolimorum status omnis, tam prosper quam adversus, posteritati nostra significetur opera, stimulos addunt, proponentes historiographorum disertissimos, Titum videlicet Romanorum non solum prospera, sed etiam adversa mandasse litteris, Iosephum quoque non solum que a Iudeis egregie gesta sunt, verum et que eis sunt ignominiose illata longis tractatibus publicasse.[46]

> But those whose concern it is that I continue the project that I have begun, and who beg me insistently to relate to posterity in my work the entire situation of the kingdom of Jerusalem, both the times of prosperity and adversity, increase their encouragements by pointing out that the most eloquent historiographer Livy had set down in writing not only the times of prosperity for the Romans but also those of adversity, and that Josephus, too, had published in his lengthy works not only the splendid deeds of the Jews, but also the dishonorable ones.

By explicitly referring to these authors as his forbears, William implies that his own work should, at the very least, be considered on the same level. His own activities as *historiographus* ("historiographer"), as he describes himself, are, in spite of the different time periods, not all that different from the *historiographi* Livy and Josephus.[47]

From this brief survey, it may be concluded that the range of attitudes toward classical culture and the relation between antiquity and modernity in the Latin East is varied and complex. Ralph considers that it is possible to rival antiquity and that modern writers have a duty to appropriate and transmit ancient learning to posterity. In Walter the Chancellor and William of

[45] WT, 23 prol. 4–16; Virg., *E*. 3.90, 5.11, 7.22, 7.26. For more on Maevius and Bavius, the other poet usually associated with bad verse, and the medieval tradition, see M.W. Herren, "Bavius and Maevius: 'Duo pessimi poetae sui temporis,'" in S. Echard and G.R. Wieland (eds.), *Anglo-Latin and its heritage: essays in honour of A.G. Rigg on his 64th birthday* (Turnhout, 2004), pp. 3–15.

[46] WT, 23 prol. 32–49.

[47] For William as a historiographer in the classical tradition, see Vessey 1973, pp. 433–455; T.M.S. Lehtonen, "By the help of God, because of our sins, and by chance: William of Tyre explains the crusades," in T.M.S. Lehtonen and K. Villads Jensen (eds.), *Medieval history writing and crusading ideology* (Helsinki, 2005), pp. 71–84.

Tyre there is a different approach. In the second book of his history, Walter deals, unlike Ralph, with a topic of defeat and tragedy instead of victory. Consequently, the measure for outdoing antiquity is overcoming muteness and inexpressibility in the face of such sadness. William, who saw the fortunes of the crusader kingdom turning, models his final prologue on that of Walter. His reflections are more firmly rooted in classical culture, however, with allusions to Virgil's *Eclogues* and the explicit mention of Livy and Josephus. At once showcasing his classical erudition and the ancient pedigree of his historiographical methodology, ancient historiography is portrayed as a source of solace for William.

5. Excursus II: Monuments of antiquity in the Levant

Reflections on the relation between antiquity and the modern age were not confined to comparisons between ancient and contemporary literature, but were frequently brought out by the surrounding landscape. For someone living in the twelfth century, the contrast between antiquity and modernity would have been most evident and tangible in the monuments left behind by the ancient Greeks and Romans that had since fallen into ruin. The appreciation of ancient ruins as reminders of bygone glory is often considered to be a crucial component of what is termed twelfth-century humanism, and scholars usually turn to Hildebert, bishop of Le Mans, and to his celebrated "Rome epigrams" as encapsulating these sentiments most eloquently.[48] In these poems, Hildebert reflects on the magnificence of ancient workmanship, which was such that the now dilapidated ruins cannot be rebuilt by modern hands. Ultimately, he considers that

[48] Hildebert of Lavardin, *Carmina minora*, ed. A.B. Scott, Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana (Munich, 2001), nos. 36 and 38. For a discussion, see See C. Witke, "Rome as 'region of difference' in the poetry of Hildebert of Lavardin," in A.S. Bernardo and S. Levin (eds.), *The classics in the Middle Ages: papers of the Twentieth Annual Conference of the Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies* (Binghamton, N.Y., 1990), pp. 403–411.

the advent of Christianity brought glorious Rome to its knees, and as it embraced celestial truth, its earthly glory faded. But not only Europe witnessed literary appreciation of the cultural grandeur of antiquity and its ruins in this period. For the crusaders who set foot in Palestine, Lebanon, and Syria, the Levant was almost as much a Holy Land as it was a place replete with Graeco-Roman history. At every turn they would have found remnants of the classical past: from the Roman ruins at Jarash in modern-day Jordan, to the spolia incorporated into churches and mosques in Jerusalem, to the ancient foundations of Antioch and Latakia in Syria. The words of Ralph of Caen are illustrative in this regard, when he describes the siege of Latakia:

> Urbs ea, sicut hodie ex ruinis ipsius deprehendere est, quondam nobilis, ecclesias, populum, opes, turres, palacia, theatra et huiusmodi, quae habent aliae, inter alias cuncta habuit preclara. Excipio Antiochiam, nulla per circuitum urbs tanta priscae nobilitatis reservat insignia: columnarum ordo multiplex, aquae per abrupta ductus, turrium ad astra eductio, effigies per compita excubantes omnia. Preciosae ars et materia, de preterita presenti, de integra dirutae, de populosa desertae testimonium perhibent, utpote post tot soles, post tot grandines, opus adhuc insigne . . .[49]

> That city, as may even today be grasped from its ruins, was once noble among other [cities], possessing in splendor churches, inhabitants, riches, towers, palaces, theaters, and all such things as the other cities had. I except Antioch, for no city all around still holds such evidence of its ancient nobility: multiple rows of columns, steep aqueducts, lofty heights of towers reaching to the stars, statues that keep watch over every crossroads. The precious artistry and materials bear witness of a previous [city] to the present one, of an intact city to the dilapidated one, of a heavily populated city to the deserted one—given that, after so many suns, so many hailstorms, it remains a remarkable structure.

The awe expressed for the ancient city is palpable, while Ralph—in much the same way as his contemporary Hildebert of Le Mans—clearly relishes the rhetorical opportunities afforded by a studied comparison between ancient glory and modern ruin. A similar kind of admiration—though with markedly less rhetorical embellishment—is found in Fulcher of Chartres. In the third book of his history he describes Baldwin II's efforts to find suitable locations for outposts

[49] RC, 4085–4096.

to defend the city. One of the places under consideration was the by now abandoned site of the ancient city of Jarash:

> Iarras nominant hoc castrum regionis incolae, quod intra civitatem quandam mirabiliter et gloriose situ forti antiquitus fundatum, lapidibus magnis et quadris illic erectum erat. Ubi autem comperit rex non sine gravitate magna obtineri nec sine difficultate gente et alimentis, ut oporteret, posse muniri, iussit illud dirui et omnes ad sua regredi. Haec olim urbs insignis fuit in Arabia, Gerasa nominata, monti Galaad adiuncta, in tribu Manasse instituta.[50]

> The local inhabitants call this fort Jarash, which was established in antiquity within a certain city on a fortified spot in a wondrous and triumphant manner, constructed out of large square rocks. When the king [Baldwin II] found out that it could not be held without much trouble, nor that it could be fortified easily without personnel and supplies, he ordered it to be razed and for all to return home. This was once a famous city in Arabia, called Gerasa, bordering on the mountain range of Gilead, and within the Tribe of Manasseh.

Fulcher clearly admires the ancient workmanship of Jarash, but matter-of-factly relates how parts of it were brought into further ruin, so as to render the site unusable to the enemy forces. Given that the site was largely uninhabited, there was no modern counterpart that would allow Fulcher to wax poetic in the way that Ralph does; instead, Fulcher integrates the ancient city within biblical topography.

William of Tyre makes similar remarks to those of Ralph and Fulcher when he describes Gaza, which the Franks were considering as a military outpost:

> Fuerat autem eadem Gaza, civitas antiquissima, una de quinque urbibus Philistiim, edificiis preclara, cuius antique nobilitatis in ecclesiis et amplis domibus, licet dirutis, in marmore et magnis lapidibus, in multitudine cisternarum, puteorum quoque aquarum viventium, multa et grandia exstabant argumenta.[51]

> That same Gaza, a most ancient city, was one of the five cities of the Philistines; it was splendid on account of its buildings, and many great signs of its ancient nobility remain in the churches and large houses,

[50] FC, 3.10.4–5.

[51] WT, 17.12.16–21.

> though they are now in ruins, in the marble and large blocks of stone, in the great many cisterns, wells, and flowing waters.

Here, too, the extant ruins bore witness to the city's dignified antiquity, remarkable both for the large size of the stones used in its construction (as in Fulcher), and for the extensive waterworks (as in Ralph). The Franks quickly realize, however, that they would not be able to rebuild the existing structure:

> Videntes autem nostri quod non satis expediret nec fortasse presentis temporis vires sufficerent ut tota reformaretur, partem predicti collis occupant et iactis ad congruam altitudinem fundamentis opus muro insigne et turribus edificant et in brevi, opitulante domino, consummant feliciter, consummatum etiam et partibus suis absolutum de communi consilio fratribus militie Templi custodiendum et perpetuo cum universa adiacente regione possidendum committunt.

> When our men saw that [the city] was not quite suitable but that the strength of our present time would be insufficient to completely rebuild it, they occupied a part of the aforementioned hill and, laying down foundations to the proper height, they built a construction remarkable for its walls and towers, favorably completing it, with God's aid, in a short time; by consensus they entrusted the completed work, though it had been done in their lands, to be guarded by the brothers of the Knighthood of the Temple, and to be owned in perpetuity along with the entire adjacent area.

William creates the binary opposition of "noble antiquity" and "present time"; although the Franks were unable to rebuild the ruins of the ancient city, still they managed to lay down impressive defensive works in a short amount of time. There is a nostalgia for the classical past, and if the present time is to be accorded any praise, it is only because of God's favor (*opitulante domino*), bestowed upon the current age, and upon His chosen people.[52]

[52] See for this concept Chapter 3, section 3 below.

6. Mapping classical myth onto the Holy Land

In describing the coastal city of Jaffa, William of Tyre praises it as the oldest city on earth, quoting as his authority the venerable compiler Solinus, who claimed that a rock in Jaffa's harbor bore the antediluvian marks of the chains with which Andromeda was tied before being rescued by Perseus, and that the skeletal remains of the monster slain by Perseus were recovered by the Roman aedile Marcus Scaurus.[53] The connection with the myth of Andromeda is confirmed, William helpfully adds, by Jerome (who, however, in the quotation given by William, qualifies the story as one of the "fables of poets").[54] The point is that classical culture was not merely a rival to the modern age, but shaped an intellectual framework by providing a rich font of classical lore and mythology. Classical mythology in particular is perhaps the most enduring and widespread part of the ancient cultural legacy, providing authors and artists alike with ready-made subject matter with which their audience could be counted on to be familiar.[55]

But how did a medieval audience gain access to such tales? Apart from the classical poetry of the likes of Virgil, Horace, Ovid (especially the *Metamorphoses*), and Statius, a medieval reader would have found ancient mythological lore in Pliny the Elder and his compiler Solinus, in Isidore's *Etymologies*, as well as in scholarly exegesis on the poets in the form of commentaries and glosses, most notably Servius' commentary of Virgil's works.[56] The ancient

---

[53] WT, 8.9.6–15, quoting Solinus, *De mirabilibus mundi* 34.1–3 (=Pliny the Elder, *Naturalis historia* 9.11).

[54] WT, 8.9.17–19: *Idipsum et Ieronimus in Epitafio sancte Paule testatur his verbis: "Vidit et Ioppen fugientis portum Ione et, ut aliquid perstringam de fabulis poetarum, religate ad saxum Andromede spectatricem."* William quotes from *Ep*. 108.8.2.

[55] An excellent discussion of medieval attitudes toward and appropriation of classical myth is still that of H.J. Westra, "The allegorical interpretation of myth," in in A. Welkenhuysen, H. Braet, W. Verbeke (eds.), *Mediaeval antiquity* (Leuven, 1995), pp. 277–291.

[56] A discussion of mythological sources in early medieval insular texts can be found in M.W. Herren, "Graeco-Roman mythology in Anglo-Saxon England, 670–800," *Anglo-Saxon England* 27 (1998), pp. 87–103; much of the discussion is in fact relevant for greater medieval Europe, both geographically and chronologically.

mythological compendium of Hyginus was another important source, as was the late-antique collection of *Mythologies* by Fulgentius, and its medieval offshoots known as the Vatican Mythographers. Finally, patristic works such as Augustine's *De civitate Dei* and Orosius' *Historia adversus paganos*, which were key sources for ancient history, also furnished medieval readers with mythological learning. Moreover, (Ps.-)Theodulus' *Eclogue*, a school text dating to the ninth or tenth century, offered a reinterpretation of classical myths as distortions of Biblical figures and episodes.[57] Of these works, we know that Isidore's *Etymologies* was available in the library of the church of Nazareth, as was Virgil's *Aeneid*, and several glossed copies of the works of Statius and Horace.[58]

In the extant works from the Latin East, there is not much in the way of reflections on the nature of such classical mythology, which, if interpreted literally, would almost certainly have clashed with the religious views of a Christian Frank. An exception is found, however, in Achard of Arrouaise, who opens his poem on the *Templum Domini* with a rejection of classical poetry and the pagan values their mythological subject matter espoused:

Bella quidam poetarum descripserunt hominum,
Alii terrarum situs, maris atque fluminum,
Laudaverunt deos suos, opus quidem manuum,
Deum verum ignorantes, creatorem omnium.
Veritati preferebant fabulas, mendacium
Ideoque meruerunt inferni supplicium.
Nos autem illuminati dono sancti spiritus
Originalisque culpe liberati nexibus
Redemptori nostro laudes, deo vero, canimus,
Eius donis ut possimus perfrui celestibus.
Genite patris eterni cum sancto spiramine,

[57] *Theoduli Ecloga*, ed. J. Osternacher (Urfahr, 1902). See also the useful discussion on the sources used by (Ps.-)Theodulus: R.P.H. Green, "The genesis of a medieval textbook: the models and sources of the 'Ecloga Theoduli,'" *Viator* 13 (1982), pp. 49–106.

[58] Beddie 1933, p. 241.

Illustra cor servi tui claritatis lumine![59]

> Some poets have described the battles of men, others have made descriptions of lands, sea, and rivers, others praised their gods, though they were made by the hands of men, while they were ignorant of the true God, creator of all. They preferred fables and falsehood to truth, and therefore they deserved infernal punishment. But we, illumined by the gift of the Holy Spirit and freed from the bonds of Original Sin, sing praises to our Redeemer, the true God, so that we might enjoy in perpetuity his heavenly gifts. Son of the eternal Father, together with the Holy Spirit, illumine the heart of your servant with the light of your brilliance!

In opposition to the ancient poets, who—as in Ralph of Caen—are depicted as "preferring fables and lies to truth," Achard calls on the Holy Trinity to inspire him instead of the Muse of classical tradition.[60] Unlike Ralph, however, Achard expresses not the slightest hint of wistful nostalgia for antiquity or admiration for the classical legacy. The focus of Achard's comparison of the two traditions is religious rather than artistic, leading to an unequivocal condemnation of the pagan poets as deserving of infernal punishment.

In spite of these objections, authors of the Latin East made abundant use of classical literature as source materials, and even incorporated episodes of classical mythology within historical discussions. Fulcher of Chartres, for instance, claims that "when Gideon was a Judge in Israel, at that time Tyre was founded, a little before the time of Hercules," cites Orosius as an authority for the claim that Carthage was founded 70 years before Rome by Dido, and explains that Phoenicia was named after Phoenix, the brother of Cadmus.[61] Finally, Fulcher gives a lengthy catalogue of fabulous beasts, which he derived from Solinus, and follows it with a

[59] AP, 1–12.

[60] AP, 5, 11–12; RC, Prol. 23–25.

[61] FC, 3.29.4, 30.6, 30.8; Or., *Historia adversum paganos* 4.22.4., 4.23.6, 4.6.1, 4.23.1. This Phoenix is not to be confused with the homonymous mythical bird.

discussion of various types of snakes from India, based on a spurious but popular letter of Alexander the Great to Aristotle.[62] He ends the discussion with a quote from the letter:

> "Non crederem cuiquam tot esse prodigia, nisi sumpta ipse oculis meis ponderavissem." Vere rex iste vir fuit omnino magnificus et in negotiis suis sagax et circumspectus, et vigens viguit et potens potuit, non ut pluma volitans nec stipula fluitans.[63]
>
> "I would not believe anyone [claiming] that there are so many wonders, if I had not considered them after seeing them with my own eyes." Truly he [i.e., Alexander] was a magnificent king, wise and careful in his dealings, exceedingly powerful and capable, not like a feather that floats or a piece of chaff that glides.

For Fulcher, all of these elements existed on the same level. As a Frankish writer who had been transplanted to Jerusalem, making sense of the world and the events that took place by writing a history in Latin, he turned to those sources that would have been familiar to a medieval author and that could provide information that was relevant in some way to the East—even if it meant going as far afield in his reading as India. Fulcher's fulsome praise of Alexander the Great should be interpreted in tandem with Ralph of Caen's praise of Baldwin of Boulogne as surpassing Alexander: the implicit claim being that Frankish rule in the Latin East is on a par with that most famous ruler of the Eastern lands.[64] In the case of Fulcher, the claim may even be extended to imply that he was the Aristotle to Baldwin's Alexander.

In his pilgrim guide, Rorgo Fretellus displays a similar lack of distinction between his source materials as we found in Fulcher. So, for example, in his description of Tyre:

---

[62] For a discussion of these passages, see Manitius, vol. 3, p. 429.

[63] FC, 3.60.9. On the pseudepigraphical letter of Alexander, see M. Feldbusch, *Der Brief Alexanders an Aristoteles über die Wunder Indiens* (Meisenheim am Glan, 1976). For a more detailed discussion about the textual tradition of this text, see E. Hanetseder, "Der angebliche Brief Alexanders an Aristoteles über die Wunder Indiens: eine sprachliche Untersuchung der Fassung in der bamberger Handschrift," *Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi* 52 (1994), pp. 167–200.

[64] RC, 1142–1145.

> De Tyro rex Appollonius regnante Antioche Antiocho. Rex et Yram regnante Salomone Iherusalem. Tyrum expugnavit magnus Alexander, terram muro continuans. Que et mari tunc temporis ambiebatur. Tyrum beate memorie patriarcha Warmundus Domini preeunte gratia viriliter tempore Francorum terra marique Veneticorum auxilio obsedit et cepit, regnum inde David sublimans et accrescens . . . Sexto miliario ab Sarphen Sydon, ex qua Dido que Cartaginem construxit in Affricam.[65]

> King Apollonius was from Tyre, in the time when Antiochus ruled in Antioch. So also was King Hiram, when Solomon ruled Jerusalem. Alexander the Great conquered Tyre, and surrounded the land with a wall, which at that time also extended up to the sea. With the grace of God preceding him, Patriarch Warmund, of blessed memory, bravely besieged and captured Tyre by land and sea in the time of the Franks with the aid of the Venetians. From there the kingdom of David rose on high and grew . . . At the sixth milestone from Sarphen lies Sidon, where Dido came from, who built Carthage in Africa.

In one full sweep, Rorgo combines Josephus on Apollonius and Hiram, the Bible, Virgil, and recent Frankish history into a multifaceted mosaic. When Rorgo turns to more recent history, there is a sense of cultural identification: Patriarch Warmund is referred to as "of blessed memory," indicating that the author is writing within a context where the name would have held a particular significance; moreover, the events of the capture of Tyre in 1124 are referred to as having taken place in the "age of the Franks" (*tempore Francorum*), as opposed to the bygone classical and biblical eras.

Like Rorgo Fretellus, William of Tyre also has recourse to ancient mythology in his geographical descriptions.[66] In the *ekphrasis* of Tyre, William offers a considerably more extensive description than that of Fulcher:

> Ex hac urbe, si ad veteres recurramus historias, Agenor rex fuit et filii eius Europa, Cathmus et Phenix, a quorum altero tota regio ut Phenicis diceretur nomen accepit, alter vero, Thebane conditor urbis et

[65] RF, 26.

[66] For William's descriptions of cities in their literary and rhetorical context, see W. Giese, "Stadt- und Herrscherbeschreibungen bei Wilhelm von Tyrus," *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 34 (1978), pp. 381–409.

> Grecarum inventor litterarum, celebrem posteris de se reliquit memoriam, tercia vero, eiusdem regis filia, orbis terrarum parti tercie nomen dedit ut Europa diceretur.[67]
>
> From this city, if we turn to the ancient histories, was King Agenor and his children Europa, Cadmus, and Phoenix; the entire region took its name from one of them, so that it was called "Phoenicia," another was the founder of the city of Thebes and the inventor of the Greek alphabet, leaving behind a famous legacy to posterity; the third, the daughter of the same king, gave her name to the third part of the world, so that it was called "Europe."

After proceeding to describe how the first writing system was invented by the citizens of Tyre, William supports his claims with authority:

> Id et veterum habent historie et Belli Civilis egregius prosecutor Lucanus designat. . .
>
> This is what the histories of the ancients contain, and what Lucan, excellent author of the *Bellum Civile*, indicates. . .

William then quotes the relevant passage from Lucan—which, however, is also to be found in a passage of Isidore's *Etymologies* dealing with this very topic.[68] The fact that William neglects to mention Isidore as his source, referring instead to unspecified "ancient histories," is significant: clearly there was a need for the authoritative aura of hoary antiquity.[69] Moreover, these episodes of what, to William, would have been "pagan" mythology are treated as historical fact.

A similar attitude is found earlier, when William discusses the origins of Tarsus. Josephus had asserted that the founder was Tharsis, mentioned in Genesis as one of the sons of

[67] WT, 13.1.9–15.

[68] WT, 13.1.23–24, quoting Lucan 3.220–221. Isid., *Etym*. 1.3.5.

[69] See also the comments on this passage in Edbury and Rowe 1988, p. 33.

Javan, son of Japheth; Solinus, on the other hand, had claimed that Perseus, son of Danaë, was its founder.[70] Always the arbiter, William rules a compromise:

> Et potest tamen utrumque verum esse, et quod Tarsis primus eam fundaverit, et quod postmodum eam reparaverit vel ampliaverit Perseus.[71]
>
> And yet it is possible for both of these things to be true: both that Tharsis first founded it, and that afterward Perseus rebuilt and expanded it.

Rather than outright rejecting Solinus' suggestion as the product of pagan mythology, William gives it due consideration and deems it possible, if not plausible. He carefully avoids, however, any reference to Perseus' father Zeus, as this would put William in a difficult position. Similarly, when he referred to Europa, William did not specify the details of her story, instead presenting her and her siblings in a historicized manner.

In some instances, however, William denounces elements of classical mythology as "fables," as in his *ekphrasis* of Antioch. Part of his description of the city includes a discussion of Mount Casius (mod. Mount 'Aqra' on the Syrian-Turkish border), then also known as Mount Parlier:

> Hunc [montem] quidam Parnasum reputant, Bacco dedicatum et Apollini; quorum opinioni suffragari videtur fons Dafnidis, quem quidam Castalium reputant, iuxta veterum tenorem fabularum Musis sacrum et ginnasiis celebrem philosophorum, qui ad radices eiusdem montis, in eo loco qui dicitur Scala Boamundi, iuxta urbem predictam habere dicitur exordium. Sed a vero secus est hec opinio, nam Aonie regionis, que pars est Thessalie, Parnasum constat esse promuntorium, secundum quod Naso in primo Metamorphoseos describit ita . . .[72]

[70] Josephus, *Ant. Iud.* 1.6.1; Gen 10:2–4; Solinus, *Mirabilia* 38.3–4.

[71] WT, 3.20.20–23.

[72] WT, 4.10.21–29. Compare WT, 4.10.35.3.

> This mountain some consider to be Parnassus, dedicated to Bacchus and Apollo; their view seems to be supported by the Spring of Daphne, which some believe to be the Castalian Spring, sacred to the Muses according to the ancient fables and famous for its schools of philosophers. This spring, which is at the foot of this mountain, in the place called Bohemond's Staircase, is said to have its source right by the aforementioned city. But this view is beside the truth, for it is fact that Parnassus is a promontory of the region of Aonia, a part of Thessalia, in accordance with what Ovid writes in the first book of the *Metamorphoses* . . .

The mountain was an ancient cultic site, known as Ṣaphon and dedicated to the god Baal of the Canaanites. Earlier, the Hittites had proclaimed the mountain to be the residence of their weather-god, as had others before them, who had called it Mount Hazzi, whence the Greeks called it Mount Kasios. Kassiopeia may be related to the Greek version of this name, who was the mother of Andromeda—the very same hapless princess, as we have seen, who was exposed to the monster at Jaffa.[73] Although William challenges the notion of the existence of the Muses by qualifying his sources as "fables," he admits a core historical truth, taking issue only with the identification of Parnassus with Mount Casius because of a passage in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*—of all texts.[74] Moreover, as Rorgo Fretellus had done before him, William juxtaposes the Frankish present with the ancient past, conspicuously avoiding the intermediate period, both of Byzantine and of Turkish rule. Mount Casius was renowned for the fifth-century monastery of St. Barlaam, while the sixth-century St. Symeon performed his renowned feats of asceticism atop a pillar there—but all this goes unmentioned by William. Antiquity was William's frame of reference and model, even if its religious values clashed with his own, as in the remainder of his discussion of the spring at the foot of the mountain:

> Fons autem supradictus Dafnis dicitur et Castalius, ubi fanum olim fuisse dicitur Apollini dedicatum, quod gentilis supersticio frequentare consueverat ut inde reportaret oracula et super ambiguis questionibus

[73] For an overview of the ancient period, see R.L. Fox, *Travelling heroes: Greeks and their myths in the epic age of Homer* (London, 2008), pp. 255–264.

[74] Ov., *Met*. 1.313–317.

> responsa . . . Et licet fons predictus Castalius dicatur, non tamen intelligendus est esse ille Castalius qui alio nomine Pegaseus, Caballinus et Aganippe dicitur: ille enim in predicta esse legitur Aonia, iuxta verbum Solini . . .[75]
>
> The aforementioned Spring of Daphne is also called the Castalian Spring, where once is said to have been a temple dedicated to Apollo, which pagan superstition used to frequent in order to bring back oracles and answers to unclear questions . . . and although the aforementioned spring is said to be the Castalian Spring, one should not understand this to be the Castalian Spring also known by the names of the Spring of Pegasus, the Horse Spring, and Aganippe; for one reads that that spring is in the aforementioned Aonia, in accordance with a passage from Solinus . . .

William recognizes that the cult of Apollo, established near Antioch by Seleucus I Nicator, was not the original one, which was located in Delphi. He does this by using ancient sources, including the poetry of Ovid. Although he denounces "pagan superstition," he refers to the proponents of said superstition as authorities in identifying the location of the sites under discussion. Thus classical poetry was a way for William to understand the landscape of the Latin East. Even when dealing with the origins of the Seljuk Turks, the chief enemies of the Franks of Outremer, William finds a way to tie them into an overarching conception of history that is founded on classical antiquity:

> Dicti autem sunt, prout ipsi asserunt idque ipsum etiam in nostris continetur cronicis, a quodam eorum duce Turco nomine, sub quo post excidium Troianum ad regiones Yperboreas se contulerunt, ubi armorum usu relicto procurandis gregibus et armentis vacabant, gens inculta penitus et certam non habens sedem.[76]
>
> They are named after a certain leader of theirs called Turcus—so they themselves claim, just as it is found in our chronicle.[77] Under his leadership they went to northern lands after the fall of Troy, where they abandoned the practice of arms and devoted themselves to herding flocks and herds, being an entirely uncivilized people without a fixed abode.

[75] WT, 4.10.63–66.

[76] WT, 1.7.9–14. This passage occurs only in one manuscript (V, ca. 1200), used by Robert Huygens in his edition, and therefore is absent from earlier editions and translations. See the discussion in Murray 2001.

[77] William presumably refers to his now lost *Historia de Orientalibus principibus*.

As with Fulcher of Chartres and Rorgo Fretellus, classical culture provided a framework of knowledge and authority. In the writings of these authors we encounter the phenomenon of the so-called "hourglass effect" or "floating gap," in which the representation of history assumes the shape of an hourglass: the distant past is filled out in rich detail, while the period intervening between antiquity and the present is glossed over or ignored entirely.[78] The result is that space presents opportunity for a collapse of time: the geographical discussions of cities such as Tyre or Antioch allow the historiographer to "fold" the Frankish present onto the classical and biblical past.

In the context of historiography, classical mythology was approached in a historicizing manner. In Ralph of Caen, whose *Tancredus* is more akin to classical epic on the one hand and vernacular *chansons de geste* on the other, we see instead a literary appropriation of mythology, in which their cultural import rather than their historicity is at stake. To see how this works in practice, let us look at Ralph in more detail.

7. Excursus III: classical heroism in Ralph of Caen

The classical cultural legacy played a vital role in the literature of the Latin East, not only as an authority on ancient history and geography, but also in valorizing the actions of the protagonists of the First Crusade. By virtue of association with figures representing the classical heroic ethos, Latin authors in Outremer sought to establish their own brand of the heroic cult. Although epic

[78] For a useful discussion of this phenomenon in the context of ancient Greek historiography, see R. Thomas, "Herodotus' *Histories* and the floating gap," in N. Luraghi (ed.), *The historian's craft in the age of Herodotus* (Oxford, 2001), pp. 198–210. The term "floating gap" originated with the ethnologist Jan Vansina: *Oral tradition as history* (Madison, Wis., 1985), p. 23.

epithets for protagonists of the First Crusade were used as early as the *Gesta Francorum* for this very purpose, Ralph of Caen most overtly associates the crusaders with classical heroes.[79]

To see how classical heroism is appropriated, let us turn to a few examples. For instance, Ralph relates that, during the siege of Antioch, Tancred would occasionally sally forth, *uno comitatus Achate* ("accompanied only by Achates").[80] On one of these occasions, Tancred faces off against three Turks, at which point the author steps in to address them:

> Quin immo, miseri, fugite: fugite, inquam, Castoris Cyllarum, Achyllis fraxinum, dextram Meleagri, animos Tydei, Herculis trinodem, Aiacis septemplicem! Haec enim omnia unum hunc bellatorem armant. . .[81]
>
> Nay rather, flee, miserable ones, flee, I say, from Castor's Cyllarus, Achilles' spear, Meleager's right hand, Tydeus' courage, Hercules' club, Ajax's shield! For all of these arm this single warrior. . .

Ralph presents Tancred's armor—and by implication the hero himself—as a composite of some of the most famous heroes of ancient epic, the sum of which is far greater than the individual parts. Tancred, so claims Ralph, is cast from the classical mold of Homer, Virgil, and Statius—better yet, he is a combination of all the great heroes, at once embodying and surpassing the classical heroic ideal.

A similar sentiment occurs in a passage describing the siege of Jerusalem, during which Tancred succeeded in being the first to penetrate into the Aqṣā Mosque, vanquishing a slew of enemies in the process. His achievement is unmatched in classical epic:

---

[79] For a discussion of the role of epithets in the *Gesta Francorum*, see especially Wolf 1991 and Flori 2010, pp. 78–81. On the establishment of an heroic cult on the classical model in Ralph of Caen, see the discussions of Glaesener 1951, Boehm 1956, Payen 1982, Elm 2001, and Hodgson 2007a.

[80] Virg. *Aen*. 1.312. Achates was the trusty companion of Aeneas.

[81] RC, 1648–1653.

> . . . Neuter, quod somniet, Aiax,
> Non Hector, non Hectoreus superator Achylles,
> Audeat, hoc facile et pronum, Wiscardida, ducis![82]
>
> . . . That which neither Ajax could dream of, nor Hector or his vanquisher Achilles would dare, this you, scion of Guiscard, consider easy and straightforward!

As in the previous passage, Ralph apostrophizes a character, in this case the hero of the epic, as if the poet has grown astonished at this portrait of the perfect hero. It is not a far leap for the reader to conclude that, if Tancred is the greatest hero depicted in all of literature, then surely his encomiast must be one of the greatest writers. Ralph hints at this when he boastfully compares his hero Tancred and his patron Arnulf to Aeneas and Hector:

> De quibus simile illi, quod de Hectore et Enea edidit Mantuanus, confidenter et ipse protulerim: "Si duo preterea misisset Gallica tales Terra viros,"[83] iam dudum Gallos habuissent reges Memphys et Babylon.[84]
>
> About whom I myself would confidently proclaim something similar to that which the Mantuan uttered about Hector and Aeneas: "If the land of Francia had sent two more of such men," then both Memphis and Babylon would long ago have had Frankish kings.[85]

This passage shows how classical culture could provide both a foundation as well as a rival to a nascent culture in the East, in which Ralph sees his heroes Tancred and Arnulf as successors to Aeneas and Hector, and himself as the implicit torchbearer of the Mantuan's muse.

For Ralph of Caen, the Bible and classical literature alike could provide useful examples to draw from, sometimes intricately combined within a single passage. So when a messenger sent

---

[82] RC, 3615–3618.

[83] Compare Virg. *Aen*. 11.285–287: *si duo praeterea talis Idaea tulisset / terra viros, ultro Inachias venisset ad urbes / Dardanus, et versis lugeret Graecia fatis*.

[84] RC, 3945–3948.

[85] I.e., Cairo.

by Alexios Komnenos compels Bohemond and Tancred to return to his court, they ignore his pleas and are described by Ralph as having learned the proper lessons from ancient and biblical literatures:

> Sordet revocatio absentis, cuius presens contempta est persona; neque, adituri summi regis cunabula, Herodis audiunt perfidiam revocantis. Immissave aratro manu, lumina non reflectunt, semel quam sit illa reflexio damnosa experti; sed et illae, quarum altera chaos Sodomae respexit, altera Threicio coniugi est respecta, emersos ad lucem rursus prohibent tenebris immergi. Tot admoniti exemplis, omnia haec visi sunt sibi evadere tormenta, dum hunc unum pretereunt tortorem.[86]

> The call to return made by him in his absence is neglected, whose person was despised in his presence; intending to go to the manger of the highest king, they do not listen to the betrayal of Herod calling them back. With their hands pressed down on the plough, they do not turn their eyes back, having learned how ruinous a single glance backward can be; and the examples of those two women, one of whom looked back at the chaos of Sodom, the other of whom was looked at by her Thracian husband,[87] keep them from being pulled back into the darkness now that they have emerged into the light. Forewarned by so many examples, they considered that they avoided all such punishments by eluding this one punisher.

In an elaborate intertextual game, Bohemond and Tancred are depicted as readers: they have understood the moral message to be had from the story of Lot's wife at Sodom and Orpheus' failed attempt to rescue Eurydice. Raised on the same curriculum of literary *exempla*, Ralph's readers are intended to recognize the allusions, and to conclude with Ralph that the protagonists have acted wisely.

8. Roman history in the Latin East

Writers in the Latin East also made use of the rich font of ancient history in addition to classical mythology. Instead of having direct recourse to ancient historiography, most medieval readers would have been familiar with the classical past through the lens of later, Christian authors. The

[86] RC, 641–647.

[87] Referring to Orpheus.

works of Orosius, Augustine (especially *De civitate Dei*), the Latin translations of the works of Eusebius, and the Christianized version of Eutropius' late-antique historical compendium made by Paul the Deacon are of particular importance in this regard.[88]

Sallust is an exception, having become a school author from Carolingian times onward, as are the works of Flavius Josephus, which were translated into Latin in Late Antiquity and became a valuable source of historical information on the Levant during the Middle Ages.[89] The *Antiquities* were recommended by and translated under the direction of Cassiodorus, while the *Jewish War* was available in a literal Latin translation by Ps.-Rufinus as well as in a Christianized abbreviation by Ps.-Hegesippus.

Moreover, the twelfth century saw the beginnings of a limited dissemination of the works of Livy; most notably, for our purposes, in the work of William of Tyre, who has since been shown to have had access to Livy's first and fourth decades, while his periodic style may at least in part have been indebted to Livy's effluence.[90]

Poetry and the scholarly apparatus that had formed around it also served as an important source of ancient history. Ralph of Caen, for instance, uses classical prose and poetry alike as

---

[88] On the sources of ancient history in use in the Middle Ages, see the valuable survey of E.M. Sanford, "The study of ancient history in the Middle Ages," *Journal of the history of ideas* 5:1 (1944), pp. 21–43, as well as B. Munk Olsen, "La diffusion et l'étude des historiens antiques au XIIe siècle," in Welkenhuysen, Braet, and Verbeke 1995, pp. 21–43; and L.B. Mortensen, "The texts and contexts of ancient Roman history in twelfth-century western scholarship," in P. Magdalino (ed.), *The perception of the past in twelfth-century Europe* (London, 1992), pp. 99–116; *idem*, "Working with Ancient Roman History: a comparison of Carolingian and twelfth-century scholarly endeavours," in C. Leonardi (ed.), *Gli Umanesimi medievali: atti del II congresso dell'"Internationales Mittellateinerkomitee" Firenze, Certosa del Galluzzo, 11–15 settembre 1993* (Florence, 1998); *idem*, "The diffusion of Roman histories in the Middle Ages: a list of Orosius, Eutropius, Paulus Diaconus, and Landolfus Sagax manuscripts," *Filologia mediolatina* 6–7 (1999–2000), pp. 101–200; Minervini 2002, pp. 337–348.

[89] On Sallust, see still the useful discussion in B. Smalley, "Sallust in the Middle Ages," in R.R. Bolgar (ed.), *Classical influences on European culture A.D. 500–1500* (Cambridge, 1971), pp. 165–175. On the medieval reception of Josephus, see the expansive—though unfortunately not exhaustive—study of H. Schreckenberg, *Die Flavius-Josephus-Tradition in Antike und Mittelalter* (Leiden, 1972).

[90] See the discussion in Chapter 1, section 2.7.

sources for ancient history. In the poetic section of the *Tancredus* that deals with the capture of Jerusalem and the accompanying slaughter, Ralph embellishes the well-known account not only by increasing the scale of the bloodshed, but also by comparing it to other well-known massacres in history and literature:

> Quippe cruor tantus, tanta inficit unda penates,
> Quanta nec Emathiam sub Cesare, nec sub Achivo
> Marte Friges, nec sub Mario Syllave Latinos.[91]
>
> Indeed, so much blood, so great a river envelops the deities, as [did not envelop] Pharsalos under Caesar, or the Trojans in their battle with the Greeks, or the Romans under Marius and Sulla.

The three examples chosen here—the Battle of Pharsalos between Caesar and Pompey in 48 BC, the Trojan War, and the Social War and Civil War under Marius and Sulla between 91–88 BC—would have been known to Ralph and his readership most directly through the works of Sallust (*Bellum Iugurthinum*), Virgil (*Aeneid*), and Lucan (*Pharsalia* / *Bellum Civile*).[92] Poetic and prose authorities are used side by side, and since they were part of the school canon, Ralph could count on his audience to be familiar with these episodes. Similarly, Geoffrey the Abbot names Lucan as an authority on the history of the civil war between Caesar and Pompey.[93]

Strikingly, Ralph, in glorifying an event that had profound religious aspects (the Liberation of Jerusalem), turns to a wholly classical frame of reference. In comparing the event, scenes from ancient history and classical mythology came to his mind most readily. Ralph foregrounds the comparison by using the term *penates*, with its distinctly Roman cultural

[91] RC, 3779–3780.

[92] See also William of Tyre, who describes the deposed archbishop of Antioch Ralph of Domfront as *alter Marius*, on account of the vicissitudes of his fortune: WT, 15.17.32–37.

[93] GA, Ios, 294.

associations, in order to describe the deities allegedly housed in the Aqṣā Mosque.[94] Earlier, when Tancred burst into the mosque, Ralph wonders with him whether the statue he found there, made of silver and gold, and studded with gems, was one of Mars or Apollo—surely not one of Christ!—but concludes that it represents the Antichrist, who is identified as Muḥammad.[95] With Islamic religion assimilated to Roman paganism, Ralph appears to conceive of the Frankish capture of Jerusalem as both a military and cultural victory over Rome.

This motif is reversed in Albert of Tarsus' lament on the recent calamities that struck the Crusader States in 1187. The fourth strophe casts the defeat of Christianity at the hands of paganism in an allegory of *Alathia* (i.e., *alētheiā*, "truth") versus *Pseustis* ("falsehood"), in which Truth has her hair shorn like a slave and Christ's gold is trampled by Falsehood. These allegorical characters are highly reminiscent of the popular ninth- or tenth-century school text known as the *Ecloga* of Theodulus. In fact, this text may have been the source for Albert's mention of Medea, described as having perpetrated a slaughter against her own kin.[96] The idea of an allegorized woman being shorn, however, is also redolent of the passage in Jerome's letter to Magnus, in which he advocates an appropriation of classical culture by reference to the precept in Deuteronomy for any Israelite who wishes to marry an Egyptian to shave her hair first and clip her nails.[97] The trampling of gold might then be connected with Augustine's similar injunction to

[94] In Roman culture, *penates* referred to the guardian deities that watched over the household. Ralph sets this scene in the *Templum Salomonis*, i.e., the Aqṣā Mosque, whereas Fulcher of Chartres describes the setting as the *Templum Domini*, i.e., the Dome of the Rock. See FC, 1.27.10–30.3.

[95] RC, 3636–3645. For a discussion of the statue as a possible ancient Roman statue (or referring to traditions of Roman statues in the Temple area), see X. Muratova, "Western chronicles of the First Crusade as sources for the history of art in the Holy Land," in J. Folda (ed.), *Crusader art in the twelfth century* (Jerusalem, 1982), pp. 47–69. On the eschatological dimensions of this scene, see M. Di Cesare, *Constructing the image of Muhammad in Europe* (Berlin, 2013), p. 8 and the references in n. 14.

[96] *Theoduli Ecloga* 272.

[97] Deut 21:10–14; Jerome, *Ep*. 70.2.

appropriate valuable elements of classical culture just as the Israelites stole the gold of the Egyptians when they left Egypt.[98] In an ironic reversal, paganism now appropriates the treasures of "Truth" (i.e., Christianity).

Behind such passages lies the concept of *translatio imperii*.[99] This notion became widespread through the fourth-century history of Orosius, who, basing himself on a passage in the book of Daniel, posited four world empires: Babylonia, pagan Rome, Macedonia, and Carthage, which would all be succeeded by a Christian Rome.[100] Eventually, this scheme came to be reconfigured or expanded in the Middle Ages, as new civilizations laid claim to be next in line, as was the related notion of *translatio studii*, or the idea that the cultural supremacy of the ancient world could also be passed on.

We find the notion of *translatio imperii* clearly expressed in Walter the Chancellor's prologue to his history, in which he explains the causes for the catastrophic earthquake that struck Antioch in 1114 by enumerating the various sinful behaviors and conducts of the local Christian populace of Antioch, and, to a lesser extent, that of the Frankish population. The end of the prologue describes a succession of various rulers over Antioch across history, who were used as tools of punishment by God to afflict its inhabitants in order that they might change their ways:

---

[98] Ex 3:22, 11:2, 12:35; Augustine, *De Doctr. Chr*. 2.40.60. The line referring to the trampling of gold is a borrowing from a lyric of Walter of Châtillon; see Chapter 1, section 3.5.

[99] On the concept of *translatio imperii* more generally, see W. Goez, *Translatio imperii. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Geschichtsdenkens und der politischen Theorien im Mittelalter und in der frühen Neuzeit* (Tübingen, 1958); F.J. Worstbrock, "Translatio artium," *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 47 (1965), pp. 1–22; É. Jeauneau, *Translatio studii. The transmission of learning. A Gilsonian theme* (Toronto, 1994); U. Krämer, *Translatio imperii et studii. Zum Geschichts- und Kulturverständnis in der französischen Literatur des Mittelalters und der frühen Neuzeit* (Bonn, 1996).

[100] Dan 2:31–45; Or., *Historiae adversum paganos* 2.1.4–5 and 7.2.

> Hos itaque perpetrata mala non plangentes et plangenda voluntarie et publice perpetrantes auctor summae iustitiae signis, prodigiis, plagis, tribulatione etiam adversarum gentium, multis annorum curriculis inlatis, non perdendo sed parcendo permisit adfligi. Graecis namque regnantibus ipsorum imperio servisse convincuntur. Eisdem ex Asia propulsis Parthorum regnantium cessere dominio; tandem, Deo volente, intolerabiliori succubuere Gallorum potestati. Qui cum neque hinc neque inde corrigerentur, praefati Syri et eorum dominatores tantam a contingente terrae motu sunt passi calamitatem et ruinam, quantam antea fuisse nulla commemoravit historia.[101]

> The Author of the highest justice allowed these [inhabitants of Antioch], who did not bewail the evils they had committed but voluntarily and publicly committed acts worthy of bewailing, to be afflicted by signs, prodigies, plagues, and even the tribulation [caused by] people hostile to them, all of which were brought upon them over the course of many years, not in order to destroy them but rather to have mercy on them. For when the Greeks ruled, they were compelled to be subservient to their rule. When the same [Greeks] had been driven from Asia, they passed to the lordship of the ruling Parthians; finally, by God's will, they gave way to the more unbearable power of the Gauls. And since they could not be brought to mend their ways in this manner or that, the aforementioned Syrians and their overlords suffered such a great disaster and destruction from the earthquake that occurred, as no history has ever told of before.

This passage accomplishes two things, which at first sight may appear to be at odds with one another. Firstly, Walter explains how the Normans came to be rulers of Antioch: they were sent by God to punish its inhabitants for their wickedness. The Normans (*Gallorum*) are presented as the successors to the Byzantine Greeks (*Graecis*) and the Turks (*Parthorum*) by historic precedent and divine authority.[102] Lending ancient lustre to the cultural succession, Walter uniformly applies anachronistic ethnic epithets in this passage: Normans have become the Gauls of Caesar's time and the Turks the early medieval Parthians.[103]

Secondly, Walter explains the reasons for the disastrous earthquake that forms the start of his history. The earthquake sets the tone for his moralistic approach to historiography, in which he is not afraid to level criticism at his fellow Normans: the *dominatores* ("overlords") of the

[101] WC, 1 prol. 6.

[102] Antioch was under Byzantine rule until 1085, when it passed to the Seljuk Turks. Since the *Parthi* mentioned in the prologue to book 1 of the *Bella Antiochena* must refer to the Seljuk Turks (1 prol. 1), this is a strong indication that Walter uses Parthians here in the same way. For the chronology to make sense, therefore, the Greeks mentioned here must refer to the Byzantines rather than the Ancient Greeks.

[103] "Greek" is used in Western medieval sources both for the Ancient Greeks and the Byzantines, and cannot be considered marked in the way that *Gallus* and *Parthus* are.

Syrians contributed to the wickedness that led to the earthquake.[104] This criticism of the Normans is paralleled later on in Book 2, when Walter admits that the local populace of Antioch had every reason to riot against their overlords, given the confiscations of wealth and property they had suffered.[105]

For Walter, the Normans ruled Antioch by virtue of their status as divine agents of God; but this did not make them immune to sin and consequential punishment. This tension forms the heart of Walter's history: as long as the Normans live virtuously, they are victorious (Book 1); as soon they lapse into sin, utter defeat is their lot (Book 2).

Both the concepts of *translatio imperii* and *translatio studii* are present in the historical compilation commissioned and sanctioned by Baldwin III. The prefatory poem offers a unique insight into the way a young king may have perceived the foundation of the kingdom of Jerusalem within the broader context of the First Crusade. In fact, the poem presents all of the events of the First Crusade as culminating in its foundation:

> Ac Turcos Sancto Domini pepulere Sepulcro,
> Auxilio Domini; sedesque fit inclyta regni,
> hoc regno reges reprimens populosque rebelles.[106]
>
> And they drove the Turks from the Holy Sepulcher of the Lord with the aid of the Lord; it becomes the seat of a renowned kingdom, keeping in check with its kingly rule resisting kings and peoples.

---

[104] Given this context, Kedar's translation of "more intolerable" for the phrase *intolerabiliori succubuere Gallorum potestati* is much to be preferred over Asbridge and Edgington's "they succumbed to the irresistible power of the Gauls." See B.Z. Kedar, "The subjected Muslims of the Frankish Levant," in *Muslims under Latin rule, 1100–1300*, ed. J.M. Powell (Princeton, N.J., 1990), pp. 135–174, at p. 168 and n. 89 (repr. in Kedar 1993, no. XVIII), who based himself on the earlier comments of Hagenmeyer (WC, pp. 124–126); Asbridge and Edgington 1999, p. 68; see also p. 80. Compare also Walter's other instance of using this word in 1.6.2 (*quod intolerabilius est*, "that which is even more unbearable"), where it is used in the context of a punishment, and see also Hagenmeyer's index, at WC, p. 364, for the other words described by Walter as *intolerabilis*: *vis* (2.4.6) and *aestus* (2.7.3).

[105] WC, 2.8.5.

[106] *HN*, Prol. 8–10.

By this account, the foundation of the kingdom of Jerusalem is the logical and divinely ordained consequence of the crusader mission to liberate the Holy Sepulcher. Tellingly, the mission of this kingdom, to conquer and subjugate the surrounding nations, is strongly reminiscent of the objectives of Roman rule as famously formulated by Virgil.[107] A further Virgilian echo occurs a few lines down, when the author praises the first two rulers of the kingdom, Godfrey and his brother Baldwin. They expanded the realm, for which they will reap the reward of enjoying a celestial realm without end (*sine fine*); their successors, in turn, inherit an empire (*imperium*).[108] The juxtaposition of the words *sine fine* and *imperium* call to mind the famous words of Jupiter in the first book of the *Aeneid*, predicting that Roman rule will know no spatial or temporal bounds.[109] The author thereby places the newly-established kingdom of Jerusalem within the paradigm of classical empire (though necessarily a Christianized version), providing it with the legitimacy that the newly-founded institutions of the twelfth century were so eager to acquire, and at the same situates his own work within the classical literary tradition.[110]

Having provided a general overview of the reception of ancient historiography in the Middle Ages, and in the Crusader States in particular, let us look at a subject of ancient history with an especially rich medieval tradition.

---

[107] The passage can be seen as a combination of Virg. *Aen.* 6.851–853 and 6.858, conjoining the injunction of *regere imperio populos* with the prediction that the Roman army *sternet Poenos Gallumque rebellem*.

[108] *HN*, Prol. 21–23.

[109] Virg., *Aen*. 1.278–279: *His ego nec metas rerum nec tempora pono; / imperium sine fine dedi.*

[110] On the broader phenomenon of new twelfth-century institutions seeking legitimacy by resorting to classical antiquity, see Benson 1982, p. 339.

9. The crusade of Titus and Vespasian

Episodes of Greek and Roman history that intersected with that of the Holy Land were particularly favored in the Latin East, especially the siege and subsequent destruction of Jerusalem begun by Vespasian and completed by Titus in 70 AD. While it has been observed that these two figures were held up as examples to the crusader community of the East, it will be useful to consider in more detail how authors of the Latin East treat the motif of the siege of Jerusalem, and especially the role of Titus and Vespasian therein.[111] Before we do so, however, let us trace the earlier development of this motif, which had a long tradition within Late Antique and Early Medieval Christian exegesis, historiography, and religious polemic.[112]

Beginning with Tertullian, the idea that Vespasian and Titus had visited the destruction upon Jerusalem as agents of divine vengeance against the infidelity of the Jews began to take root, and would be disseminated further by authors such as Lactantius, Eusebius, Orosius, and later Isidore of Seville.[113] Jerome, building on Eusebius, interpreted the destruction as the fulfillment of divine prophecies in his various exegetical works on Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the minor prophets. Significantly, this anti-Jewish interpretation also figures in the Latin Christian

[111] Epp 1989, p. 600; K. Elm, "'O beatas idus ac prae ceteris gloriosas!' Darstelling und Deutung der Eroberung Jerusalems 1099 in den *Gesta Tancredi* des Raoul von Caen," in G. Thome and J. Holzhausen (eds.), *Es hat sich viel ereignet, Gutes wie Böses: lateinische Geschichtsschreibung der Spät- und Nachantike* (Munich, 2001), pp. 152–178, at p. 161; K. Elm, "Die Eroberung Jerusalems im Jahre 1099. Ihre Darstellung, Beurteilung und Deutung in den Quellen zur Geschichte des Ersten Kreuzzugs," in D. Bauer, K. Herbers, N. Jaspert (eds.), *Jerusalem im Hoch- und Spätmittelalter: Konflikte und Konfliktbewältigung—Vorstellungen und Vergegenwärtigungen* (Frankfurt am Main 2001), pp. 31–54, at pp. 49–51.

[112] A useful place to start is still S.G.F. Brandon, *The fall of Jerusalem and the Christian church: a study of the effects of the Jewish overthrow of A.D. 70 on Christianity* (London, 1951). A more recent overview is in M. Hebron, *The Medieval Siege* (Oxford, 1997), pp. 112–135; and see for this motif in the context of the crusades S. Schein, *Gateway to the heavenly city: crusader Jerusalem and the catholic West (1099–1187)* (Aldershot, 2005), pp. 42–44.

[113] See Jacobsen 2001, pp. 342–343.

adaptation of Josephus' *Jewish War*.[114] On the basis of this patristic foundation, a New Testament apocryphal text by the title of *Vindicta Salvatoris* ("The avenging of the Savior") appeared by the seventh century, itself closely related to other apocrypha (as part of the so-called "Pilate cycle"), which presents a fantastical narrative set during the reign of Tiberius, in which Titus avenges Jesus' death.[115] This popular text, which was translated into Old English, Old and Middle French, and later in Italian, proved to be influential for later vernacular literary traditions on the siege of Jerusalem, playing on the association of the siege of Jerusalem by Titus with the First Crusade.[116]

This association came about by means of a view of history founded on biblical exegesis. With the New Testament came the idea that certain events and persons of the Old Testament formed a precursor to those of the New, resulting in a so-called typological interpretation. When such an approach was applied to the reading of history more generally, it gave rise to *figura*, or

---

[114] See the Prologue in Ps.-Hegesippus, ed. Ussani 2.21: . . . *liqueat universis quod ipsi* [sc. Iudaei] *sibi propriae cladis auctores fuere* . . .

[115] For text and translation, see *The Apocryphal Gospels: texts and translations*, ed. and tr. B.D. Ehrman and Z. Pleše (New York, 2011), pp. 537–558.

[116] The first instance in which Titus and Vespasian are associated with crusading may in fact predate the First Crusade: a papal encyclical issued by Sergius IV after the sack of the Church of the Holy Sepulcher in 1009 by the Fāṭimid caliph al-Ḥākim calls on Christians to undertake an armed expedition to avenge Christ, just as Titus and Vespasian had done. In the past, this encyclical has been regarded as a forgery intended to justify the First Crusade *post factum*, but general opinion now tends to regard it as authentic. For the text, see: A.J. Lair, *Bulle du pape Sergius IV, lettres de Gerbert* (Paris, 1899). For the argument of the text as forgery, see A. Gieysztor, "The genesis of the Crusades. The encyclical of Sergius IV (1009–1012)," *Medievalia et Humanistica* 5 (1948 and 1950), pp. 3–23 and 3–34. For a more recent study arguing for its authenticity, see H.M. Schaller, "Zur Kreuzzugsenzyklika Papst Sergius' IV," in H. Mordek (ed.), *Papsttum, Kirche und Recht im Mittelalter: Festschrift für Horst Fuhrmann zum 65. Geburtstag* (Tübingen, 1991), pp. 135–153. On the vernacular reworking of the *Vindicta Salvatoris*, see *La vengeance de Nostre-Seigneur: the Old and Middle French prose versions: the Cura sanitatis Tiberii (The Mission of Volusian), the Nathanis Judaei legatio (Vindicta salvatoris), and the versions found in the Bible en français of Roger d'Argenteuil or influenced by the works of Flavius Josephus, Robert de Boron and Jacobus de Voragine*, ed. A.E. Ford (Toronto, 1993); B. Millar, *The siege of Jerusalem in its physical, literary, and historical contexts* (Dublin, 2000); S.M. Yeager, "'The Siege of Jerusalem' and biblical exegesis: writing about Romans in fourteenth-century England," *The Chaucer Review* 39:1 (2004), pp. 70–102; *eadem*, *Jerusalem in Medieval Narrative* (Cambridge, 2008); S.C. Akbari, "Erasing the Body: History and memory in medieval siege poetry," in Paul and Yeager 2012, pp. 146–173; S. Thiolier-Méjean, *La prise de Jérusalem par Vespasien: une légende médiévale entre Languedoc et Catalogne* (Paris, 2012).

the idea that persons and events in history could find counterparts in a process of typological fulfillment.[117] This meant that, on the one hand, persons and events of recent history were interpreted within the light of earlier persons and events, but conversely that history was read as a prefiguration of current events. This concept allowed crusaders to view themselves as a reborn "Titus and Vespasian," this time besieging with divine wrath not the Jews but the Muslims in Jerusalem. The destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans comes to represent a complex nexus of notions: holy war, the destruction of paganism, and the inheritance of the Roman legacy of power and authority in a condensed form of *translatio imperii*. This reading of history is essential for understanding the relevance of Matthew of Edessa's comment that Godfrey of Bouillon descended from the Roman emperors and bore the sword and crown of Vespasian.[118] Just as Godfrey became associated with the Roman imperial legacy, so did Vespasian come to be linked with crusader ideals.

Given the long tradition that regarded Titus and Vespasian as avengers of Christ's murder, it is surprising that most of the Latin chronicles of the First Crusade written in Europe do not develop this motif in their accounts, especially considering the rich vernacular tradition, from the late-twelfth century *Chanson d'Antioche* onward, that would later tie the Roman sack of Jerusalem to the crusades.[119] While it would be an exaggeration to say that this motif is at the

---

[117] The notion of *figura* in this sense has gained traction in scholarship most notably through the work of Erich Auerbach; see especially the posthumously published "'Figura,'" in *idem*, *Scenes from the drama of European literature* (New York, 1959), pp. 11–78.

[118] Matthew of Edessa, *Chronicle*, in *Armenia and the Crusades: tenth to twelfth centuries: the Chronicle of Matthew of Edessa*, tr. A.E. Dostourian (Lanham, MD, 1993), 110. See also the discussions of this passage in Elm 2001, pp. 40–41, 51, and J. Rubenstein, *Armies of heaven: the first crusade and the quest for apocalypse* (New York, 2011), p. 363, who suggests that, since Matthew is the only source for this myth, it originated with the circle of Baldwin of Boulogne while he was at Edessa.

[119] I have found no mention of Titus and Vespasian in the chronicles of Baudri of Bourgueil, Guibert of Nogent, Robert the Monk, Ekkehard of Aura, or in the poems of Gilo of Paris and his continuator. Albert of Aachen does mention the two while discussing the various Jewish Temples atop the Temple Mount, and also quotes Christ's prophecy (AA, 6.24). The world chronicle of Ekkehard of Aura also mentions the Roman sack of Jerusalem (which

forefront, it is telling that Titus and Vespasian are referenced in several works of the twelfth-century Latin East, beginning with Achard of Arrouaise and extending to William of Tyre. Let us start by looking at the motif in historiography. Fulcher of Chartres is the first crusade chronicler to place the crusade and events of recent history within a historical framework that includes the sack of Jerusalem in 70 AD. The passage occurs in the middle of Book 3, when an historical exposition of Tyre leads into a digression on invasions of the Holy Land more generally, and Jerusalem specifically:

> Post annorum plurium spatia, peccatis Iudaeorum exigentibus, Antiochus Epiphanes legem eorum impugnans, Machabaeos valde coartavit. Post hunc venit Pompeius, qui Hierusalem infeliciter dissipavit. Ad ultimum vero Vespasianus cum Tito, filio suo venit, qui penitus eam destruxit. Itaque per varios rerum eventus usque ad tempora nostra et civitas sancta et patria ei subdita praecipitanter exstitit vexata.[120]

> After the space of many years, as the result of the Jews' transgressions Antiochus Epiphanes persecuted their religion, vigorously pursuing the Maccabees. After him came Pompey, who destroyed Jerusalem to great misfortune. Lastly came Vespasian, together with his son Titus, who utterly razed it to the ground. In this way, both the holy city and the land ruled by it has been vehemently violated through various events even up to our own times.

In accordance with established tradition, Fulcher blames the Jews for the calamities that befell Jerusalem. He emphasizes, however, the misery and misfortune that has befallen the city for so much of history, extending up through his own day. Instead of singling out the Roman sack of Jerusalem, Fulcher places the event within a series of tragedies that afflicted the Jews and

---

the *Hierosolymita*, his account of the First Crusade, does not do), but not within the context of the First Crusade: *Ekkehardi Chronicon Universale*, ed. G. Waitz, MGH SS 6 (Hannover, 1844), pp. 102. There does exist a crusader poem, probably composed in the West in early 1147, that refers to *gesta Titiana* ("the deeds of Titus") within a context of a call to a new crusade, but this seems to be an isolated instance. See KL 8 in Schmuck 1954, pp. 107–109; Spreckelmeyer 1974, pp. 64–69, especially 65–66. As for the vernacular tradition, the *Chanson d'Antioche* and the *Chanson de Jérusalem* were redacted into their final form in the late twelfth century, possibly from earlier versions by Graindor of Douai, but it is uncertain what these earlier versions looked like or precisely when they were composed. The lost original version of the *Chanson d'Antioche* is said to have been composed by Richard the Pilgrim, who took part in the First Crusade. See the introduction in *Chanson d'Antioche*, tr. S.B. Edgington and C. Sweetenham (Farnham, 2011), pp. 3–48.

[120] FC, 3.30.7.

Jerusalem. Although he subscribes to the established tradition that the Jews had brought these disasters upon themselves, this is a far cry from the fanciful account of the *Vindicta Salvatoris*. Instead, he depicts the Romans as part of a succession of foreign empires that have invaded and brought destruction upon Jerusalem.

In his description of Jerusalem, William of Tyre turns to the authorities of Ps.-Hegesippus and Josephus to give the now familiar account of Titus and Vespasian as divine agents in the punishment of the Jews:

> Hanc [sc. urbem], ut referunt egregii scriptores et illustres historiographi Egesippus et Iosephus, Iudeorum id exigentibus meritis quadragesimo secundo post passionem domini anno Titus, Vespasiani filius, Romanorum magnificus princeps, obsedit, obsessam expugnavit et expugnatam deiecit funditus, ita ut iuxta verbum domini non remaneret in ea lapis super lapidem.[121]

> As the excellent and well-known historiographers Hegesippus and Josephus report, Titus, the son of Vespasian, the magnificent Roman emperor, besieged, conquered, and utterly destroyed this city in the forty-second year after the Lord's Passion—for so the Jews' transgressions required. In this way, in accordance with the Lord's saying, "no stone was left upon another."[122]

Setting, as usual, great store by the histories of Ps.-Hegesippus and Josephus, William does not depart from the interpretation that the sack of Jerusalem was a divine punishment of the Jews. Unlike Fulcher, however, who emphasized the deplorable suffering of Jerusalem throughout history, William strikingly praises Titus as "magnificent," and highlights instead the fulfillment of the divine prophecy.[123] Given that this book of William's history culminates in the crusader

[121] WT, 8.2.16. The end of this passage derives, almost verbatim, from Albert of Aachen, but not the assignation of blame to the Jews. See AA, 6.24: *post incarnationem ex prenunciatione Domini Iesu a principibus Romanorum Tito et Vespasiano funditus cum habitatoribus suis sic deleta est ut ad vocem Domini lapis super lapidem non remaneret*.

[122] Mt 24:2; Mk 13:2; Lk 21:6.

[123] The same sentiments can be found in Sae 184–191, based on Lk 19:41–44, and in Theo 31–37.

conquest of Jerusalem, it is tempting to consider the crusaders as a typology of Titus and Vespasian in their role as divine agents come to avenge Christ.

A mid-twelfth century sermon from Jerusalem that borrows extensively from Fulcher also mentions Titus and Vespasian.[124] The passage in question is not lifted directly from Fulcher, but is clearly influenced by his presentation of the events. After quoting Jeremiah's prophecy that Jerusalem's sins will cause it to topple,[125] the preacher remarks:

> Qua de re multas tribulationes perpessa est, aliquando temporibus iudicum, aliquando temporibus regum Assyriorum, Caldeorum, Persarum, Syrorum; novissimo vero sub Vespasiano et Tito, Romanorum principe, usque ad solum est diruta. Quod Dominus previdens, die quadam, cum eam esset intuitus, super illam pie flevit . . .[126]

> For this reason it suffered many tribulations, some in the time of the Judges, others in the time of the Assyrian kings, the Chaldaeans, the Persians, and the Syrians; most recently, however, under Vespasian and Titus, the Roman emperor, it was razed entirely to the ground. Foreseeing this, one day the Lord wept piously for the city as He gazed upon it . . .

The preacher references a passage in Luke, in which Christ prophesies the day when Jerusalem will come under siege and ultimately be razed to the ground as a result of not recognizing "the time of [its] visitation."[127] The traditional themes of prophecy and calamity are united in the sermon. The larger historical framework found in Fulcher is also present, as well as the emphasis on the extended period of suffering that has been Jerusalem's lot. In a departure from Fulcher, however, the sermon leaves out the Jews entirely, since the goal here is the development of a narrative arc that leads to the Frankish conquest of Jerusalem as an expression of God's pity

[124] The motif of Titus and Vespasian as it occurs in this sermon is briefly discussed in Schein 2005, p. 43.

[125] Lam 2:17 and 1:8 are quoted, but see also Jer 51:12.

[126] *Sermo Fulcheri*, p. 161.

[127] Lk 19:41–44.

upon the personified city. In this way, Roman history was adapted to suit the occasion of the Feast of the Liberation of Jerusalem. In both Fulcher and the sermon, the presentation of a sequence of empires that ruled Jerusalem in times past invites a reading of history within the framework of the *translatio imperii*, in which Frankish rule has superseded all previous ones and ushered in a new era.[128]

Achard of Arrouaise, as we have seen, opposed the inherited tradition of writing poetry about pagan mythology. Instead, his aim is to compose a poem dealing with the history of the site of the *Templum Domini*. Within the context of this historical focus, how does he treat the role played by the Romans in the history of Jerusalem? Initially, Achard retains the commonly accepted narrative in which the Romans are viewed as divine avengers:

> Evolutis a diebus passionis Domini
> Quadraginta et duorum annorum curriculis
> Titus et Vespasianus, Romanorum principes
> Superveniunt tantorum peccatorum vindices.[129]
>
> When the span of forty-two years had passed since the days of the Lord's passion, the Roman Emperors Titus and Vespasian came against [the Jews] as avengers of such great sins.

Achard explains that the Jews' refusal to acknowledge Christ as Son of God led to the eventual destruction of Jerusalem, including the Temple. Toward the end of the work, however, he also offers an alternative theory that places greater emphasis on the Temple: the Jews were punished not for their role in bringing about the death of Christ, but rather for the execution of James the Less. Achard presents James as the first bishop of the Temple, which adhered to the "Catholic

[128] For a discussion of the notion of *translatio imperii* in connection with the Roman sack of the Temple as represented in Middle English literature, see Akbari 2012.

[129] AP, 683–686.

tradition" (*consuetudo . . . catholica*). While preaching the message of Christ, he was cast headlong from the Temple by the Jews and struck by a fuller's staff for good measure.[130] In this way, Achard brought the existing narrative of the destruction of the Temple by the Romans into connection with the Temple as a site of martyrdom.

Achard's successor Geoffrey saw frequent opportunity to treat the topic of the Roman presence in Jerusalem in his versification of Josephus' *Jewish War*. In a departure from his source texts Ps.-Hegesippus and Ps.-Rufinus, Geoffrey refers to the same passage in Luke used in Ps.-Fulcher's sermon to explain the Roman siege as a fulfillment of Christ's prophecy.[131] This passage would have been particularly poignant for the community of canons at the *Templum Domini*, since it immediately precedes the episode in which Christ evicts the moneylenders from the Temple. This episode, in which Christ famously quotes Isaiah ("My house shall be a house of prayer"), held a particular resonance, for this very phrase was inscribed within the *Templum Domini* after the renovations of the early twelfth century.[132] Geoffrey therefore draws an intimate connection between Christ's prophecy, the Roman siege of Jerusalem, and the Frankish *Templum Domini*. The link is made explicit when Geoffrey describes how Titus attempts to persuade the Jews to surrender:

Sepe Tytus misertus est	eosque deprecatus est
Ut sibimet consulerent	et ut in pace viverent,
Nec paterentur destrui	urbem Templumque Domini.[133]

[130] AP, 759–778. Schreckenberg (1972, p. 140), who did not seem to have been aware of Lehmann's edition of Achard, suggests that this argument was based on a "contamination" of various passages in the *Jewish Antiquities*.

[131] GA, 539–541.

[132] Lk 19:46, quoting Is 56:7. See the discussion on Geoffrey in Chapter 1, section 3.3.

[133] GA, Ios, 559–561.

> Frequently Titus commiserated with them and beseeched them to look out for themselves and to live in peace, and not to allow the city and the *Templum Domini* to be destroyed.

Geoffrey nearly transforms Titus from a warlord into a pacifist. Moreover, he renders history more immediate by the anachronistic focus on the *Templum Domini*. The same anachronism occurs later on, when Herod Agrippa II delivers a lengthy speech intended to persuade the Jews to surrender to the Romans. If they are unwilling to do so, he says, they may as well commit suicide and burn the city and the *Templum Domini* to the ground themselves. The speech contains a long encomium of the Romans, who are presented as the all-powerful rulers of the world, governing with divine assistance. Another long speech, this time by Josephus himself, contains many of the same elements, as well as a lengthy catalogue of various peoples throughout history and of diverse regions that have been unable to resist the might of the Romans. An exception is made for the Gauls, however, "who are mighty in strength," and who receive extended praise from the poet.[134] Although both of these speeches were in Geoffrey's source materials, Geoffrey develops them at great length, casting them as rhetorical set-pieces in direct speech, whereas they are in indirect speech in both Ps.-Hegesippus and Ps.-Rufinus. Certainly, praise of the divinely-sanctioned Romans, whose might could only be matched by the Gauls, would not have been lost on a Frankish audience of Jerusalem.[135]

Almost all references to Titus and Vespasian in the literature of the East are within the context of the siege of Jerusalem. One exception, however, can be found in the treatise describing the discovery of the tombs of the Patriarchs in Hebron. There, the emperors Vespasian

[134] GA, Ios, 726–745. G. Morin believed this passage to be an original composition on the part of the poet, since it is not in Ps.-Hegesippus; however, it does occur in Ps.-Rufinus. See Morin 1914, p. 176. See also my remarks in GA, Ios, p. 78.

[135] Note that these same speeches were used earlier by Widukind of Corvey (d. after 973) as a testament of the prowess of the Saxons. See Widukind of Corvey, *Res gestae Saxonicae*, ed. D.G. Waitz, MGH SS, vol. 3, p. 418. See also the discussion in Schreckenberg 1972, pp. 127–128.

and Titus are presented in a very different light from conventional medieval tradition. The author describes them as *increduli* ("unbelievers") and writes about their persecution of the Jews in some detail.[136] There is little commiseration with the Jews, who are called *impios* ("impious"), but eventually the persecutions spill out to the local Christians. When they notice that the holy sites are left unprotected, they emerge from their hiding places, exposing themselves to Roman cruelty. They are assisted, however, by an array of Christians of various confessions, many of whom suffered martyrdom at the hands of the Romans as a result. The Christians who spilt their own blood in an effort to protect the site of the tombs of the Patriarchs were granted their revenge upon the Romans when, several centuries later, Emperor Theodosius II was thwarted by divine intervention in his quest to uncover the tombs and bring the relics to Constantinople. In spite of Theodosius' piety, there is a kind of poetic retribution for the persecutions staged by his predecessors Titus and Vespasian, described by the author as "his wicked predecessors as emperors" (*iniqui predecessores sui imperatores*).[137] The recasting of Vespasian and Titus as villains serves the author's purpose in trumping up the dignity of the tombs of the Patriarchs. In addition to housing the venerable relics, they now become the site of a story of Christian martyrdom—a similar strategy as we have seen in Achard. Unlike the *inventio* account of Hebron, however, Achard did not present the Romans as wicked persecutors; given that his poem is directly addressed to the king of Jerusalem, such an outright criticism of the Roman legacy might have been a step too far within the context of the royal court—an institution that, as we have seen in the *Historia Nicaena*, associated itself with the prestige of this legacy.

[136] *Inventio* I, 84–90.

[137] *Inventio* I, 110–111. On this aspect, see Elm 1997, p. 324.

The history of Titus and Vespasian and the later emperor Theodosius II as represented in the *inventio* can be read as a parable, and as a way for the canons of Hebron to express implicit criticism of disruptive intervention from outside seeking to remove the relics of the Patriarchs from their resting place. This would have meant a loss in status as well as income for the canons, who would be less likely to benefit from the revenue generated by pilgrimage. For instance, as the *inventio* account indicates, the canons of Hebron mistrusted the involvement of the local lord Baldwin of Hebron in the excavations of the newly-discovered relics, having experienced only a few years earlier a pillaging at the hands of Peter of Narbonne, bishop of Albara and later archbishop of Apamea; their depiction of Titus and Vespasian as ruthless persecutors and the consequential punishment even of a Christian Roman emperor should be read within this context.[138]

10. Conclusion

One may conclude that resurging interest in the ancient world during the twelfth century, into its literary and historical legacy as useful and worthy of emulation, into the legitimacy that association with ancient culture could bring and the cultural capital it could imply, did not bypass the Latin East. What little evidence survives from medieval catalogues and individual codices indicates that there was access to all of the principal classical authors that formed part of the school canon in twelfth-century Europe.

Moreover, the historical and geographical writings of Fulcher of Chartres, Rorgo Fretellus, and William of Tyre imply an expected familiarity on the part of the audience with key

[138] At *Inventio* I, 365–368, the canon Arnulf fears that Baldwin might think that there is plunder in the form of gold or silver to be had in the Cave of the Patriarchs. On the plundering of the *Ḥaram al-Khalīl* under the Franks, see *Inventio* I, 264–265. One may compare this situation with Tancred's plundering of the Dome of the Rock, resulting in similar reactions from the canons who took residence there.

figures and events of ancient history and mythology that were relevant to discussions of the Levant, while Ralph of Caen makes intricate allusions to classical mythology, at once fitting the heroes of the First Crusade within the mold of the classical epic hero and seeking to surpass all previous expressions of the heroic ideal. Though firmly rooted in classical values, Ralph's age is a new and glorious one—even if all of his contemporaries were too slothful to take up the pen, leaving him to be the (supposedly) reluctant *vates* of the new heroic age.

The anonymous author-compiler of the *Historia Nicaena* similarly considered that the Frankish kingdom of Jerusalem could lay claim to Roman conceptions of rule, using the well-known medieval concept of *translatio imperii*. The notion could be combined with a typological view of history, which in the Latin East often involved the figures of Titus and Vespasian. Although the inclusion of these historical figures in literature surrounding the crusades would become a commonplace in later vernacular literature, they are largely absent from the twelfth-century crusader chronicles from the West; in the Latin writings from the East in this period, however, they occur with some frequency.

By tracing this motif, we have been able to discern a multitude of approaches: from a preacher's celebrations in a liturgical setting of the capture of Jerusalem in the First Crusade as a modern counterpoint to the sack of Titus, to efforts of the canons of the *Templum Domini* to make it the focus of worship by bringing it into connection with the Temple that was pillaged by Titus, and by introducing an alternative tradition of the Temple as the site of the divinely-ordained avenging of the martyrdom of James the Less; and finally the attempts of the canons of Hebron to elevate their church by pointing out the persecutions staged there by Titus and Vespasian.

Although the suggestion that Titus and Vespasian served as exemplary models for those living in the Latin East may be true in some instances, a discussion of the available source materials shows that the situation is much more complex. These figures provided a lens that could be used in various ways, depending on an author's audience and agenda. By tracing this motif it is possible to understand how the Roman past was valorized within institutional contexts, which in turn tells us much about political and ecclesiastical concerns in the twelfth-century Crusader States. We may conclude therefore that, while the interest in the intersection between the ancient and modern was typical for the time, the specific ways of classical reception bear out a "local flavor" of this otherwise broader twelfth-century phenomenon.

For these authors, the Levant was not only a Holy Land but also a place filled with Graeco-Roman history and mythology, given that they ascribed to a classical framework of knowledge and history. Fulcher's use of the pseudepigraphical letter of Alexander demonstrates an interest in classical traditions that were popular in Europe at the time, and particularly in those that were relevant to his new abode. This is part of a larger phenomenon, as persons and stories of ancient history and mythology are referenced, retold, and reinterpreted because of their relevance to a Frankish community in the East, which explains the prominent place of the figures of Titus and Vespasian. We will see a similar phenomenon in the following chapter, which will deal with the use of biblical imagery in the Latin literature from the East.

3. The Bible and the Latin East

> . . . langue de l'Église et du christianisme, le latin remplit le rôle d'instrument d'une civilisation considérée comme exemplaire, et il servit de langue véhiculaire pour la culture médiévale, dans l'enseignement, dans la littérature et dans toutes les manifestations de la vie civilisée.[1]

> C'est ce qui explique qu'après la prise de Jérusalem par les Croisés, un nouveau système de localisation ait pu recouvrir ces vestiges, les absorber, mais aussi les modifier, en changer l'aspect, la signification, et surtout faire surgir toute une floraison nouvelle d'emplacements consacrés, de basiliques, d'églises, de chapelles. C'est la communauté chrétienne universelle qui reprend possession des lieux saints, et veut qu'ils reproduisent l'image qu'elle s'en est construite de loin, au cours des siècles. D'où un foisonnement de localisations nouvelles, bien plus nombreuses, mais aussi, le plus souvent, bien plus récentes, et l'invitation surtout à les multiplier encore, et à les grouper suivant les besoins de la foi.[2]

1. *Langue chrétienne*? Medieval Latin as a Christian language

The charters issued by the Frankish kings of Jerusalem typically proclaim their position as some variant of *Dei gratia Latinitatis Ierosolimorum/Ierusalem rex* ("By the grace of God, king of all Latinity in Jerusalem").[3] The noun *Latinitas* refers in this context not merely to a linguistic element, but also to a religious component, as it indicates those Christians who use the Latin rites, as opposed to Greek or Armenian. Thus Latin was, in some ways, a *Religionssprache* that constituted a vital element of Frankish culture in Outremer. This was because in the Middle Ages Latin had, distinct from its relation to the classical heritage, religious associations as the language of church and liturgy, and the language in which the Bible was read in much of Europe.

[1] C. Mohrmann, "Le latin médiéval," *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale* 1:3 (1958), pp. 265–294, repr. in *Études sur le latin des chrétiens*, vol. 2 (Rome, 1961), pp. 181–232.

[2] M. Halbwachs, *La topographie légendaire des Évangiles* (Paris, 1941), p. 204.

[3] The earliest instance, to my knowledge, is a charter issued by Baldwin I in 1115: Mayer, *Urkunden*, vol. 1, p. 197, no. 64. Earlier, Baldwin I typically proclaimed himself to be *dei gratia Ierosolimorum/Ierusalem rex* (e.g., Mayer, *Urkunden*, vol. 1, p. 187, no. 57), a title that occasionally reappears in charters of his successors (e.g., Baldwin II in Mayer, *Urkunden*, vol. 1, p. 232, no. 86, although the end of the charter lists him as *Balduinus dei gratia secundus Latinorum rex Iherosolimitanus*).

Until the advent of the first universities over the course of the twelfth century, schooling at all levels was almost exclusively organized within churches, cathedrals, and monasteries.[4] As a consequence, the authors under discussion would have received their training from monks or clerics, and nearly all of them were either members of the clergy themselves or belonged to a monastic order.[5] As such, they would have been intimately familiar with the Bible and able to employ biblical imagery in a variety of ways, and in turn expected similarly-trained readers to recognize biblical allusions.

At the same time, it is perhaps misleading to speak in this period of "the Bible," inasmuch as codices purporting to contain all biblical texts were rare: typically, portions of the Bible, such as the Psalms, circulated separately. In another sense, too, a fixed notion of the Bible in this period is anachronistic: despite the attempts at producing a standardized text during the Carolingian Renaissance (the so-called "Alcuin Bibles") a proliferation of textual variants even in the most fundamental biblical texts persisted, to the extent that the text of the Bible did not become relatively stable and fixed until the thirteenth century.[6]

Yet, in spite of these caveats, there was a shared biblical tradition, cultivated in monasteries and cathedral schools across Western Europe, and one can describe the deployment of biblical imagery and motifs in texts produced within this tradition. Because such imagery is never used in isolation, tracing it across a range of texts can tell us much, not only about the

[4] Even after universities became the established locus of higher education, basic training still occurred within parish, episcopal, or monastic schools.

[5] The one exception may be Ralph of Caen; and it is perhaps no coincidence that, of all the authors of the Latin East, he incorporates by far the least amount of biblical materials in his text. See the discussion in Chapter 1, section 2.4.

[6] See A.V. Murray, "Biblical quotations and formulaic language in the chronicle of William of Tyre," in S.B. Edgington and H.J. Nicholson (eds.), *Deeds done beyond the sea: Essays on William of Tyre, Cyprus and the military orders presented to Peter Edbury* (Farnham, 2014), pp. 25–42, at 27, and especially the recent overview of the problems in F.A. van Liere, *An introduction to the medieval Bible* (Cambridge, 2014).

development of the motifs themselves over time, but also about a particular author's rhetorical agenda, and the intellectual and cultural milieu more broadly.

The word "crusade," an Early-Modern coinage derivative of the French word for "cross," brings to a contemporary reader associations of Christ's passion as described in the various books that make up the New Testament.[7] Nevertheless, the biblical imagery applied to participants of the First Crusade and to those who settled in the Latin East more often than not derives from the Old Testament.[8] While one of the principal aims of the First Crusade was to liberate the Holy Sepulcher, the place where Christ was believed to have been interred before His resurrection, the Israelite narrative of a people chosen by God and led to the Promised Land spoke to the imagination of the crusaders, and certainly to those chronicling the crusade and the establishment of the kingdom of Jerusalem.

For the purposes of our discussion, I have distinguished three broad categories of biblical imagery in the Latin texts produced in the Crusader States during the twelfth century: implicit and explicit comparisons to the Israelites (largely drawn from Exodus, Leviticus, Deuteronomy, and Numbers), to the Israelite kings Saul, David, and Solomon (drawing on the books of Samuel and Kings), and references to the Maccabees (principally 1 and 2 Maccabees).[9] My intention will

[7] The first book to use it in its title was A. de Clermont, *L'Histoire des croisades* (Lyons, 1638). See the discussion of the origins and diffusion of the term in P. Lock, *The Routledge companion to the crusades* (New York, 2006), p. 258.

[8] A similar point was made by Y. Katzir, "The conquests of Jerusalem, 1099 and 1187: Historical memory and religious typology," in V.P. Goss (ed.), *The meeting of two worlds: Cultural exchange between East and West during the period of the crusades* (Kalamazoo, Mich., 1986), pp. 103–113.

[9] The starting point for any discussion on the Bible and the crusades remains the dated but still useful survey of P. Alphandéry, "Les citations bibliques chez les historiens de la premiere croisade," *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 99 (1929), pp. 139–157. See also P. Alphandéry, *La chrétienté et l'idée de croisade* (Paris, 1954); P. Rousset, *Les origines et les caractères de la première croisade* (Neuchâtel, 1945). A recent article by Benjamin Kedar gives important background on the nature of Alphandery's book, which was assembled by his student Dupront on the basis of lecture notes: B.Z. Kedar, "Emicho of Flonheim and the apocalyptic motif in the 1096 massacres: between Paul Alphandéry and Alphonse Dupront," in I.J. Yuval and R. Ben-Shalom (eds.), *Conflict and religious conversation in Latin Christendom: studies in honour of Ora Limor* (Turnhout, 2014), pp. 87–97. The recent

not be to discuss the use of individual biblical texts, which would amount to a lengthy and tedious enumeration of quoted or alluded passages; instead my aim is to pursue the deployment of particular biblical imagery, figures, and motifs, and to explore how these interface with conceptions of Frankish culture as expressed by Latin authors.

2. Cultural memory in the Holy Land: biblical imagery as a form of cultural expression

In his pioneering study *La topographie légendaire des Évangiles*, Maurice Halbwachs explored how textual traditions surrounding the holy sites in Palestine reflect the various Christian societies that have lived there over the ages, representing a kind of written memory for these cultures, or a "collective memory" in written form.[10] Although the study is limited in scope and many of the observations concerning the First Crusade are now greatly outdated, it proved influential in the way that it opened up new avenues of debate, while the case study of the Holy Land forms an important precedent for our present discussion. The observation, for instance, that the crusaders who settled in the East sought to recreate—in a literary, artistic, and architectural sense—the holy sites as they had learned of them in the West, offers a useful starting point, inasmuch as it focuses attention on the Franks and their sense of identity in relation to their perception of biblical space and time.

When authors from the Latin East write about the role of the Franks in history, and, for our current purposes, particularly in biblical history, they create a fixed version of the story. In the case of Fulcher, such a version was invested with authority as it was retold in sermon, liturgy,

---

discussion by Alan Murray (2014) offers up new avenues of debate in studying biblical quotations in Latin texts from the Crusader States.

[10] On the use of this term, see the Introduction to Part II.

and other historiographical works.[11] Similarly Achard and Geoffrey, as heads of their monastic communities at the *Templum Domini*, set down in their poems foundational histories of their institution, while comparable examples may be found in the *inventio* account of the Church of Hebron and the document describing the legendary origins of the Knights Hospitaller.[12]

The use of biblical imagery in reference to participants of the First Crusade, the Frankish kings of Jerusalem, and the military orders therefore not only constitutes a literary technique but also represents a written account of contemporary reflections on the nature of Frankish culture and society in the East—or, in other words, a cultural memory. The subject of this chapter will be to describe the nature of these reflections, what the implications are, and how they fit within each author's rhetorical purpose.

3. THE CRUSADERS: *POPULUS DEI*?

The practice of appropriating the concept of "God's chosen people" is as old as the New Testament, in which a New Covenant was established that asserted that God's Chosen People were no longer to be identified with the Israelites of the Old Testament but with the Christian community.[13] This paved the way for others to lay claim to the status of Chosen People, sometimes by excluding other Christians. It has been recognized that, in early medieval Western Europe, the Franks especially began to view themselves as a "New Israel" under Carolingian influence, and that, by the end of the eighth century, the notion had become widespread among

[11] See Chapter 1, section 2.2.

[12] For the legends of the Hospitallers, see section 8.3 below.

[13] E.g., 1 Petr 2:9–10; Hebr 11:8–10.

the cultural elite.[14] But to what extent did Frankish authors in the Latin East portray themselves as *populus Dei* ("people of God"), and what are the implications of such expressions?

As letters composed during the First Crusade demonstrate, those who participated considered that through them divine prophecies were being fulfilled, while the *Gesta Francorum*, arguably the earliest account, speaks consistently of the crusader army as *populus Dei* and *populus* or *militia Christi* ("people/knighthood of Christ").[15] This trend continues with Fulcher of Chartres, who refers to the crusaders as "God's people" at key moments, as when they reach Antioch and after they conquer Jerusalem.[16] The latter instance is perhaps the fullest expression of this sentiment:

> Et vere memoriale et iure memorandum, quia quaeque Dominus Deus noster Iesus Christus, in terra homo cum hominibus conversans, egit et docuit, ad memoriam celeberrimam renovata et reducta sunt orthodoxis. Et quod idem Dominus per hunc populum suum tam, ut opinor, dilectum et alumnum familiaremque, ad hoc negotium praeelectum, expleri voluit, usque in finem saeculi memoriale linguis tribuum universarum personabit et permanebit.[17]

> And it is truly memorable and justly worthy of remembrance that, all that our Lord God Jesus Christ did and taught while He lived among men on earth, has been renewed and brought back into celebrated memory for the true believers. And that which, as I think, the same Lord wished to bring to fulfillment through this people of His, so beloved and dear to Him, and chosen beforehand for this very task, will resound as a memorable deed in the tongues of all tribes and remain until the end of time.

[14] The best overview is M. Garrison, "The Franks as the New Israel? Education for an identity from Pippin to Charlemagne," in Y. Hen and M. Innes (eds.), *The uses of the past in the Early Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 114–161. An important earlier discussion remains D.H. Green, *The Millstätter Exodus: a crusading epic* (Cambridge, 1966), pp. 188–227.

[15] *Epistulae et chartae ad historiam primi belli sacri spectantes. Die Kreuzzugsbriefe aus den Jahren 1088–1100* (Innsbruck, 1901), no. 18, p. 168. See the list in *Gesta Francorum*, ed. H. Hagenmeyer, pp. 21–22. On the fulfillment of prophecies, see Alphandéry 1929, pp. 139–141.

[16] FC, 1.17.1, 1.29.4. See also FC, 1.30.1; 1.33.12, and the discussion in Epp 1990, p. 153.

[17] FC, 1.29.4. On Jerusalem as the city where Christ lived, a new idea that developed shortly after the First Crusade, see the discussion in Schein 2005, pp. 63–90.

Fulcher considers that the capture of Jerusalem precipitates a renewal of the memory of Christ, of His life and teachings. This line of thought belongs to pilgrims, for whom a visit to the holy sites triggered reflection on the biblical texts and figures associated with them. But the chain of memories is extended by Fulcher to the crusade, for he deems the Liberation of Jerusalem worthy of commemoration (*memoriale et iure memorandum*), since through it is celebrated the memory of Christ. The First Crusade is thereby directly connected to biblical history, and the crusaders who captured Jerusalem are considered to have been elected by God to do so as His people. Thus the events and participants of the First Crusade are incorporated within the sacred landscape of the Holy Land.

Once the Franks have settled in the East and face off against the Turks near Beirut in 1100, Fulcher considers the event a fulfillment of God's promise to the Israelites:

> Vere pro nobis et nobiscum fuit complens in nobis quod Israeliticis per prophetam dixit: *Si praecepta mea servaveritis, hoc dono vos ditabo, ut persequantur V de vobis C alienos, et C ex vobis X milia*.[18]

> Truly [God] was there with us and on our behalf, fulfilling in us that which He spoke to the Israelites through a prophet: "If you will keep safe my precepts, I will enrich you with this gift, so that five from among you may pursue a hundred foreigners, and a hundred from among you ten thousand."

Fulcher, therefore, portrayed both those who participated in the First Crusade and those who remained in the Crusader States as a *populus Dei*, with the second group logically following from the first. For this a biblical model was readily available to him: a Chosen People led by God into the Promised Land easily fit the trajectory of the Israelites brought to Canaan under Moses' guidance—a Promised Land that, for once, could be identified with precisely the same

[18] FC, 2.3.4; Lev 28:8.

geographical region as the biblical land. A corollary is that those who settled there were the equivalents of the Israelites under the Judges and especially under the Kings.

That Fulcher was not alone in viewing the Frankish inhabitants of the Levant as a *populus Dei* is indicated by the implicit comparison of the Franks to the Israelites in the Canons of the Council of Nablus of 1120.[19] This was a momentous occasion in the history of the Crusader States, for it was the first church council held in the Latin East, attended by, among others, Patriarch Warmund of Jerusalem, King Baldwin II, Archbishop Evremar of Caesarea, Prior Achard of the *Templum Domini*, and the lay members Eustace Grenier (lord of Sidon) and William de Buris (prince of Galilee). The preamble to the canons reflects on the recent history of Outremer, particularly the disastrous rout of Roger of Antioch's army at the Battle of the Field of Blood a year earlier (1119), which is deemed to have been the result of sinful behavior among the Franks. The aim of the council is, therefore, to reduce the sins committed by setting down a number of stringent laws, so that, instead of chastising them, the Lord will save them from their enemies, just as they read happened in the case of the Israelites (*ut in populo Israelitico contigisse legimus*).[20] The canons are thus one of the earliest textual witnesses to reflections on a communal past and identity shared among clergy and lay people of various parts of Outremer.

Geoffrey, prior and later abbot of the *Templum Domini* in Jerusalem, draws on this notion of a "Frankish people of God" in the Levant. Setting the scene at the beginning of his versification of the Maccabees, he writes:

Brevi quidem volumine	decrevimus perstringere
Machabeorum prelia	que commiserunt plurima.

[19] B.Z. Kedar, "The origins of the earliest laws of Frankish Jerusalem: the Canons of the Council of Nablus, 1120," *Speculum* 74 (1999), pp. 310–335 (repr. in Kedar 2006, no. i).

[20] Kedar 1999, p. 331.

Sed prius causas expedit	narrare, cur contigerit
Terre depopulatio	templique desolatio.
Quamdiu lex a populo	conservabatur sedulo,
Hostilis hunc incursio	non conterebat prelio.
Sed potius ab omnibus	venerabatur gentibus
Templum dei vel populus	quem protegebat dominus.[21]

> I have decided to abbreviate in a short book the many battles of the Maccabees that they fought, but first it is useful to relate how the land came to be abandoned and the Temple deserted. As long as the Law was dutifully observed by the people, no enemy invaded or attacked them. Instead God's Temple and his people, whom the Lord protected, were venerated by all other peoples.

Underlying Geoffrey's poetic endeavor is the assumption, present in the canons of the Council of Nablus, that sinful behavior among the Franks jeopardized their position in the Levant. What is new in Geoffrey's formulation of this concept is the idea that preservation of God's people goes hand-in-hand with that of the Temple. Thus an established concept was adapted to suit the needs of a new religious institution, which wished to place itself at the center of the Frankish biblical narrative.

As the preamble to the canons of Nablus indicates, the Franks in Antioch were clearly considered part of God's People of Outremer. But what evidence is there for this notion within Antioch? When the Antiochenes prove victorious against the Seljuks in the critical Battle of Tall Danith (also known as the Battle of Sarmin) in 1115, their leader, Prince Roger of Salerno, follows a triumphal procession into the city, led by the Latin patriarch and the rest of the clergy. Walter the Chancellor commemorates the occasion with a jubilant hymn that represents the hymns sung by the entire populace. The hymn, which consists of eleven strophes in accentual meter, begins with an address to God (*summi regis*, "the highest king"), and a portrayal of Antiochenes of all walk of life united as "His flock" (*sui gregis*).[22] Both free citizens and slaves

[21] GA, Macc, ll. 27–30.

[22] WC, 1.7.8–9. The hymn consists of alternating strophes composed in 2x8p+7pp, although there are exceptions. Likewise, the rhyming scheme is flexible, varying from ABAB to AABB, to AAAA.

(*Liber, servus et ancilla*) of various ethnicities (*diversarum / nationum populus*) decorate the various streets and neighborhoods of the city with all manner of gold, gems, silks, and spices, such that "one might very well say that it was an earthly paradise" (*tantus odor funditur, / quod terrestris paradisus / possit dici penitus*). Eventually the procession arrives at the church of St. Peter, where Roger dedicates his banner to the church and its community (*Ergo princeps ad altare / Fert vexillum triumphale, / Offert illud speciale, / Post haec munus principale*). After the clergy has given thanks and prayed, the congregation leaves the church and salutes Roger:

> Clamant omnes cordis voce:
> "Salve rex! Athleta veri!
> Te formidant hostes Dei,
>
> Tibique sit continua
> Pax, salus et victoria
> Per saeculorum saecula!
> Amen!"
>
> All shout with heart-felt words: "Greetings, king! Champion of truth! God's enemies fear you, and may you have continuous peace, salvation, and victory, for all times! Amen!"

Walter's depiction of the scene presents an arresting thematic unity, and represents one of the clearest cases of the interplay between literary technique and the creation of a common cultural identity. The hymn with which Book 1 of the *Bella Antiochena* ends parallels the prologue. This becomes clear at the introduction of the hymn, in which the people of Antioch cry out: "Fear God and observe His commands!"[23] Clearly, the same people who had brought the destructive earthquake of the year before upon themselves through their sinful behavior, as described in the prologue, had learned their lesson and become a God-fearing people. This theme is developed in some detail throughout the hymn: the sinful coveting of gold, gems, and other jewelry,

[23] WC, 1.7.7: *"Deum time et mandata eius observa!"*

principally by immoral women prostituting themselves "in the streets and neighborhoods" parallels the decoration of the same streets and neighborhoods with gold and gems during the triumphal procession.[24] The dramatic arc of Walter's first book is that of the formation of a God-fearing populace. Whereas before they are divided by creed and ethnicity, by the end they have fused into a unified populace, with a single leader (saluted as a king, no less), who dedicates the symbol of their unification—his banner—to the church of St. Peter, in language highly reminiscent of the relic of the True Cross. They stand, so Walter depicts them, together against the enemies of God that surround them. Walter has given the people of Antioch their history as well as a processional hymn to commemorate it.

Although Walter painted an idealized portrait of Christian unity, Frankish identifications with the Israelites sometimes occurred by contrast with others. In a sermon that appears to have been delivered in Jerusalem shortly after the First Crusade and directed toward participants, the preacher compares the crusaders to the Israelites, following a harangue to the Jews, who are mocked for their vain hope at recapturing Jerusalem:

> Quam melius habere poteratis, tenentibus alienigenis quam possidentibus veris istis Israelitis, qui benedictionem primogeniti quam perdististis precio fidei comparatam susceperunt et filii Abrahe fieri meruerunt . . .[25]

> Much better would it have been for you to hold on to [hope of recovering this city] while foreigners held it, than under the rule of those true Israelites, who received the blessing of the firstborn, which you lost, but which they acquired with the price of their faith, and who deserved to become children of Abraham . . .

[24] WC, 1 prol. 4; 1.7.8. Compare especially the phrases in the prologue *auro Arabico pretiosarumque gemmarum* (1 prol. 4) and *per plateas et per vicos* (1 prol. 5) with the phrases in the hymn: *vicos sternunt et plateas . . . auro, gemmis adornantur* (1.7.8).

[25] Ripoll sermon, p. 61.

In a clear callback to Paul's epistle to the Romans, the preacher claims that the "true Israelites," that is to say, the true Chosen People of God or *populus Dei*, are the Christian Franks.[26] The proof of this status is the success enjoyed by the Franks in their quest to reconquer Jerusalem, which they accomplished by virtue of their Christian faith; in this way they are proclaimed to be the "true descendants of Abraham." The preacher therefore does not consider the Franks to be foreigners in the same sense as he does previous rulers of Jerusalem (presumably chiefly the Fāṭimid Muslims from whom the crusaders conquered Jerusalem, although possibly including also the Seljuk Turks, Arabs, Byzantines, and even Romans who held the city before them).[27] He engages his audience by referring to a shared cultural tradition that considered Christians to be a Chosen People, "true Israelites," activating a "usable past" that is reinforced by liturgical and communal repetition, while the harangue to the Jews designates them as the Other in contrast to whom the contours of Frankish identity are defined.[28]

In William of Tyre, the term *populus Dei* becomes more layered. In contrast to earlier practice, he first uses it describe the Christians living in the Holy Land during the time of Charlemagne and in the centuries leading up to the First Crusade.[29] William earlier explained that, because "our sins required it, the holy city passed to various rulers."[30] Who does William

---

[26] Rom 9:6–7: *Non enim omnes qui ex Israel sunt, ii sunt Israelitae; neque qui semen sunt Abrahae, omnes filii; sed in Isaac vocabitur tibi semen.* Compare also Bernard of Clairvaux, *Liber ad milites Templi sive de laude novae militiae*, ed. J. Leclercq, *Opera*, vol. 3 (Rome, 1963), pp. 213–239, c. 4.8: *Veri profecto Israelitae procedunt ad bella pacifici.* For further discussion of this passage, see Schein 2005, p. 43.

[27] Compare the similar sentiment in Fulcher of Chartres, who claims that the Franks of Outremer have become indigenous (FC, 3.37): *Qui erat alienigena, nunc est indigena, et qui inquilinus, est utique incola factus.*

[28] For the concept of "usable past," see Elizabeth Castelli's insightful discussion of Maurice Halbwachs's *La topographie légendaire des évangiles en terre sainte*: E.A. Castelli, *Martyrdom and memory: early Christian culture making* (New York, 2004), pp. 14–19.

[29] WT, 1.6.332–52. William uses the term *populus Dei* several times throughout this passage to indicate the Christian populace of the Holy Land.

[30] WT, 1.3.1–4.

include in this use of the first person plural? Is it all of Christendom, or merely the Christians inhabiting Jerusalem? The focus here on the Christians of Jerusalem seems to indicate the latter interpretation.

When the phrase *populus Dei* is next employed, Jerusalem has passed to the Seljuks in the eleventh century. Closely basing himself on the narrative of Albert of Aachen, William relates the (now generally considered legendary) story of Peter the Hermit, who allegedly undertook a pilgrimage to the holy city shortly before 1096. Symeon II, patriarch of Jerusalem, informs Peter of the persecutions afflicting "God's people living in the city [of Jerusalem]," and, explaining that their prayers have not yet been heard by the Lord on account of their sins, he urges him to solicit aid from the West.[31] The patriarch's description of the Christians as a *populus Dei* represents a key departure from Albert of Aachen on William's part.[32]

The phrase next occurs when William relates the Council of Clermont in 1095. The specific context—which, as we will see below, is crucial—is the introduction of Adhémar of Le Puy, the papal legate who attended the council and who accompanied (or led, as William has it) the crusade, an "expedition of the People of God."[33] From this point onward, William continuously refers to the crusaders as *populus* or *plebs Dei*. Something interesting happens immediately after the capture of Jerusalem, when the crusaders come face to face with the Christians of Jerusalem, a union of two peoples of God. This moment, too, is connected to Adhémar of Le Puy: shortly after the crusader conquest of Jerusalem, the papal legate, along

[31] WT, 1.3.10; 1.6.34; 1.6.39; 1.6.52. For the Christians in the Holy Land at the time of Peter the Hermit, see WT, 1.11.26.

[32] See Susan Edgington's comment that Albert of Aachen tends to avoid the depiction of the crusaders as a *populus Dei*: S.B. Edgington, "Albert of Aachen and the *chansons de geste*," in J. France and J.G. Zajac (eds.), *The crusades and their sources: essays presented to Bernard Hamilton* (Aldershot, 1998), pp. 23–37, at 36.

[33] WT, 1.16.33.

with many others who had fallen over the course of the crusade, appear to the crusaders as they first visit the holy sites after the conquest of Jerusalem—a miraculous blessing, as William interprets it, bestowed on "God's people in the holy city and its confines" that foretold the future resurrection.[34] Directly afterward, the local Christians come into view, referred to as *fideles* ("faithful"): they remember their plea to Peter the Hermit, and give thanks to God for answering their prayers and inspiring Peter's appeals, such that entire peoples and kingdoms undertook such labors in the name of Christ. From this point onward in William's narrative, the two *populi Dei* have fused into one.

With William we encounter the novel notion that the *populus Dei* designated the Christian inhabitants before the First Crusade, going at least as far back as the ninth century. As I will argue below, William drew on an early tradition that took shape over the course of the First Crusade, or immediately afterward at the latest, in which the crusaders were conceived of as a People of God on their way to the Promised Land, led by Adhémar of Le Puy as a new Moses. William thus integrated two models of religious exceptionalism: that of the crusaders, who had been chosen by God to liberate their brethren and inhabit the Promised Land, and that of local Christians of Jerusalem who drew on a long tradition of trials and tribulations that mirrored those of the Israelites. What may have motivated William to do so? As has recently been argued, William appears to have gone back to the earlier books of his history at some point in the 1180s and made revisions, which included replacing the more standard appellation of the Church of the Holy Sepulcher as *Ecclesia Sancti Sepulchri* with that of the Church of the Resurrection (*Ecclesia Sancte/Dominice Resurrectionis*), which follows the Greek name of the shrine

[34] WT, 8.22.21–26.

(*Anastasis*) in drawing a closer connection between the church and Christ's resurrection.[35] In several instances where the phrase *populus/plebs Dei* describes the local Christians of Jerusalem, it appears alongside the renamed Church of the Resurrection.[36] William may have wanted to effect a rapprochement with the Orthodox Christians who had lived in Jerusalem long before the crusade, or—more likely perhaps—wished, possibly out of patriotic sentiments, to emphasize the preeminent status of the Christian populace of Jerusalem within Christendom. The miraculous scene after the conquest of Jerusalem is the most telling, for it includes an extended interpretation of the apparitions as prefigurations of the Resurrection to come and the Harrowing of Hell. If William's renewed focus on the Resurrection was indeed part of a later series of redactions he decided to implement, it is tempting to regard the emphasis on both the local Christians and the crusaders as People of God as one of these changes.

In what follows, we will discuss the imagery used in the Latin literature of Outremer portraying the Franks as a *populus Dei*, first the motif of the Israelites entering the Promised Land, and second, that of the Israelite kings. By discussing each of these motifs in detail, it will be possible to discern what the precise implications are of such comparisons and how they develop over time.

4. The First Crusade as Exodus

On August 1 of the year 1098, shortly after the crusaders triumphed decisively in the long battle for Antioch, the papal legate Adhémar of Le Puy passed away. To those who would go on to take Jerusalem nearly a year later, it would have seemed apt to draw a parallel with Moses, who

---

[35] Kedar 2014.

[36] WT, 1.15.40–52 (more precisely, the term here is *cultor dei populus*); 7.23.19–26; 8.22.11–21.

successfully led the Israelites to the land of Canaan, though he died before he could enter it himself. An early instance where such a connection is made occurs in Raymond of Aguilers, who describes Adhémar as "a man loved by God and dear to all men in everything he did" (*dilectus Deo et hominibus vir per omnia omnibus carus*), probably alluding to a passage in Ecclesiasticus in praise of Moses as "loved by God and men" (*Dilectus Deo et hominibus*).[37]

An explicit comparison is made later on: eight days after the crusaders finally take Jerusalem on July 15, 1099, the leaders of the crusade set about electing a king to govern the city; when some of the clergy protested that a new patriarch of Jerusalem ought to be appointed first, Raymond remarks that they were forced to give in, since their influence had waned without Adhémar, who "had kept the army in check with divine acts and words like a second Moses" (*in vita sua Moyses alter exercitum nostrum rebus et colloquiis divinis confovens continebat*).[38]

Other evidence suggests that the comparison with Moses was made at an early date. Nineteenth-century copies of now lost frescoes in the cathedral of Notre Dame of Le Puy show signs that an extensive program centered on Moses the Lawgiver and Christ in typological juxtaposition, and it has been argued persuasively that this cycle of frescoes was made shortly after Adhémar's death in 1098.[39] The account of Raymond of Aguilers, former canon of Le Puy with close ties to Adhémar and to the cathedral, may have influenced the choice of frescoes, which could well have been conceived with an eye to capitalize on the renown enjoyed by its former bishop.

---

[37] RA, p. 84; Sirach 45:1.

[38] RA, p. 152. Similar descriptions of Adhémar as *alter Moyses* occur in Western chroniclers: e.g., RM, 731; BB, 16.

[39] A. Derbes, "A crusading fresco cycle at the cathedral of Le Puy," *Art Bulletin* 72 (1991), pp. 561–576. I am grateful to Gil Fishhof of Tel Aviv University for drawing my attention to this.

It seems, therefore, that over the course of the First Crusade, a tradition had developed in which the papal legate was deemed a typological counterpart to Moses. Given the limited nature of the comparisons, he may have been accorded this honor purely by virtue of being the spiritual leader of a group of people that considered themselves God's Chosen People. A fully developed *comparatio*, or rhetorical comparison (or *synkrisis* in Greek, as it is more commonly known), detailing in what aspects Adhémar and Moses are alike, appears in the epitaph written by Ralph of Caen in elegiac couplets, where Adhémar is described as "this most celebrated imitator of Moses."[40] I will quote the most salient part:

> Causa vi*ae* Moysi tellus Canaam memoratur:
> huic quoque causa vi*ae* Terra fuit Canaam.[41]
> Cernere non uti Moysi conceditur illa
> huic quoque non uti, cernere ferme datum est;
> longa Deo Moysen ieiunia conciliarunt,
> hunc quoque longa Deo consecrat esuries.
> Ipse Deus Moysen, hunc papa Urbanus, et ipse
> preco Dei sequitur: misit utrumque Deus.[42]

> The land of Canaan is said to have been the cause of Moses' journey, and for him also was the land of Canaan the cause of his journey. It was given to Moses to lay eyes upon it, but not to lay hold of it; to him also it was not given to lay hold of it, but nearly to lay eyes upon it. Long fasts drew Moses closer to God; a long fast also consecrated him to God. God Himself listened to Moses, Pope Urban, the very messenger of God, listened to him; both were sent by God.

[40] RC, 2769: *Conditus est Moysis clarissimus hic imitator*. For a brief introduction to *synkrisis* in medieval Latin literature, see W. Berschin, "Synkrisis in der mittellateinischen Biographie: Paare von Helden im Vergleich (IV.–XII. Jahrhundert)," *Stuttgarter Arbeiten zur Germanistik* 420 (2004), pp. 182–187.

[41] I have adopted Martène's transcription of these two lines and rejected D'Angelo's nonsensical reading: *Causa vir Moysi tellus Canaam memoratur: / huic quoque causa via? Terra fuit Canaam*. The portion of the manuscript that originally contained this epitaph is now missing, so that Martène's transcription of it is the only remaining witness. It is unclear why D'Angelo made these emendations, which do not improve the sense.

[42] RC, 2773–2780. I have taken the liberty to arrange the verses as elegiac couplets (as they were in Martène's transcription), though they are not arranged as such in D'Angelo's edition.

By comparing Adhémar to Moses so extensively, Ralph invites the reader to draw a typological connection between the two, implying at the same time that the crusaders under the papal legate's guidance are equivalent to the Israelites entering the Promised Land. Moreover, Ralph invests Adhémar's speech, in which he appoints Arnulf of Chocques as his successor just before his death, with biblical significance.[43] If Adhémar is a new Moses, it is only logical that his successor is a new Joshua. Ralph implies as much by his own comment after Adhémar recommends Arnulf to the crusader army as his successor as papal legate, describing Arnulf as "second to none in this struggle" (*nulli hoc in agone secundum*).[44] Thus Ralph significantly augments his addressee's prestige by implying that he, too, is god-sent in the crusaders' expedition.

Arnulf, or so Ralph portrays him, eagerly promoted the biblical associations of his new role. After the crusaders' disillusionment with the Holy Lance of Antioch following Peter Bartholomew's trial by fire, Ralph relates that he suggested a new means of raising morale:

> Postquam fraudis commentor Petrus, quam meruit, penam luit, denuo fit conventus, ut elapso cassatae inventionis gaudio, novum succedat solacium. Imago Salvatoris auro ex purissimo effigianda proponitur populo, Israelitici structura tabernaculi: quantae in his, quantae in illis fuerint expensae, devotio illius seculi retrectatur. Nec preteritur merces incunctata, frequentes ex hoste victoriae; monetur quoque et pro amotis iam periculis Deo esse gratandum, et pro amovendis supplicandum. Huius igitur exhortationis Arnulfus predicator ipse auditores suos, *quocumque volebat, inclinabat*.[45]

> After Peter, that contriver of deceit, suffered the punishment he deserved, an assembly is held once again, so that a new consolation may be found after the joy of finding the lance had dissipated. A proposal is put to the people to fashion a statue of the Savior from the purest gold, as a representation (?) of the Israelite Tabernacle; the devotion of that age is brought into memory, how great the expenses that were lavished on this and that. Nor did they neglect to mention the instant reward, the frequent victories over their enemy that would follow, and they urge that God ought to be shown gratitude for the dangers He had already

[43] RC, 2742–2750.

[44] RC, 2751.

[45] RC, 3135–3144. Cf. Prov 21:1.

> warded off, and that He should be entreated for those yet to come. It was Arnulf who preached this exhortation, *swaying his listeners whichever way he wished*.

The proposal to build a statue of Christ as the equivalent of the Israelite Tabernacle is telling: it was not sufficient to be "soldiers of Christ" alone, for the crusaders were also to be the typological counterparts to the Israelites led by Moses. The "devotion of that age" (*devotio illius seculi*) needed to be rekindled in order for the crusaders to replicate the Israelites' success. Ralph's earlier association of Arnulf with the biblical figures of Moses and Joshua, his choice to narrate in some detail this particular episode (which does not appear in any other chronicle of the First Crusade), and the dramatic presentation in which Arnulf is depicted as delivering a sermon combine to impart the reader with a sense that, truly, the new Children of Israel were about to enter the Promised Land, carrying before them not the Ark of the Covenant but a golden statue of their Savior.

Ralph completes his comparison between crusaders and the Israelites when describing the siege of Jerusalem. When the crusaders on the front lines had all but given up hope, the priests came forth to assist in carrying ladders over to the walls, singing psalms as they did so. The unusual sight was enough to reinvigorate the crusaders:

> Tuncque prae labore militaris torpebat virtus, visu insolito experrecta. Redit ad muros, pium illud "kyrryeleison" comitans; illud, inquam, et ab imo pectore egressum et ad summi aures iudicis efficaciter progressum. Exaudivit enim Dominus clamorem contritorum, neque ultra sustinuit perfidorum blasphemias: *qui divisit mare Rubrum in divisiones, et eduxit Israel per medium eius, modo solatus est desolatos suos; atque ubi iam spes exciderat vitae, aditum reseravit victoriae* [Ps 135:13–14].[46]

> And at that time the knightly valor was faltering on account of the toil, but perked up at this unusual sight. They return to the walls, accompanied by that pious outburst, "*kyrie eleison*," which had proceeded from the depths of their hearts to the ears of the Highest Judge—and not without result. For the Lord answered the cries of the repentant, and did not suffer any longer the blasphemies of the impious ones: *He who*

[46] RC, 3537–3544.

parted the Red Sea, and brought Israel out of its midst, now consoled His desolate people; and when the hope for survival had already vanished, He opened a way to victory.

Uniquely, Ralph brings the Franks' victory at the siege of Jerusalem into conjunction with the narrative of the Israelites in Exodus, particularly with the scene that shows most clearly God's support of His Chosen People: the parting of the Red Sea.[47] The psalm Ralph quotes is particularly apt, for it develops the relationship between God and His Chosen People, who are led through the desert to the Promised Land and elevated above their vanquished foes.

Like Ralph, Fulcher of Chartres was not present at the Capture of Jerusalem in 1099, as he and Baldwin I were in Edessa at this time. Baldwin's arrival in Jerusalem after its conquest must in many ways have been experienced as an anticlimactic event that was not so easily aligned with the story of Exodus. Perhaps to remedy the situation, one of Baldwin's first actions as Frankish king of Jerusalem in 1100 was to undertake an expedition to explore the surrounding area, venturing as far as the Byzantine monastery of St. Aaron on the Mountain of Aaron (Jabal Hārūn) near Petra. Although the expedition must have served some military and political purposes, Fulcher of Chartres, who accompanied Baldwin, emphasizes the religious aspects. He recognizes the rock that Moses struck to provide water to the wandering Israelites—"which even now flows no less than at that time"—and identifies the monastery of St. Aaron as situated on the mountain "where Moses and Aaron used to speak to God."[48] Thus the first Frankish king of Jerusalem is portrayed by Fulcher as retracing the path along which Moses had let the Israelites into the Promised Land.

[47] Ralph is the only author to refer to the parting of the Red Sea when describing the capture of Jerusalem. For other crusade historians using the image of crossing the Red Sea in different contexts, consult J. Rubenstein, "Godfrey of Bouillon versus Raymond of Saint-Gilles: how Carolingian kingship trumped millenarianism at the end of the First Crusade," in M. Gabriele and J. Stuckey (eds.), *The legend of Charlemagne in the Middle Ages: Power, faith, and crusade* (New York, 2008), pp. 59–75.

[48] FC, 2.5.8–9.

The concept of the Franks in the Latin East as a People of God persisted throughout the twelfth century, for William of Tyre declares his subject matter in the Prologue to his history in the following terms:

> . . . narrationis seriem ordinavimus, exordium sumentes ab exitu virorum fortium et deo amabilium principum, qui a regnis Occidentalibus, vocante domino, egressi Terram Promissionis et pene universam Syriam in manu forti sibi vendicaverunt, et inde usque ad regnum domini Balduini quarti, qui in ordine regum, computato domino duce Godefrido, qui primus regnum obtinuit, locum habuit septimum, per annos LXXXIIII cum multa diligentia protraximus historiam.[49]

> I have arranged the order of the narrative such that I begin with the departure of the valiant men and princes who are dear to God, who left the Western kingdoms at God's summons and claimed the Promised Land and nearly all of Syria for themselves with might, and I have extended my history with great diligence all the way up to the kingdom of Lord Baldwin IV, who (counting the lord Duke Godfrey, who first ruled over the kingdom) held the seventh place, covering 84 years.

William considers the crusaders God's Chosen People and the land they conquered the Promised Land. Moreover, in describing the First Crusade he uses language evocative of Exodus (*exitu*, *egressi*) before speaking of the Frankish kingdom of Jerusalem, thus inviting a comparison between the Frankish kings and the biblical kings of Jerusalem.[50] Yet in the remainder of his history William took the comparison to the Israelites in a different direction. Writing some seventy years after the First Crusade, William lived in vastly different circumstances from the euphoria experienced by the first crusaders. Closely connected to the royal court, he had witnessed firsthand how internal strife, political jockeying, and material greed had divided the Crusader States and posed a serious threat to their continued existence. Not coincidentally, he

---

[49] WT, Prol. 91–99. Compare also WT, 20.3.3.

[50] Note especially William's use of the phrase *amabilium deo* to describe the leaders of the First Crusade, a phrase similar to the *amabilis Domino* used to describe David in 2 Sam 12:25. For a discussion of the Franks as *populus Dei* in William of Tyre, see the still useful treatment of D.W.T.C. Vessey, "William of Tyre: apology and apocalypse," in G. Cambier (ed.), *Hommages à André Boutemy* (Brussels, 1976), pp. 390–403; see also the discussion in Winkler 2006, pp. 465–474. See below ("The kingdom of David") for a more nuanced discussion of the extent to which William's conception of history is based on typology.

continuously emphasizes in his account of the First Crusade the bickering among the crusaders, frequently describing them as "stiff-necked"—the term used in the Bible to describe the stubborn Israelites when they refused to pay heed to Moses.[51] William sees the First Crusaders, and by extension their descendants, as quarrelsome Israelites: they require leadership from a Moses-like figure, and they can lose God's favor through impious behavior, even though they are His Chosen People. All of this is implicit when, for example, later on in his history William criticizes Count Hugh of Jaffa, who had no desire to obey the newly-crowned King Fulk and was accused of plotting against him, by qualifying him as "stiff-necked."[52] For William, the First Crusaders were as stubborn as the Israelites under Moses; the implicit comparison both criticizes them and their bickering offspring, and claims that the Franks of Outremer are similarly a chosen people, a *populus Dei* living in the Promised Land, who nevertheless require proper direction under a new Moses.[53]

5. Excursus I: Lamentations of the Fall of Jerusalem

The lament attributed to Albert of Tarsus, bewailing the recent tragedies that had befallen the etiolated Latin East in 1187, opens with a series of references to the ancient foes of the Israelites:

> Plange, Sion et Iudaea,
> Plangant, quotquot sunt in ea,
> Quod triumphat Idumaea,
> Et Aegyptus fert tropaea;
> Amalech invaluit,
> Ierusalem corruit,

[51] WT, 1.18.50; 1.23.4; 1.26.27; 2.22.44; 4.22.1. Ex 32:9; 33:3, 5; 34:9; Deut 9:6, 13.

[52] WT, 14.15.47.

[53] See also the discussion in Vessey 1976, pp. 401–403, although I take issue with the biographical arguments painting William as a dejected pessimist after his denial of the Jerusalemite see.

Loca sancta polluit
Proles Chananaea.[54]

> Weep, Zion and Judea, let all that is in it weep, for Idumea triumphs and Egypt carries off the trophies; Amalek has gained in strength, Jerusalem has fallen, and the Canaanite sons defile the holy places.

Why does the poet mention specifically the Edomites (inhabitans of Edom or Idumea, south of Judea), the Egyptians, the Amalekites (nomadic descendents of Amalek living in the Sinai desert), and the Canaanites? The common denominator underlying the metaphors is their connection to the story of Exodus. The Israelites had managed to escape Egypt under the guidance of the divinely-led Moses, after which they were attacked by the Amalekites, while the Edomites refused to allow the Israelites to pass through their land on their way to Canaan.[55]

While the crusaders in their conquest of Jerusalem were considered typological figures of the Israelites and their conquest of Canaan, Albert depicts the loss of Jerusalem as an ironic reversal: it is as if history repeated itself, yet this time, without God's assistance, Israel's foes were allowed to triumph. The poem follows the model of the Book of Lamentations, bewailing the loss of Jerusalem after the sack of Nebuchadnezzar in 587 BC, from the perspective of the Babylonian captivity.[56] Albert, therefore, continued to align Frankish history with the fate of the Israelites: they, too, have incurred divine disfavor and must remain in exile. Like the Israelites, however, the Franks also hope that one day they may be allowed to return.

---

[54] AT, 1–8.

[55] Ex 17:8–10; Num 20:19. For an earlier reference to the Franks as battling Idumea and Amalek, see Rorgo Fretellus (RF, 2): *considera sanctam Iherusalem, contemplare et ipsam Syon, que celestem paradysum allegorice nobis figurat et in qua modo fortiores ex Israel, novi Machabei scilicet, veri Salomonis lectulum excubant, expugnantes inde ydumeum et Amalech.*

[56] See especially Lam 1:4: *viae Sion lugent eo quod non sint qui veniant ad sollemnitatem*; 1:16: *facti sunt filii mei perditi quoniam invaluit inimicus*; 2:2: *polluit regnum et principes eius*; 4:21: *gaude et laetare filia Edom quae habitas in terra Hus*; 5:2: *hereditas nostra versa est ad alienos*; 5:6: *Aegypto dedimus manum et Assyriis ut saturaremur pane*; 5:13: *pueri in ligno corruerunt*.

6. The kingdom of David: Biblical kings in Frankish Jerusalem

Given that it was an established practice for authors in the Latin East to consider themselves a *populus Dei*, it would be expected that they perceived the Latin kings of Jerusalem to be modern counterparts to the Israelite kings. They had at their disposal a multitude of earlier medieval precedents for such a comparison, which can be traced back to at least the fifth century, when Emperor Marcian was depicted as a new David when he convened the Council of Chalcedon in 451.[57] In sixth-century Gaul, Gregory of Tours hails Clothar I as "a new David," and the anonymous author of the *Liber historiae Francorum* likens the peaceful Dagobert to Solomon.[58] The comparisons become something of a commonplace from Carolingian times onward, the most famous instance being perhaps that of Charlemagne, habitually addressed as "David" by members of the literary coterie attached to his court, who claims to follow the example of Josiah, famed for restoring the Temple and reforming the priesthood, in the preface to the *Admonitio generalis*.[59] Charlemagne cultivated the association with the kings of the Old Testament not as a

[57] A concise overview of biblical imagery used in political context during the Middle Ages (especially useful for the early and Carolingian period), is: P. Riché, "La Bible et la vie politique dans le haut Moyen Âge," in P. Riché and G. Lobrichon (eds.), *Le Moyen Âge et la Bible* (Paris, 1984), pp. 385–400. For Byzantium, see the excellent new discussion of C. Rapp, "Old Testament models for emperors in early Byzantium," in P. Magdalino and R. Nelson (eds.), *The Old Testament in Byzantium* (Washington, D.C., 2010), pp. 175–197. Steger's extensive study that focuses specifically on the representation of David in medieval art remains useful: H. Steger, *David: rex et propheta. König David als vorbildliche Verkörperung des Herrschers und Dichters im Mittelalter, nach Bilddarstellungen des achten bis zwölften Jahrhunderts* (Nürnberg, 1961).

[58] Gregory of Tours, *Libri historiarum x*, ed. B. Krusch and W. Levison, MGH SS Rer. Merov. 1.1 (Hannover, 1951), c. 4.20, p. 153: *Ibatque Chlotharius rex tamquam novus David contra Absalonem filium pugnaturus . . . Liber historiae Francorum*, ed. B. Krusch, MGH SS Rer. Merov. 2 (Hannover, 1888), recension A, c. 42, p. 314: *Ipse pacificus, velut Salomon, quietus regnum obtenuit Francorum*.

[59] So in the verse epistles of Angilbert and Alcuin: e.g., MGH, Poetae 1, p. 245, 360–363 (*passim*); Theodulph also adds comparisons to Solomon and Joseph, see MGH, Poetae 1 (Berlin, 1881), p. 483, ll. 29–30. The most thorough study remains that of E. Rieber, *Die Bedeutung alttestamentlicher Vorstellungen für das Herrscherbild Karls des Grossen und seines Hofkreises* (diss. Tübingen, 1945). For the *Admonitio generalis*, see MGH Capit. 1 (Hannover, 1883), p. 52.

mere literary topos but as part of a larger program in which he laid claim to a biblical model of kingship; for instance, Alcuin writes how Charlemagne's palace chapel at Aachen was built on the model of Solomon's Temple.[60]

The inheritors of Charlemagne's empire continued to align themselves with the biblical kings: Thegan, a biographer of Louis the Pious, describes how Pope Stephen IV (816–817) greeted Louis as "a second King David," while Ermoldus Nigellus embellishes upon the encounter by having the Pope draw an extended comparison between Louis and Solomon, and elsewhere refers to Louis the Pious as both a second David and a new Solomon.[61] Nigellus' comparisons have been brought into connection with his description of the paintings in Louis' palace at Ingelheim, which apparently included depictions of David and Solomon, to argue that these were part of Nigellus' aim in showing Louis as the meeting point between the sacred and the secular.[62] Charles the Bald, moreover, is described by John the Scot Eriugena as "the heir of David" and exhorted to follow the example of David by Lupus of Ferrières, while the so-called San Callisto Bible, commissioned by Charles, bears splendid illuminations portraying the various

[60] Alcuin, *Epistulae*, ed. E. Dümmler, MGH, Epistulae Karolini Aevi (Berlin, 1895), vol. 2, 145, p. 235. Gustav Kühnel argues that the *Templum Salomonis* mentioned by Alcuin refers not to the Temple of Solomon of the Old Testament, but rather to the Dome of the Rock, concerning the appearance of which Charlemagne would have been well-informed through his diplomatic relations with Caliph Hārūn al-Rashīd and through travelers' accounts: G. Kühnel, "Aachen, Byzanz und die frühislamische Architektur im Heiligen Land," in G. Minkenberg, W. Dreßen, A.C. Oellers (eds.), *Ex Oriente. Isaak und der weisse Elefant; Bagdad-Jerusalem-Aachen. Eine Reise durch drei Kulturen um 800 und heute*, vol. 3 (Mainz am Rhein, 2003), pp. 52–67.

[61] Thegan, *Vita Hludowici imperatoris*, ed. R. Rau, *Quellen zur karolingische Reichsgeschichte*, vol. 1 (Darmstadt, 1969), pp. 215–253, c. 16. Ermoldus Nigellus, *In honorem Hludowici Caesaris Augusti libri iiii*, ed. E. Faral, *Ermold le Noir: poème sur Louis le Pieux et épitres au roi Pepin*, Les classiques de l'histoire de France au Moyen Âge 14 (Paris, 1964), 892–925, 969–970, 989–995.

[62] Nigellus 4.2202–2298; A. Ebenbauer, *Carmen historicum: Untersuchungen zur historischen Dichtung im karolingischen Europa*, vol. 1 (Vienna, 1978), 137–140.

kings of the Old Testament, including Saul, who is depicted as being crowned according to Carolingian rites.[63]

Although writers of the Latin East had a well-established tradition to draw on, no eyewitness account of the First Crusade makes explicit parallels between rulers of the Old Testament and leaders of the First Crusade. The obvious exception are the Maccabees, who may not have been judged to possess the legitimizing associations of kingship that David or Solomon had, and seem to have been considered chiefly exemplary figures of the holy warrior (see below). In fact, given that the first Frankish ruler of Jerusalem, Godfrey of Bouillon, is reported never to have staked a claim to the title of king, initially the leaders appear to have hesitated to make too direct a claim to be a successor to the kings of the Old Testament. This hesitation may at least partly have been motivated by apocalyptic concerns, in which an establishment of a kingdom in Jerusalem signaled the beginning of the End of Times.[64] The most widely disseminated version of the story (generally referred to as the legend of the Last Emperor) is the

[63] John the Scott: *PL*, vol. 122, col. 1229, l. 46: *Heres davidicus efficiere pius*. Lupus of Ferrière: *Loup de Ferrière*: *Correspondance*, ed. L. Levillain (Paris, 1927–1935), vol. 1, 37, p. 162 and vol. 2, 49, pp. 67–68. On the San Callisto Bible, see J.M. Wallace-Hadrill, *The Frankish Church* (Oxford, 1983), pp. 248–249.

[64] Jay Rubenstein questions the evidence for the title Godfrey is reported to have taken: *advocatus Sancti Sepulchri*. His discussion of the problems remains the best introduction: Rubenstein 2008; see also J. Riley-Smith, "The title of Godfrey of Bouillon," *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 52 (1979), pp. 83–86; J. France,"The election and title of Godfrey of Bouillon," *Canadian Journal of History* 18 (1983), pp. 321–329; and A.V. Murray, "The title of Godfrey of Bouillon as ruler of Jerusalem," *Collegium medievale: interdisciplinary journal of medieval research* 3 (1990), pp. 163–178; L. Ferrier, "La Couronne refuseé de Godefroy de Bouillon: eschatologie et humiliation de la majesté aux premier temps du royaume latin de Jérusalem," *Le concile de Clermont de 1095 et l'appel à la Croisade: actes du Colloque universitaire international de Clermont-Ferrand 23–25 juin 1995* (Rome 1997), pp. 245–265. The best summary of the available evidence in favor of this title is in Murray 2000, pp. 63–77. It is not the place here to discuss the foundation of the kingdom of Jerusalem or the way in which the kings portrayed themselves, be it in charters, seals, or in the form of visual arts commissioned by them, which merits a book-length study of its own; I eagerly await the forthcoming book on the matter by Deborah Gerish, who is currently reworking her dissertation: *Shaping the crown of gold: Constructions of royal identity in the first kingdom of Jerusalem* (Ph.D. diss., University of California, Santa Barbara, 1999). In an earlier study, Gerish demonstrated that the kings of Jerusalem did not emphasize their position as inheritors of David's throne in the charters they issued: D. Gerish, "Ancestors and predecessors: royal continuity and identity in the first kingdom of Jerusalem," *Anglo-Norman Studies* 20 (1997), pp. 127–150. Another study, which goes some way to providing a more general narrative of the foundation of the kingdom of Jerusalem, largely based on the chronicles, recently appeared: É. Crouzet-Pavan, *Le mystère des rois de Jérusalem. 1099–1187* (Paris, 2013).

treatise of the tenth-century Cluniac abbot Adso of Montier-en-Der (d. 992), which relates that the End of Times will be at hand when a king of the Franks will lay down his crown and scepter on the Mount of Olives.[65]

Fulcher of Chartres is therefore slow to compare anyone to the Old Testament rulers, though his thinking on the matter develops. At the beginning of his work, Fulcher proclaims that the crusade fulfills Old Testament prophecies, particularly those of David, establishing at an early point the connection between the crusade and King David.[66] When Baldwin of Boulogne was crowned the first king of Jerusalem, Fulcher begins to draw a subtle comparison with earlier biblical rulers: at the start of his reign, Baldwin faced off against the Turks in a fierce battle near Beirut; the onslaught was such that, as Fulcher enjoins in a *sententia* in the form of a dactylic hexameter, *nec saperet Salomon, nec posset vincere Sanson* ("neither Solomon nor Samson would have been able to win").[67] Eventually, however, the Franks prove victorious on account of their piety; although he does not say it in so many words, Fulcher does bring Baldwin here into the same sphere as Solomon and Samson.

---

[65] Adso of Montier-en-Der, *De ortu et tempore Antichristi*, ed. D. Verhelst, *CCCM* 45 (Turnhout, 1976). For a fuller discussion, see R. Konrad, *De ortu et tempore Antichristi. Antichristvorstellung und Geschichtsbild des Abtes Adso von Montier-en-Der* (Kallmünz, 1964); Vessey 1976; Schein 2005, pp. 35–36, 96–97; Gabriele 2011, pp. 107–128. Adso's main source was the apocalypse of Ps.-Methodius, an originally Syriac text from the seventh century, which was translated into Greek and later into Latin. For the Latin text with English translation, see *Apocalypse: Pseudo-Methodius; An Alexandrian world chronicle*, ed. and tr. B. Garstad, Dumbarton Oaks Medieval Library 14 (Cambridge, Mass., 2012).

[66] FC, 1.6.10: *Insulae marium et omnia regna terrarum adeo concussa sunt, ut sit credendum adimpletam prophetiam Davidis, qui dixit in Psalmo: "omnes gentes quascunque fecisti venient et adorabunt coram te, Domine"* [Ps 85:9]*, et illud, quod postea illuc usque pervenientes merito dixerunt: "adorabimus in loco ubi steterunt pedes eius"* [Ps 131:7]. *De hoc itinere plurima etiam in prophetiis legimus, quae revolvendi taedium est.* Matthew of Edessa shows a similar strategy by quoting a prophecy from David when he first mentions the First Crusade (ME, p. 164).

[67] FC, 2.3.1.

By the time Baldwin I passes away, Fulcher clearly feels more at ease in making explicit comparisons with Old Testament figures (though not yet with the biblical kings), for in the epitaph with which he ends the book, he writes:

> Cum rex iste ruit, Francorum gens pia flevit,
> Cuius erat scutum, robur et auxilium.
> Nam fuit arma suis, timor hostibus, hostis et illis;
> Dux validus patriae, consimilis Iosue.[68]
>
> When that king fell, the pious Frankish people wept, for he was their shield, strength, and aid. He was a weapon to his people, but fear to his enemies, being an enemy also to them; he was a valiant leader of the fatherland, very much like Joshua.

Fulcher recreates biblical history, portraying Baldwin as a reborn Joshua, the leader of the Israelite tribes in their conquest of Canaan.[69] Moreover, Fulcher perceives Israel to be his *patria* ("fatherland"): although the heavenly Jerusalem is in a sense the true *patria* of every Christian, Fulcher proudly calls the earthly city his homeland as well. As a citizen of this *patria*, he and the rest of the *Francorum gens pia* ("pious Frankish people") participate in biblical history. The comparison with Joshua is very apt: as Joshua entered the Promised Land with the Israelites and marked the next phase in Israelite history after the forty years of wandering the desert under Moses, so had a new era of Frankish history begun after the crusade with the foundation of the kingdom of Jerusalem under Baldwin I.

If we accept the earlier dating of Achard of Arrouaise's poem, placing it in the period 1109–1112, we find in the opening of his poem the earliest instance where a Frankish king

---

[68] FC, 2.64.7.

[69] For a more general discussion of the use of the imagery of Joshua in crusader context, particularly in thirteenth-century France, see M.C. Gaposchkin, "Louis IX, crusade and the promise of Joshua in the Holy Land," *Journal of Medieval History* 34 (2008), pp. 245–274.

(Baldwin I) is considered to be in a line of succession to King David by an author from the Latin East:

> Ad te regem, successorem David regis incliti,
> Clamat gemens et suspirat prior Templi Domini.[70]
>
> To you, king, successor of famed King David, the prior of the *Templum Domini* cries out with sighs and groans.

At the start of a poem intended to shed light on the biblical history of the site of the *Templum Domini* and to build up its dignity as much as possible, it made sense for Achard to bring his addressee into connection with the biblical past as well. The result is that, when Achard relates how David built an altar at the current site of the *Templum Domini* to atone for his sin of pride and to escape the wrath of the avenging angel, King Baldwin is expected to perceive the lesson to be drawn from this cautionary tale and return the crown's portion of the treasure.[71] As will be discussed below, Achard includes similar episodes relating to the Maccabees.

Ralph of Caen makes a subtle reference to David when describing Adhémar of Le Puy's rousing speech to the leaders of the crusade before the battle of Antioch, urging them to exhort their men by telling of the rewards that await them. They should take an example, he says, from Saul:

---

[70] AP, 24–25. On the dating of the poem, see Chapter 1, section 3.2. Earlier, ca. 1102, Anselm of Canterbury wrote to Baldwin I that he had "King David as his predecessor." See Anselm of Canterbury, *Opera*, ed. F.S. Schmitt (Edinburgh, 1946–1951), no. 324, p. 255. See also the discussions in A. Graboïs, "Anselme, l'Ancien Testament et l'idée de Croisade," in R. Foreville (ed.), *Les mutations socio-culturelles au tournant des XIe–XIIe siècles. Études Anselmiennes (IVe session)* (Paris, 1984), pp. 163–173; Schein 2005, p. 96.

[71] AP, ll. 110–127. Albert of Aachen reports that Tancred shared the spoils of the *Templum Domini* with Godfrey of Bouillon: AA, 6.23. For a discussion, see W.G. Zajac, "Captured property on the First Crusade," in J. Phillips (ed.), *The First Crusade. Origins and impact* (Manchester, 1997), pp. 153–186, at 161–162.

> Respicite Saul, quid fecerit, et de antiquis exempla sumamus: non fuit in Hebreis, qui contra Goliath surgeret, donec regis filia et libertas patriae domui promissa David suscitarunt.[72]
>
> Consider what Saul did, and let us follow the example of the ancients: there was no one among the Hebrews who stood up against Goliath, until the promise of the hand of the king's daughter and of freedom for his paternal house stirred David's heart.

The context is that the leaders have been squabbling over who should receive the city of Antioch if they succeed in taking it. Adhémar's advice is not to let the argument cause them to lose sight of their goal: Jerusalem. It is better, he suggests, to cease quarrelling and decide that Antioch should pass to the one responsible for gaining entrance into the city.[73] As soon as all the leaders voice their assent and, at Bohemond's instigation, swear to uphold this resolution, Bohemond sends a messenger to the Armenian traitor who had agreed to admit the Frankish army into the city. To the reader it becomes clear that Adhémar's sermon invites identifying Bohemond with David, thereby solidifying Bohemond's claim to Antioch.

Most commonly, however, the figure of David is employed in relation to the kingdom of Jerusalem. When describing Tancred and Baldwin's dispute over the city of Tarsus in Cilicia, Ralph grants the latter the following qualifications:

> Nec mirum tot vitae intervallum ornari dotibus, quae a Francorum sceptro lucem ingressa, ab Hierusolimitanorum erat egressura: utque liquidius clarescat, a magno illo rege Carolo genus trahens, super solium David sessurus divinitus trahebatur! Iure igitur ac merito Alexandrum vincebat, cuius illustrabant Carolus ortum, David occasum . . .[74]

---

[72] RC, 1996–1999.

[73] RC, 2004–2006: *melius ipsa civitas illi contingat merces, si cuius ope nos receperit, quam premii expes virtus torpeat, excusationem, quam audistis, obiciens.*

[74] RC, 1142–1145. See also the discussion below in Chapter 4, section 3.

> And it is no wonder that his [i.e., Baldwin of Boulogne's] earthly life was adorned with such a wealth of riches, seeing as how it had come into existence under the scepter of the Franks and would leave this existence under the scepter of the Jerusalemites. And, in order that this might be the clearer, deriving his descent from Charlemagne, he was born divinely as one who was to take his seat on David's throne. Rightly and deservedly so did he, whose birth was illuminated by Charlemagne and his death by David, surpass Alexander . . .

Ralph portrays Jerusalemite kingship as characterized and legitimized by three qualities: associations with Charlemagne as the model of medieval kingship, with the kings of the Old Testament, and with classical models of rule and empire. Ralph, who composed an encomium of Baldwin's opponent Tancred, may have wished to hedge his bets and angle for royal patronage by including a few laudatory remarks for Baldwin. Even if the passage is hyperbolic, it is particularly instructive for the categories it includes as worthy of praise to a Frankish king of Jerusalem: Carolingian lineage and an association with biblical kingship combine to surpass classical ideals.

The association with biblical kings also appears in pilgrim literature. Rorgo Fretellus is the first author from the East to liken the Latin kingdom to "the kingdom of David," when describing the castle atop Montréal, constructed by Baldwin I in 1115:

> Mons Regalis quem Balduinus Bononiensis, impiger ille leo primus comes Edessanus, postea primus Francorum rex in Iherusalem, ad Arabiam christicolis subiugandam et ad tuendum regnum David, in castrum firmum reddidit.[75]

> Montréal, which Baldwin of Boulogne, that tireless lion, the first count of Edessa and later the first king of the Franks in Jerusalem, turned into a fortified castle, with the aim of subjugating Arabia to the Christians and of protecting the kingdom of David.

[75] RF, 24. Compare RF, 26; JW, 563–566.

Thus, in a guide intended for pilgrims, Rorgo integrates the biblical topography with the Latin East he lived in. Later on, Rorgo even uses the phrase "kingdom of David" in reference to Godfrey of Bouillon:

> Voverat equidem, si divina pietas Aschalonem in manu eius quandoque reddere dignaretur, totius Iherusalem redditus Deo militantibus in ecclesia Dominici Sepulchri dominique patriarche dominio se largiturum. Sperans Dei preeunte gratia restituere regnum David, Phylistiim quidem et Egyptum, veri subiugare Salomonis imperio.[76]

> He [Godfrey of Bouillon] had vowed that, if at any point God's piety would deign to offer Ascalon to his authority, he would grant the revenues of all of Jerusalem to those doing battle for God in the church of the Holy Sepulcher and to the authority of the lord patriarch. He hoped, with God's grace as his guide, to restore the kingdom of David and to subjugate the Philistines and Egypt to the rule of the true Solomon.

In this passage on the role of Godfrey of Bouillon as protector and patron of the Holy Sepulcher Rorgo Fretellus claims that he aspired to found a kingdom on the biblical models of David and Solomon. Here, we encounter for the first time an explicit notion of reviving the biblical past and restoring the kingdom of David.

To conclude our discussion of the motif of the biblical kings, let us turn to William of Tyre. When Baldwin II dies and Fulk of Anjou is crowned king of Jerusalem in 1131, William proceeds to describe his physical characteristics and personal traits:

> Erat autem idem Fulco vir rufus, sed instar David, quem invenit dominus iuxta cor suum, fidelis, mansuetus et contra leges illius coloris affabilis, benignus et misericors, in operibus pietatis et elemosinarum largitione liberalis admodum . . .[77]

> This Fulk was a ruddy man, but like David, whom the Lord found to be according to his own heart: faithful, meek, and, contrary to most of that complexion, kind, friendly, and compassionate, and generous to the utmost in deeds of piety and in bestowing alms . . .

[76] RF, 77.

[77] WT, 14.1.6–7.

William draws an explicit parallel between King David and King Fulk, beginning with the complexion of their skin. David is famously described as "ruddy," as was Fulk.[78] The similarities go deeper than the pigment of their skin, however, for like David, Fulk possesses all of the qualities of a biblical king: he is compassionate and generous, but also experienced in warfare. While writing of Fulk's ascension to the throne of Jerusalem, William quotes from the passage in which the prophet Samuel tells Saul that David has been chosen by God to be king of Jerusalem. In the Frankish cultural memory, at least as William presents it, King Fulk had become associated with King David. This suggestion is corroborated by the splendidly illuminated Melisende Psalter, believed to have been commissioned by Queen Melisende, wife of King Fulk. The ivory covers of this codex bear depictions of King David performing the corporal works of mercy.[79] The association of King Fulk with David may therefore at least partly be indebted to a program of royal propaganda not unlike the programs of Charlemagne and Louis the Pious.

This is one of only two explicit comparisons between a king of Jerusalem and an Old Testament king in William—the other occurs earlier in his narrative, when he describes the

[78] 1 Sam 16:12.

[79] For a discussion of the iconography, see Buchthal 1957, pp. 1–14; J.S. Norman, "The life of King David as a Psychomachia allegory: a study of the Melisende Psalter book cover," *University of Ottowa Quarterly* 50 (1980), pp. 193–201; B. Kühnel, "The kingly statement of the bookcovers of Queen Melisende's Psalter," in E. Dassmann and K. Thraede (eds.), *Tesserae: Festschrift für Joseph Engemann*, *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum*, Ergänzungsband 18 (1991), pp. 340–357; S. Sandler, *The iconographic programme of the ivory covers of Queen Melisende's psalter: sources and meaning* (Ph.D. diss., Tel Aviv University, 1992); B. Kühnel, *Crusader art of the twelfth century: a geographical, an historical, or an art historical notion?* (Berlin, 1994), pp. 67–88; Folda 1995, pp. 157–158; J. Brodahl, *The Melisende Psalter and ivories (BL Egerton 1139): an inquiry into the status and collecting of medieval art in early nineteenth-century France* (Ph.D. diss., Brown University, 1999); B. Zeitler, "The distorting mirror: reflections on the Queen Melisende Psalter (London, B.L., Egerton 1139)," in R. Cormack and E. Jeffreys (eds.), *Through the looking glass: Byzantium through British eyes* (Aldershot, 2000), pp. 69–83; Dondi 2004, pp. 63–64, 162–166; Folda 2012b, pp. 449–452.

physical characteristics of King Baldwin I as he ascends to the throne, and declares that "he stood a head above all the people, just as is said of Saul."[80]

Unlike Fulcher of Chartres and Rorgo Fretellus, William of Tyre rarely makes typological statements that evoke biblical history. His view of history tends to be more linear than cyclical, given that he frequently describes the flow of time as a "sequence," or "chain of events" (*rerum gestarum series*), and consequently he suggests a greater distance between the biblical past and the Frankish present.[81] For example, he writes that Ascalon, in "the time of the sons of Israel," was the southern border of the Promised Land, along with Dan, "today called Caesarea Philippi."[82] Similarly, when discussing a valley called *Bacar*, William writes that, "in the time of the kings of Israel, it was called the Forest of Lebanon," clearly perceiving this era as uniquely identifiable and separate from his own time.[83] This fact indicates his linear view of the progression of time, and says something about his perspective on Frankish culture more generally. Whereas Achard of Arroaise, Ralph of Caen, and Rorgo Fretellus could see a continuity of Frankish and biblical kingship, and in some ways even a parallel relation, for William, who at no point speaks of "the kingdom of David," there is a clearer break. This can be explained by the different methodologies of the authors in question. William is more intent on providing a detailed historical account filled with beneficial *exempla* than on drawing typological connections between biblical characters and the protagonists of his narrative. This shift in methodology may have been due to the fact that William grew up at a time when much of the

[80] WT, 10.2.1–3: *Dicitur autem fuisse corpore valde procerus et fratre multo maior, ita ut, sicut de Saul dicitur, altior esset universo populo ab humero supra . . .*

[81] E.g., WT, Prol. 7, 15, 47, 89; 1.3.47; 16.praef.1; 21.5.8; 21.5.61.

[82] WT, 14.22.34–35: *Hic locus tempore filiorum Israel Terre Promissionis ab austro, sicut et Dan, que hodie dicitur Paneas vel Cesarea Philippi, a septentrione, erat terminus . . .*

[83] WT, 21.10.10–14.

religious fervor associated with the First Crusade had dried up and the institution of the Latin kingdom had already been established. Consequently, there was less of a need to continuously underline the legitimacy of the new kingdom in the Holy Land by pointing to biblical precedents. As we will see, however, there are a few important exceptions to this rule.

7. Excursus II: Gideon's paradox in William of Tyre

Although William speaks in the prologue of his history about treating *regum gesta* ("the deeds of kings"), at times William emphasizes God's role in history over against human agency, particularly in deciding the outcomes of battles.[84] For instance, William relates how in 1129 an alliance of King Baldwin II, Joscelin I of Courtenay, count of Edessa, and Raymond II, count of Tripoli, against Tughtekin of Damascus failed miserably due to torrential rain and thick fog. To explain the unfortunate outcome, William gives a patchwork of quotations from the Bible:

> Mirabile est, et vere mirabile et supra opiniones hominum, quod de sua virtute presumentes humilias, eterne Salvator, et qui in homine confidunt et carnem ponunt brachium suum, iaculo tue maledictionis, meritis exigentibus, confodis, adiutorem non querens nec glorie conparticipem. Tu enim dixisti, benedicte domine: *gloriam meam alteri non dabo, michi vindictam, ego retribuam, percutiam et sanabo et ego vivere faciam et non est qui de manu mea possit eruere.*[85]
>
> It is wondrous, and truly more wondrous than men's expectations, that you humble those who presume too much of their own strength, eternal Savior, and those, who trust in man and make flesh their arm, you pierce with the spear of your malediction, as they deserve, for you seek no assistant or fellow sharer in your glory. For you have said, blessed Lord: *I shall not give my glory to another, revenge is mine, I shall give retribution, I shall strike and I shall heal and I shall give life, and there is no one who can wrest [himself] from my grasp.*

[84] See for this observation Edbury and Rowe 1988, p. 41. For more extensive discussion of causality in William of Tyre, see Edbury and Rowe 1988, pp. 32–58 and 151–166; Lehtonen 2005; Murray 2014, p. 26.

[85] WT, 13.26.63–70. Cf. Is 42:8, 48:11; Rom 12:19; Deut 32:39.

The principal quotation here ("I shall not give my glory to another") comes from Isaiah, and refers to the story of Gideon as recounted in the Book of Judges. Gideon had been told repeatedly by God to bring fewer and fewer men with him to fight the multitude of Midianites, so that the Israelites would be forced to acknowledge God's aid in achieving victory rather than believing in their own strength.[86] William explains that, whenever Baldwin II relied only on his own forces, God granted him victory; the latest defeat, however, had been caused by his reliance on too great a force, which included the armies of Tripoli and Edessa.

A counterpart to this event occurs toward the end of William's history, as he describes how, some forty-eight years later, the regent Raymond III of Tripoli managed to defeat Saladin, even though he was greatly outnumbered. The outcome had, as earlier, been decided by inclement weather in the form of torrential rain. Endeavoring once again to offer an explanation, William writes:

> At nunc, iuxta verbum suum quod scriptum est: *ego gloriam meam alteri non dabo* [Is 42:8 and 48:11], reservata sibi penitus auctoritate et gloria, non in multitudine, sed paucorum usus ministerio et Gedeonis innovans clementer miracula innumeram stravit multitudinem, significans quod ipse sit et non alius, cuius beneficio unus persequitur mille et duo fugant decem milia.[87]

> But now, in accordance with His own written word: *I shall not grant my glory to another*, having reserved His authority and glory entirely for Himself, God used the support, not of a multitude, but of a few, and mercifully renewing the miracles of Gideon, He laid low a multitude without number, signifying that it was He and no other, by whose assistance a single man chased a thousand, and two men put to flight ten thousand.

By claiming that God renewed the miracle of Gideon, who succeeded in defeating the Midianites with only three hundred men, William compares Raymond III to the Israelite judge. This is a

[86] Judg 7:17–22.

[87] WT, 21.23.48.

significant passage, since it contains William's only comparison of a living person to a biblical figure. William, who was patronized by Raymond at the time of writing, seems to have been motivated to support Raymond's ambitions at becoming king of Jerusalem.[88] Partisanship aside, however, the two passages demonstrate a tendency to explain historical outcomes by turning to a biblical framework. This approach greatly resembles that of Fulcher of Chartres, for instance when he compares the Frankish army led by Baldwin I to the Maccabees and Gideon, who were also outnumbered.[89] While William on occasion adopts Fulcher's method in explaining military exploits, the changed circumstances in which he lived may have given him a different historical outlook.

8. "New Maccabees" in the Latin East

8.1 The Maccabees in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages

A flurry of recent scholarship has centered on the reception of the Maccabees in the Middle Ages, with particular attention to the context of the crusades (and especially the First Crusade).[90]

[88] For a subtle analysis, see Vessey 1973.

[89] FC, 2.54.5; see the discussion below in section 8.3.

[90] C. Auffarth, *Irdische Wege und himmlischer Lohn: Kreuzzug, Jerusalem und Fegefeuer in religionswissenschaftlicher Perspektive* (Göttingen, 2002), Chapter 4, "'Auferstanden in den Himmel': Die Makkabäer. Jüdische Heilige als Modell für die Kreuzfahrer," pp. 123–150; M. Fischer, "The Books of the Maccabees and the Teutonic Order," *Crusades* 4 (2005), pp. 59–71; R. Richtscheid, "Die Kreuzfahrer als 'Novi Machabei': zur Verwendungsweise der Makkabaermetaphorik in chronikalischen Quellen der Rhein- und Masslande zur Zeit der Kreuzzuge," in F.G. Hirschmann and G. Mentgen (eds.), *Campana pulsante convocati: Festschrift anlässlich der Emeritierung von Prof. Dr. Alfred Haverkamp* (Trier, 2005), pp. 473–486; E. Lapina, *"Things done in a foreign land": representations of the First Crusade in the twelfth century* (PhD diss., Johns Hopkins University, 2007), pp. 88–141; D. Joslyn-Siemiatkoski, *Christian memories of the Maccabean martyrs* (New York, 2009), especially Chapter 3, "Memories of the Maccabean Martyrs in the Christian Medieval West," pp. 79–119; N. Morton, "The defence of the Holy Land and the memory of the Maccabees," *Journal of Medieval History* 36 (2010), pp. 275–293; S. Gouguenheim, "Les Maccabées, modèles dese guerriers chrétiens des origines au XIIe siècle," *Cahiers de civilisation médievale. Xe au XIIe siècles* 54 (2011), pp. 3–20; E. Lapina, "The Maccabees and the Battle of Antioch," in G. Signori (ed.), *Dying for the faith, killing for the faith. Old-Testament faith-warriors (1 and 2 Maccabees) in historical perspective* (Leiden, 2012), pp. 147–159; L. Russo, "Continuité et transformations de la

Most of these discussions have tried to paint a general picture of Maccabean reception, and to distinguish various approaches across the breadth of Western European literature. If, however, we accept that the Maccabees formed an integral component in the formulation of crusader ideology and particularly for those who continued to fight in the Holy Land, it will be useful to see if the sources from the Crusader States show a chronological development in the reception of the Maccabees. Comparing such a development with contemporary attitudes in Western texts may then tell us much about the role of locality and cultural memory in the Latin East.

Let us retrace our steps first, for the reception of the Maccabees in the earlier Middle Ages would significantly inform that of the period during the crusades. The biblical Books of the Maccabees, of which only the first two are accepted within the (deuterocanonical) canon of the Catholic Church (the third being also accepted in the Orthodox canon), are historical books that relate the events under Seleucid rule in the period 175–134 BC, with 2 Maccabees presenting an alternate account corresponding to the first seven chapters of 1 Maccabees (down to 161 BC).[91]

The main theme of the first narrative is the Jewish revolt led by what would later become the Hasmonean dynasty as a result of Antiochus IV Epiphanes' attempts to force the Jews to abandon their religious customs (including circumcision and dietary laws), with particular emphasis on the heroic actions of the five sons of the priest Mattathias, especially those of Judas Maccabeus. The second account focuses on the martyrdom suffered by the priest Eleazar and an unnamed mother and her seven sons at the hands of Antiochus IV, which is elaborated upon in the fourth apocryphal book of the Maccabees (the third book relating instead an earlier episode

---

typologie des Maccabées jusqu'aux origines du mouvement des croisades," in M.T. Kretschmer (ed.), *La Typologie biblique comme forme de pensée dans l'historiographie médiévale* (Turnhout, 2014), pp. 53–76.

[91] 1 and 2 Maccabees were officially accepted into the canon by the Roman Catholic Church at the Council of Trent (1545–1563); see *Enchiridion symbolorum, definitionum et declarationum de rebus fidei et morum*, ed. H. Denzinger, 34th ed. (Barcelona, 1965), no. 1502. They are considered apocryphal by Protestants.

of Jewish persecution in Egypt that has little to do with the Maccabees). Although the four books of the Maccabees found in the Septuagint did not become part of the Hebrew Bible, the stories they tell of Jewish resistance to gentile oppression turned them into important cultural documents for communities living in the Hellenistic diaspora (and hence their inclusion in the Septuagint).

Of all the texts associated with the Bible, the books of the Maccabees formulated most explicitly the ideas of martyrdom as an act of virtue and of the resurrection of the dead. Consequently the earliest Christians, who encountered ruthless persecution at the hands of the Romans, turned to the Maccabean martyrs as exemplary figures, even though their martyrdom occurred because of a refusal to give up the Mosaic Law.[92]

When Christians came into power and the persecutions ceased, they found new ways of negotiating Christian identity through commemoration of the Jewish martyrs. At an early point, liturgical commemoration of the Maccabean martyrs on August 1 was instituted by both Jews and Christians. At the same time, a cult for the martyrs had been established at Antioch, which became known as the site of their martyrdom and the resting place of their relics before they were moved to Rome in the sixth century.[93] The first extant sermon on the Maccabees bears vivid witness to Christian strategies in grappling with the cultural identity of the Maccabees: in 362 or 363, Gregory of Nazianzus preached a sermon at Antioch that represents a coöptation of the inherited Jewish tradition of venerating the martyrs.[94] At the time, Emperor Julian the

[92] See B. Dehandschutter, "Example and discipleship: some comments on the biblical background of the Early Christian theology of martyrdom," in J. Den Boeft and M.L. van Poll-van de Lisdonk (eds.), *The impact of scripture in early Christianity* (Leiden, 1999), pp. 20–26; Joslyn-Siemiatkoski 2009, p. 25; J. Hahn, "The veneration of the Maccabean brothers in fourth century Antioch: religious competition, martyrdom, and innovation," in Signori 2012, pp. 79–104.

[93] On the Maccabean cult at Antioch, see M. Schatkin, "The Maccabean martyrs," *Vigiliae Christianae* 28 (1974), pp. 97–113; Joslyn-Siemiatkoski 2009, p. 33.

[94] On this sermon, see the study of R. Ziadé, *Les martyrs Maccabées. De l'histoire juive au culte chrétien: les homélies de Grégoire de Nazianze et de Jean Chrysostome* (Leiden, 2007).

Apostate sought to secure the support of the Jews in his campaign to wrest the empire from Christianity and to restore it to Roman religion, even going so far as to promise the reconstruction of the Temple destroyed by Titus three centuries earlier. Nazianzus' sermon therefore both discredits Judaism and promotes Christianity by presenting the Christians suffering under renewed Roman persecution as the Christian equivalents of the Maccabean martyrs.

A key moment in the Christian reception of the Maccabees comes in the Carolingian period, when the influential scholar and archbishop of Mainz Rabanus Maurus composed a commentary on 1 and 2 Maccabees.[95] Given that these books of the Bible had not been considered to be of doctrinal import in the way that the canonical books were, there had not developed an exegetical tradition around the Maccabees before this time.[96] Rabanus indicated that he did not intend merely to literally elucidate these texts when he dedicated the commentary to the Carolingian king Louis the German—and in the year 843 no less, when the Treaty of Verdun bore witness to the division of Charlemagne's empire (or, more precisely, that of his weaker son, Louis the Pious). The treaty constituted a victory for Charles the Bald and Louis the German, who prevailed over their brother Lothar. Rabanus' commentary sought to provide, in addition to a more literal, historical commentary, an allegorical interpretation of the Maccabees' struggle against the divisive forces of corruption: as the Maccabean warriors united the Jews, so was it paramount now for King Louis to be a uniting force among the Franks.[97]

---

[95] *Commentaria in libros Macchabaeorum*, *PL* 109, cols. 1125–1256.

[96] See, for instance, Jerome's comments in his preface to the Books of Solomon: *Prologus in Libris Salomonis*, ed. R. Weber, p. 957, ll. 19–21. Compare also Gregory the Great, *Moralia in Iob* 19.21.34.

[97] See the remarks in J. Dunbabin, "The Maccabees as exemplars in the tenth and eleventh centuries," in K. Walsh and D. Wood (eds.), *The Bible in the medieval world: essays in memory of Beryl Smalley* (Oxford, 1985), pp. 31–41, and in Gouguenheim 2011, pp. 6–7; see especially the discussion in Joslyn-Siemiatkoski 2009, pp. 82–86.

After providing an exposition according to the literal sense, Rabanus offers Louis an allegorical exegesis: the death of Mattathias, father of Judas Maccabeus, prefigured that of Christ. His final words, *Iudas*, *Machabaeus fortis viribus sit vobis princeps militiae, ipse aget bellum populi* ("may Judas Maccabeus, valiant in strength, be the leader of your army; he will wage the war of the people"), are interpreted by Rabanus as having a typological connection with the apostles, described by him as *idonei . . . ad agendum bellum Christiani populi* ("ideally suited to wage the war of the Christian people").[98] Judas' Jewishness is elided, in what Daniel Joslyn-Siemiatkoski terms an "allosemitic attitude."[99] More importantly, however, Rabanus interprets the figure of Judas Maccabeus as a precursor to Christ:

> Sed quia "Iudas" "confessio" interpretatur, et plerisque in locis typum tenet ipsius Salvatoris, sciamus tunc ordinabiliter agi bellum nostrum, quando ipse dignatur dirigere et consilium et actum nostrum.[100]
>
> But since "Judas" means "confession," and he has a typological relation to the Savior Himself in many passages, we ought to realize that our war is waged properly when He deigns to guide both our thoughts and actions.

Jewish resistance to the Seleucids is turned into a basis for Christians to wage war under the leadership of Christ. The connection made by Rabanus between the Maccabees and the notion of Christian warfare in a medieval context would become crucial.[101]

Reception of the Maccabees in the Ottonian period also largely focused on the warriors rather than the martyrs. Liudprand of Cremona compares Otto the Great to Judas Maccabeus,

---

[98] *PL* 109, col. 1147C.

[99] Joslyn-Siemiatkoski 2009, *passim*, but especially p. 8.

[100] *PL* 109, col. 1147C.

[101] For a discussion of Rabanus' pivotal role in formulating the concept of *militia Christi* more generally, see R. Grégoire, "Esegesi biblica e 'militia Christi,'" in *Militia Christi' e crociata nei secoli XI-XIII: atti della undecima Settimana internazionale di studio: Mendola, 28 agosto-1 settembre 1989* (Milan, 1992), pp. 21–45.

while Widukind of Corvey (whose monastery almost certainly possessed a copy of Rabanus Maurus' commentary on the Maccabees) extensively uses 1 and 2 Maccabees to provide legitimation to the rulers Henry I and Otto the Great, who are depicted as Christian warriors leading their men into battle against the Hungarians, and whose battle orations carry distinct echoes of those of the Maccabees.[102] In the dedication to the *Gesta Chuonradi* ("Deeds of Conrad"), which was intended to be a mirror of princes, Wipo mentions David, Solomon, Gideon, and the battles of the Maccabees as worthy examples for a monarch to follow.[103] Others, like Aelfric of Eynsham (ca. 955–1025), saw the Maccabees not as exemplary figures for military warfare but as allegories for the spiritual warfare to be waged by each Christian against evil.[104]

The struggle of a priestly caste, as embodied by Eleazar, against the might of a secular power, as represented by Antiochus IV, led to the adoption of Maccabean imagery by the popes and their supporters in what has become known as the Investiture Contest. Papal supporters resisting imperial forces are likened to Judas Maccabeus, the Holy Roman Emperor to Antiochus IV.[105]

---

[102] Liudprand of Cremona, *Antapodosis*, CCCM 156 (Turnhout, 1998), 4.27. For Widukind, see the in-depth discussion in H. Keller, "*Machabaeorum pugnae*. Zum Stellenwert eines biblischen Vorbilds in Widukinds Deutung der ottonischen Königsherrschaft," in H. Keller and N. Staubach (eds.), *Iconologia sacra: Mythos, Bildkunst und Dichtung in der Religions- und Sozialgeschichte Alteuropas: Festschrift für Karl Hauck zum 75. Geburtstag* (Berlin, 1994), pp. 417–437. On Rabanus' commentary at Corvey, see Keller 1994, p. 422. For this period in general, see Riché 1984, especially pp. 397–398, and Morton 2010, pp. 278–279.

[103] Wipo, *Gesta Chuonradi*, ed. H. Bresslau, MGH SS. rer. Germ. 61 (Hannover/Leipzig, 1915), ll. 13–16: *Sic David regis praelia, Salomonis consilia, Gedeonis ingenia, Machabaeorum pugnas propter scriptorum copiam prae oculis habemus*. See also the comments on this passage in Dunbabin 1985, p. 31 and Gouguenheim 2011, p. 8.

[104] Aelfric of Eynsham, *Aelfric's lives of saints*, ed. W.W. Skeat, 2 vols (London, 1881–1900), vol. 2, p. 113. See also the discussions of Morton (2010, p. 279) and Lapina (2012, p. 150).

[105] For examples, see Morton 2010, pp. 279–280.

The references to the Maccabees made during and after the First Crusade should be seen against the background of this rich history of reception. By the late eleventh century, the Maccabees had become well-established figures that could be used to justify Christian warfare or to legitimize claims by those not of royal stock, such as Otto the Great, to a position of military leadership.[106] Key precedents for this reception of the Maccabees took place in the Carolingian period, most notably through the commentary of Rabanus Maurus, in which typological connections were made between the Maccabees and Christ, and in which political claims were made by considering the Maccabees proper examples to be followed by Carolingian rulers.

8.2 The Maccabees and the First Crusade

The crusaders' victory at Antioch, the siege of which lasted from the fall of 1097 to the summer of 1098, in many ways represented the most crucial event of the First Crusade. To the crusaders, faced with impossible odds and on the brink of starvation, the outcome appeared miraculous and was soon compared to similarly miraculous military events depicted in the Bible. When the crusaders achieved their first major victory during the siege, routing in December of 1097 the forces sent by Yaghi-Siyan, the governor of the besieged city, the eyewitness Raymond of Aguilers interpreted the event within a biblical context:

> Auderem inquam nisi arrogans iudicarer bellum hoc Machabeorum bellis preferre. Quoniam si Machabeus in tribus milibus hostium .xl et viii. milia prostravit, hic plus quam .lx. milia hostium ope .cccc. militum in fugam versa sunt. Sed nos neque Machabeorum contempnimus, nec virtutem militum nostrorum predicamus. Sed tunc in Machabeum mirabilem, in nostris mirabiliorem annuntiamus.[107]

[106] *Pace* Lapina, who claims that "relatively few authors, either in Late Antiquity or the Middle Ages, paid any attention to the Maccabean warriors," and that "those who did, tended to consider them as prototypes not of actual soldiers, but of spiritual warriors" (2012, p. 150). The evidence appears to point to the contrary: the purely spiritual interpretation of Aelfric is the exception, not the rule, while from the Carolingian period onward, it was the Maccabean warriors rather than the martyrs that featured most prominently.

[107] RA, p. 53.

> If I did not consider it presumptuous, I would dare to prefer this battle over that of the Maccabees. For if [Judas] Maccabeus defeated forty-eight thousand enemies with the help of three thousand, here sixty thousand enemies were routed by four hundred knights. Still, I do not disdain the valor of the Maccabees or extol that of our knights. Rather, I proclaim that this [valor] was then admirable in Maccabeus, but that it was more admirable in our knights.

Raymond compares the victory of the crusaders at Antioch to that of the Maccabees under the leadership of Judas Maccabeus, who defeated the forces sent by Antiochus IV.[108] The *tertium comparationis*, or the point of comparison, was evidently the fact that in both occasions, the victorious army had prevailed while being impossibly outnumbered—the decisive factor being for Raymond *virtus mirabilis*, which may be rendered as either "miraculous" or "admirable valor."[109] For Raymond, then, the crusaders lived up to the established models of religiously motivated warfare that the Maccabees represented—or perhaps even surpassed them. The choice of the Maccabean warriors for the comparison was particularly apt, given the Maccabees' association with Antioch.[110]

Fulcher of Chartres makes a similar and perhaps more famous comparison in the prologue he added to his history after the death of Baldwin I in April 1118. The prologue begins with an explanation for the undertaking of the work, which, Fulcher argues, serves both the living and the dead: the living find pleasure in reading and reciting the deeds of those who "do

---

[108] As pointed out by the Hills (RA, p. 53 n. 2), Raymond's direct source was not the Bible but Ambrose, *De officiis* 1.40.197: *Unde postea stimulatus rex Antiochus, cum bellum accenderet per duces suos Lysiam, Nicanorem, Gorgiam, ita cum Orientalibus suis et Assyriis attritus est copiis, ut quadraginta et octo millia in medio campi a tribus millibus prosternerentur*. It would appear that Ambrose may have confused and conflated passages in 1 Maccabees where Judas' forces are said to be 3000 strong (e.g., 1 Macc 4:6, 7:40, 9:5) with 1 Macc 3:39, where the enemy's forces are said to number 47,000 (not 48,000).

[109] The fact that *virtus* is what is under discussion, not "divine succor," seems to suggest the latter interpretation.

[110] Lapina (2012, pp. 148–149) wonders to what extend those in the West would have been familiar with the Maccabees' association with Antioch; she suggests that the crusaders may have learned of the Antiochene cult from the local population, or may have already been familiar with it through Augustine's homily on the Maccabees (*Homelia* 300). Of course, several episodes of the Books of the Maccabees occur in or around Antioch; especially 1 Macc 11:44–51 would have been relevant, in which the Jews besiege and conquer Antioch.

battle for Christ" (*Deo militantium*), and are moved with religious zeal toward God upon hearing how those who participated in the First Crusade left all worldly possessions and family ties behind in order to follow the precepts of the Gospel.[111] The dead also benefit, since as a result of this account, the living will pray for them and bestow charity in their name. Having praised the deeds of the crusaders so fulsomely, Fulcher hastens to add:

> Licet autem nec Israeliticae plebis nec Machabaeorum aut aliorum plurium praerogativae, quos Deus tam crebris et magnificis miraculis inlustravit, hoc opus praelibatum aequiparare non audeam, tamen haut longe ab illis gestis inferius aestimatum, quoniam Dei miracula in eo noscuntur multipliciter perpetrata, scriptis commendare curavi; quin immo in quo disparantur hi postremi ab illis primis vel Israeliticis vel Machabaeis, quos quidem vidimus in regionibus eorum saepe apud nos aut audivimus longe a nobis positos, pro Christi emembrari, crucifigi, excoriari, sagittari, secari et diverso martyrii genere consummari, nec minis nec blanditiis aliquibus posse superari? Quin potius, si non deesset percussoris gladius, multi nostrum pro Christi amore perimi non recusassent. O quot milia martyrum in hac expeditione beata morte finierunt![112]

> Although I would not dare to place the aforementioned accomplishment [the liberation of Jerusalem] on the same level with the pride of place held by the Israelites and the Maccabees and many others, upon whom God has shone with such frequent and magnificent miracles, still I have taken pains to commit to writing that which is considered not far removed from those deeds, since by it God's manifold miracles become known; indeed, how do the latter differ from the former (be they Israelites or Maccabees), given that those whom I myself have either witnessed in the land [of the Israelites and Maccabees], or heard about when they were further away, suffered various kinds of martyrdom for Christ? Indeed, many of our men would not have refused to be killed out of love for Christ, but for want of the enemy's sword. O, how many thousands of martyrs have completed this expedition with a blessed death!

Reading the comparison within the larger context of the prologue raises two key points that help to explain the reference to the Maccabees: first, the concept of *militia Deo* ("doing battle for God") as applied to the crusaders and, second, the notion that the prayers of the living can benefit the deceased. Both ideas are at the forefront of the central role played by the Books of the Maccabees in medieval Christianity: the military prowess of the Maccabees, supported and legitimized by divine assistance, provided an important model for the development of a concept

[111] Presumably referring to Mt 19:29; Mk 10:29; Lk 18:29; Mt 16:24; Mk 8:34; Lk 9:23.

[112] FC, Prol. 3.

of Christian warfare, while the story of the Maccabean martyrs justified the practice of praying for the dead.[113] The importance of the latter notion in particular can hardly be overstated, since masses for the dead constituted a vital source of revenue for monasteries and were instrumental in making the Cluniac and Cistercian orders some of the wealthiest and most powerful institutions of Western Europe.[114] The rhetorical point of the comparisons made by Raymond of Aguilers and Fulcher of Chartres is not that the Maccabees are unvirtuous but rather that the crusaders are all the more so. Given that for three centuries the Maccabees were considered to be exemplary figures of valor, such a comparison could count on significant rhetorical effect.

As has been observed by some scholars, Fulcher focuses more on the Maccabees as martyrs than as warriors.[115] This emphasis relates to his professed aim in writing history: the communal commemoration of the fallen. Tellingly, Fulcher speaks of "*their* land," referring to the Israelites and Maccabees. Being present in the Holy Land means participation in the struggles of the Israelites and Maccabees, and to be identified with them. As we have seen throughout this chapter, the space of the Holy Land facilitates a typological connection and a collapse of time as the crusaders are superimposed upon the Israelites and Maccabees. Elsewhere in his account of the First Crusade, Fulcher displays a keen awareness that the crusaders were traversing the land that had once witnessed the deeds of the Maccabees: when the crusaders pass by Modi'in on their way to Jerusalem, Fulcher describes the city as "the city of the Maccabees" (*Modin, civitatem Machabaeorum*), referring to the fact that this city was one of the principal

[113] See especially 2 Macc 12:42–45.

[114] On the role played by so-called lay confraternities in the rise of Cluny, see C.H. Lawrence, *Medieval monasticism: forms of religious life in Western Europe in the Middle Ages* (Harlow, 2001), pp. 94–99.

[115] Lapina 2012, pp. 152–153. The distinction between the Maccabean warriors and martyrs is in some sense a false one: Judas Maccabeus on several occasions exhorts the Jews to be willing to die for God. In any case, it seems that both groups could be referred to at the same time by the word "Maccabees." I would therefore be less inclined to attach the kind of significance to Fulcher's reference to martyrdom that Elizabeth Lapina does.

locations featured in the Books of the Maccabees, and was the site where (according to these books) Mattathias and his sons Judas, Jonathan, and Simon were interred.[116]

Some scholars have noted that, in a few instances, the figure of Judas Maccabeus appears to be regarded with hostility, reflecting a pushback on the part of Christian authors against using essentially Jewish figures as models for Christian warriors.[117] The cases of Peter Tudebode and the *Chanson d'Antioche* are adduced as evidence for this: in the former, Judas Maccabeus appears in a long list of previous kings who ruled Antioch, among whom also figure such fantastical names as Pilate, Herod, and even Satan. In the latter, a very similar list (also including Pilate and Herod) of kings is given, who supposedly opposed the crusaders at Antioch alongside Corbaran (Kerbogha).[118] This interpretation, however, does not explain why, in addition to Judas Maccabeus, the names of David, Samson, and Solomon also appear in both texts. None of these figures could be said to be controversial by any means. More likely, Peter Tudebode merely offered a jumbled-up version of ancient Antiochene history based on tenuous (presumably oral) sources (and it should be noted that Peter Tudebode's list by no means indicates a list of purely hostile rulers), which the *Chanson d'Antioche* may have confused with those present at the Battle of Antioch.[119]

---

[116] FC, 1.25.13; 1 Macc 2:70, 9:19, 13:25, 13:30. See also WT, 8.1.9: . . . *Modin etiam, sanctorum Machabeorum felix presidium* . . . and RF, 69, who writes that their tombs are still visible: . . . *mons Modyn, ex quo Mathathyas pater Machabeorum in quo et sepulti quiescunt, eorum adhuc apparentibus tumulis* . . .

[117] Morton 2010, p. 282; Lapina 2012, pp. 155–156.

[118] PT, p. 120; *ChA*, 356.

[119] *Pace* Lapina (2012, p. 156), who argues that this is the case by pointing out that the name of Judas Maccabeus occurs together with a *David hereticus*, *Garbandus impius de Samardandum*, *Satanus*, and *Impius Telandus*, overlooking the fact that the name of Maccabeus is not qualified by any adjective, nor is it immediately juxtaposed with any of those who are, occurring between a *Rudandus* and *Nubles*; moreover, some of the names receive more positive adjectives such as *pulcher Clarandus* and *fortis Bruas*. For the suggestion that an oral tradition belies the list of kings in Tudebode and the *Chanson de Antioche*, see S. Louchitsky. "'Veoir' et 'oïr,' 'legere' et 'audire': réflexions sur les interactions entre traditions orale et écrite dans les sources relatives à la Premiére croisade," in S.

A clearer case in which the Maccabees are submitted to criticism is that of Guibert of Nogent. In his history of the First Crusade, *Dei gesta per Francos* ("God's deeds through the Franks"), Guibert asks how much more aid deserved to be bestowed on the crusaders at Antioch, if the Maccabees, who fought for "circumcision and pork," received heavenly succor in their struggles.[120] The distortion of the Jews as consumers of rather than abstainers from pork comes from religious polemic, as is visible elsewhere in Guibert's work, and reflects his discomfort with the common assimilation of the Maccabees as models for Christian warfare.[121] Guibert's position is the exception, however, and the dominant model in which the Maccabees were viewed as exemplary figures persisted during the course of the twelfth century.

It is possible, as has been suggested, that some of the uneasiness with the Jewish identity of the Maccabees may be reflected in Fulcher of Chartres.[122] In a later recension of his history, Fulcher expunges the reference to the "traitorous Jews" as responsible for crowning Christ with the Crown of Thorns, which could be explained as an attempt to make typological claims between the Maccabees and the Franks less complicated.[123]

To conclude our discussion of the Maccabees and the First Crusade, at the far end of our chronological spectrum we encounter William of Tyre. He is the only one to portray Pope Urban II as referring to the Maccabees in his famous speech at Clermont:

Louchitsky and M.-C. Varol (eds.), *Homo legens. Styles and Practices of Reading. Comparative Analyses of Oral and Written Traditions in the Middle Ages* (Turnhout, 2010), pp. 89–125, at pp. 92–93.

[120] GN, 6.206–210; but see also 2.156–163, where the hostile tone is absent.

[121] See E. Lapina, "Anti-Jewish rhetoric in Guibert of Nogent's *Dei gesta per Francos*," *Journal of Medieval History* 35 (2009), pp. 239–253.

[122] Epp, pp. 154–155.

[123] FC, 2.6.2.

> Templum domini . . . facta est sedes demoniorum. Idipsum enim et Matathiam sacerdotem magnum, sanctorum progenitorem Machabeorum, ad zelum accendit commendabilem, sicut ipse testatur, dicens: *templum domini quasi vir ignobilis, vasa glorie eius abducta sunt captiva* [1 Macc 2:8–9].[124]
>
> The Lord's Temple has become the seat of demons. It was this that also inspired Mattathias, the great priest, father of the holy Maccabees, to a commendable religious fervor, as he himself relates: *The Lord's Temple is like an ignoble man; the vessels of its glory have been led away in captivity.*

By referring to the Maccabees, Urban II is portrayed by William as calling for others to follow their example: the Maccabees and their concern for the Temple were clearly perceived as an important precedent for the crusaders. Moreover, the Maccabees are described by William (through Urban) as saints, whose zeal was "commendable," without a hint of their Jewish identity. Clearly, within the context of the First Crusade the Maccabees were considered proper models for Christian warfare as well as martyrdom. But what evidence is there for how they were viewed by those who continued to live and fight in the Latin East? Were they still considered to be valid examples for those who were not on crusade?

8.3 The Maccabees in the Latin East

One of the major military victories in the Latin East during the first few decades after the First Crusade took place at the First Battle of Tall Danith in 1115 (also known as the Battle of Sarmin). The battle occurred after weeks of cat-and-mouse games, as the forces of Bursuq of Hamadan, a commander sent by the Baghdad sultanate to reconquer the territories lost during the First Crusade, attempted to lure the Antiochenes into a premature battle while they awaited reinforcements from Baldwin I of Jerusalem. At this time the Franks had entered into an alliance with Toghtekin, the atabeg of Damascus, who felt that his position would be in jeopardy if Bursuq assumed total control over Syria. However, Bursuq managed to avoid the combined

[124] WT, 1.15.48–9.

forces by retreating, advancing only when the alliance had dispersed. Nonetheless, the Antiochenes, led by Prince Roger, succeeded in routing the forces of Bursuq in a surprise attack. Indeed, so complete was their victory, that the eyewitness Walter the Chancellor described it as an act of God.[125] Fulcher does not get caught up in the jubilation felt by Walter, but explains that there is a valuable lesson to be learned here:

> Vere Deus mirabilis in cunctis mirabilibus suis! Dum enim Hierosolymitani una cum Antiochenis Damascenisque parati ad proeliandum fuerunt, nihil omnino profecerunt. Numquid in multitudine gentis constat victoria bellantium? Mementote Machabeorum et Gedeonis et aliorum plurium, qui non in sua sed in Domini confidentes virtute cum paucis multa milia prostraverunt.[126]

> Truly God is miraculous in all his miracles! For while the Jerusalemites were prepared to fight together with the Antiochenes and Damascenes, they had no success whatsoever. Surely the victory of those who wage war does not depend on having a multitude of people? Remember the Maccabees, Gideon, and many others, who relied not on their own virtue but on that of the Lord and laid low many thousands with only a few [men].

Victory is accomplished not by human prowess but comes to those who are aided by God. As long as the Franks persisted in their sinful alliance with the infidels they were unsuccessful, despite their greater numbers. As soon as the alliance dissolved, Fulcher argues, the Franks were victorious, even though they were outnumbered. The figures of the Maccabees and of Gideon function therefore as valuable models of Christian warfare.

Notably, the Maccabees are referenced also in connection with the Second Battle of Tall Danith (or the Battle of the Field of Blood) in 1119, the disastrous counterpart to the first. What could have happened at the first battle occurred at the second: Prince Roger and his army were routed when they attacked the forces of Ilghazi of Mardin before the reinforcements of Baldwin

[125] E.g., WC, 1.7.3: *Felix belli campus, Domino largiente, eidem aperitur*.

[126] FC, 2.54.5.

II could arrive. The Norman historiographer Orderic Vitalis relates that Bernard of Valence, patriarch of Antioch, delivered the following speech to Roger as he urged him to encamp at Artah:

> Historias antiquas et modernas rimare et mirificorum eventus regum subtiliter intuere. Saulem et Iosiam, Iudamque Machabaeum recole, Romanos quoque apud Cannas devictos ab Hannibale, et ne parili ruina cum tibi subiectis praecipiteris, diligenti cura praecave![127]

> Study the ancient and modern histories and carefully contemplate the outcomes of miraculous kings. Remember Saul and Josias, as well as Judas Maccabeus, and the Romans who were defeated at Cannae by Hannibal, and take great care not to drag yourself along with your subjects into a similar disaster!

Bernard sets Old Testament and classical examples before Roger as a warning: the common thread among these figures is that they suffered disastrous defeat. Significantly, Judas Maccabeus is here portrayed as a counter example to be avoided rather than followed, which may have something to do with the fact that this particular account is related by an author not writing in the Latin East: none of the extant writers of the East at any point portray Judas Maccabeus as an example to be avoided, given that, early onward, he had become a rallying point for those in the East.[128]

Let us turn from Antioch to Jerusalem. In the recent flood of scholarship on the Maccabees, the poetry of Achard of Arrouaise has been entirely ignored. This is unfortunate because, after Raymond of Aguilers, Achard's poem may well represent one of the earliest reflections on the place of the Maccabees within the sacred landscape of Jerusalem. In his effort

[127] Orderic Vitalis, *Historia ecclesiastica*, ed. M. Chibnall (Oxford, 1969–1980), 4.244.

[128] Notably, Walter the Chancellor, who was an eyewitness at the Battle of the Field of Blood and also describes the interactions between Roger and Bernard at Artah, does not mention this particular exchange.

to chronicle in verse the entire biblical history of the site of the *Templum Domini*, Achard also covers the period of the Maccabees:

Quorum de stirpe processit illustris Antiochus;
fuerat hic Rome obses, qui et ipse pessimus
multum gentis Iudeorum atque sacrificium
dissipando prophanavit dei sanctuarium.
Crebro namque nequam ille missis exercitibus
Iudeos sacrificare compulit demonibus.
Quorum quidam immolare consenserunt ydolis,
quidam mori decreverunt legibus pro patriis.
Legem quoque Iudeorum combussit Antiochus,
sed et templum spoliavit ornamentis pluribus,
in sanctificacionem intrans cum superbia
aureum tulit altare, luminis candelabra
mensam propositionis atque libatoria
aureaque vasa valde concupiscibilia
velum simul et coronas atque mortariola,[129]
sublatisque universis rediit ad propria.
Post hec misit duces suos ad cogendum populum
ydolis sacrificare iuxta ritus gentium.
Quibus Iudas Machabeus restitit viriliter
et cum eo fratres eius repugnantes fortiter,
occiderunt duces multos, missos ab Antiocho
et superaverunt quosdam fugatos de prelio.
Post hec sancta mundaverunt abhominationibus
universis et immundis ydolorum cultibus,
tunc altare construxerunt dedicantes domino,
et leticia pergrandis facta est in populo.[130]

The famous Antiochus descended from this stock [the Greeks]; he had been a hostage at Rome and, being most wicked, frequently interrupted the sacrifices of the Jews and desecrated the House of God. For that wicked one often sent armies to compel the Jews to sacrifice to demons; some of them agreed to sacrifice to idols, while others preferred to die for their ancestral laws. Antiochus also burned the Torah and robbed the Temple of its many ornaments, he arrogantly entered the holy of holies and stole the gold along with the altar, as well as chandeliers, the table of proposition, and golden drinking vessels that were highly sought after, and the veil, the crowns, and small vessels; and with all of this he returned to his own lands. After this he sent two generals to compel the people to sacrifice to idols, following the rites of the gentiles; Judas Maccabeus valiantly opposed them, and his brothers fought bravely with him, killing many generals sent by Antiochus, and vanquished others in battle and put them to flight. After this they purified the sanctuary from all impurities caused by the veneration of idols; then they built an altar which they dedicated to the Lord, and a great rejoicing took place among the people.

[129] Compare 1 Macc 1:23.

[130] AP, 544–569.

Achard briefly appears to refer to the Maccabean martyrs, who preferred to die rather than forsake the Mosaic Law; but since he is chiefly concerned with the despoiling of the Temple, his main focus is on the Maccabean warriors led by Judas, and on their restoration of the Temple. Extensive attention is paid to the restoration, with an elaborate enumeration of all the items that were taken from the Temple by Antiochus. Achard then develops the popular conception of the Maccabees as exemplary warriors (*repugnantes fortiter*) into custodians of the Temple, who restore it to its former glory and in so doing appease both God and the populace of Jerusalem. The implications for the king of Jerusalem would have been fairly obvious, particularly given that King Baldwin I, the most likely addressee of Achard's poem, may have closely associated himself with the figure of Judas Maccabeus. In fact, on the basis of several witnesses, we know that the epitaph on Baldwin's tombstone read as follows:

> REX BALDEWINVS, IVDAS ALTER MACHABEVS,
> SPES PATRIȩ, VIGOR ECCLESIȩ, VIRT<VS> VTRIVSQ<VE>,
> QUEM FORMIDABANT, CVI DONA TRIBVTA FEREBANT
> CEDAR & EGYPT<VS>, DAN AC HOMICIDA DAMASCVS
> PROH DOLOR IN MODICO CLAVDITVR HOC TVMVLO.[131]

> KING BALDWIN, A SECOND JUDAS MACCABEUS,
> HOPE OF THE NATION, STRENGTH OF THE CHURCH, VIRTUE OF BOTH,
> WHOM LEBANON AND EGYPT, DAN AND MURDEROUS
> DAMASCUS FEAR AND BRING TRIBUTE TO,
> ALAS IS ENCLOSED IN THIS HUMBLE TOMB.

If Baldwin was to be considered a new Judas Maccabeus, it follows that he ought to emulate his deeds—not the least of which being, Achard appears to suggest, safeguarding the Temple and its treasures. The commemoration of the Maccabees is absorbed into contemporary politics, as

[131] I have followed here the transcription of Elzear Horn, who visited Jerusalem in the years 1724–1744. See: E. Horn, *Ichnographiae monumentorum Terrae Sanctae, 1724–1744*, ed. E. Hoade and B. Bagatti, 2nd ed. (Jerusalem, 1962), p. 71. The epitaph also occurs, with a few variants, in the earlier account of Theoderich: *Peregrinationes tres: Saewulf, John of Würzburg, Theodericus*, ed. R.B.C. Huygens, *CCCM* 139 (Turnhout, 1994), c. 360.

Achard urges Baldwin to retrieve the treasures stolen by Tancred from the *Templum Domini*. Whereas earlier the Maccabees had served as exemplary figures for crusaders fighting against pagans, here they appear to be used in the context of internal politics within the Crusader States. Of course, there had been precedent for the use of the figures of the Maccabees by Christians in religious-political discourse, most notably during the Investiture Contest, in which the pope painted the Holy Roman Emperor as a tyrannical Antiochus—the same implication made by Achard with respect to Tancred.[132] Clearly, the figure of Judas Maccabeus and his brothers, as restorers of the Temple and vanquishers of its despoilers, were to be construed as meaningful examples to the Frankish king of Jerusalem.

If Achard's representation of Judas Maccabeus (and others) in his poem is meant to imply a religious and political imperative to the king, what does this tell us about the role of the Bible in Frankish society in the East? Clearly, the Franks who had settled in Jerusalem perceived themselves to be a *populus Dei*, a chosen people of God, and that within the Bible lay buried the typological seeds to which their own lives and actions ought to conform if they were to bring forth the fruits of virtue.

Geoffrey, prior and soon abbot of the *Templum Domini*, took his predecessor's use of the Maccabees a step further, going so far as to versify both 1 and 2 Maccabees in a single, lengthy poem.[133] Yet Geoffrey's poem is much more than a mere versification of the books of the Maccabees: In the first place, it combines the two books and rearranges the order of the events to form a coherent and linear narrative that brings together the stories of the Maccabean warriors

[132] For examples, see Morton 2010, pp. 279–280.

[133] Given that the poem was not edited until 2011 by Eyal Poleg, it is perhaps understandable that it has been virtually ignored in discussions of the Maccabees in medieval traditions. The information supplied by Morton (2010, pp. 284–285), who wrote before the edition, should largely be disregarded.

led by Judas Maccabeus and of the mother and her seven sons who suffered martyrdom.[134] Secondly, three authorial digressions within the poem offer exegetical interpretations of the biblical text. The first digression relates two exempla, supposedly taken from a work of Augustine against heresy (but probably from the eleventh-century Alger of Lyon).[135] The first exemplum deals with the sacred flame of the Jewish Temple, which was miraculously preserved under water during the Babylonian Captivity and was extinguished only after Jason purchased the priesthood.[136] The second exemplum gives a moral or tropological interpretation of the story of Potiphar, who is said to have become a eunuch upon purchasing Joseph.[137] Having established the overarching theme of simony, Geoffrey then relates in a second digression the events described in his poem to modern times:

Ammonemus hoc carmine	lectores ut sollicite
Perpendant, quam nefarium	sit contra sanctum spiritum
Nunc temporis per pretium	ambire sacerdotium.
Non enim adeps pinguium,	taurorum vel arietum
Nunc immolatur domino	in nostro sacrificio,
Immo caro cum sanguine	quam de Maria virgine
Assumpsit dei filius	pro nobis peccatoribus.
Si ignis tunc extinctus est,	quando Iason potitus est
Pontificali gloria	data regi pecunia,
Quid fieri nunc, credimus,	de igne sancti spiritus?
Extinguitur emptoribus	simul ac venditoribus.[138]

> With this poem I urge the readers to consider carefully how unlawful it is, and in opposition to the Holy Spirit, at this moment in time to attempt to acquire the priesthood through purchase. For now we do not

[134] See Geoffrey's own words at the end of the poem, GA, Macc, ll. 1153–1158: *Est et in hoc opusculo quod attendendum estimo: / In illis voluminibus de quibus hec excerpsimus / Que primo quidem facta sunt posterius conscripta sunt, / Unde lectoris animus conturbatur frequentius. / Nos autem rem ex ordine aggressi sumus scribere / Ut quod illic implicitum hic cunctis sit perspicuum.*

[135] Poleg in GA, Macc, p. 21.

[136] GA, Macc, ll. 111–131.

[137] GA, Macc, ll. 132–142.

[138] GA, Macc, 214–224.

> sacrifice the fat of bulls or rams to the Lord, nay, instead the flesh and blood assumed by the Son of God from the Virgin Mary for us sinners. If the fire was extinguished when Jason acquired the priestly glory by bribing the king, what do we believe will happen now with the fire of the Holy Spirit? It is extinguished both to the buyers and the sellers.

Geoffrey draws on the earlier poem of Achard, who had made the case that the Ark of the Covenant, kept within the Temple, prefigured the Eucharist. Here, the typology is much more obvious and direct: the sacrifices made in the Jewish Temple prefigured Christ's sacrifice on behalf of mankind. Salient for Geoffrey is the relation between *tunc* ("then") and *nunc* ("now"): for him, the time of the Maccabees has a bearing on his own time, and reading the books of the Maccabees may help his contemporaries in understanding the present and perhaps to avoid another destruction of the Temple. Then there was a *sacerdotium* ("priesthood") in Jerusalem that could be purchased, while in Geoffrey's own day, too, there were accusations that ecclesiastical offices could be "bought" by the highest bidder. For example, Ralph of Domfront, archbishop of Antioch, was accused of simoniacal practices by two clergymen in 1138, a year after Geoffrey composed his poem.[139]

Geoffrey also emphasizes the importance of the site of the *Templum Domini* in salvation history: by framing history as the difference between sacrificing bulls and rams in the Jewish Temple and partaking of the Eucharist—the flesh and blood of Christ, born of the Virgin Mary—in the *Templum Domini*, Geoffrey completely passes over Christ's Resurrection and the Church of the Holy Sepulcher that commemorated it. As the chief rival of the *Templum Domini* within the religious landscape of Frankish Jerusalem, Geoffrey may have been motivated to reframe salvation history in a way that placed his own institution at the center of events. Geoffrey's

[139] WT, 15.16.33, and see the discussion in Hamilton 1980, pp. 34–35.

poem, therefore, opens a new window on the competition between the various religious institutions of Frankish Jerusalem.[140]

At the very end of the poem, Geoffrey again steps in to relate the Maccabees to his own time:

> Nunc autem dicunt plurimi preteritorum nescii
> Huic nostro similia nunquam fuisse tempora,
> Qui si nossent preterita hec dicerent felicia.[141]
>
> But now many, ignorant of the past, say that never was there a time like that of our own; but if they knew the past, they would call these happy times.

Geoffrey berates those who are ignorant of history, and argues that there is value to be had in studying previous events that took place in Jerusalem—a pursuit that may aid the present and prevent future calamities. As Eyal Poleg argued, this comment may reflect a criticism of those who were reluctant to recognize the Maccabean martyrs, who died for outdated Jewish dietary laws and circumcision, in the same way that Christian martyrs were honored.[142] For Geoffrey, this kind of presentist thinking was a dangerous affair, because it disregards the valuable lessons that the past may have to offer. More importantly for the canons of the *Templum Domini*, such attitudes diminish the importance of their institution, which had no established status as a Christian sanctuary to draw on. The key point, therefore, of these last verses of Geoffrey's poem

[140] For the architectural dimensions of the rivalry between the Holy Sepulcher and the *Templum Domini*, see N. Kenaan-Kedar, "Symbolic meaning in crusader architecture: the twelfth-century dome of the Holy Sepulcher Church in Jerusalem." *Cahiers archéologiques* 34 (1986), pp. 109–17.

[141] GA, Macc, 1168–1170. For a brief discussion of this passage, which has otherwise been ignored by scholars, see Russo's forthcoming piece on the Maccabees in crusader literature: L. Russo, "Continuité et transformations de la typologie des Maccabées jusqu'aux origines du mouvement des croisades," in E. Lapina and N. Morton (eds.), *Uses of the Bible during the Crusades* (forthcoming in 2015).

[142] GA, Macc, pp. 19–20. For a discussion of twelfth-century Latin sources that problematize the Maccabees, see Lapina 2012.

seems to be that there is a similarity between the time of the Maccabees and that of the Franks. It lies in Geoffrey's view that both the people of Israel at the time of the Maccabees and the Franks of the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem are a chosen people of God, but also that similar acts of impiety can bring similar destruction upon them—a topic treated at length in Geoffrey's poem on the Roman destruction of the Temple. Just as greed and simoniacal actions led to the subjugation of the Jews, while adherence to the Law safeguarded them from enemy attacks, so did the Franks' greed place them in peril from their neighboring enemies. Yet, as Geoffrey's earlier statements show, the essential comparability of the Maccabean past and Frankish present does not take away from the fact that current stakes are higher: while previously one risked extinguishing the sacrificial fire in the Temple, now the fire of the Holy Spirit hangs in the balance.

Before concluding our discussion of the Maccabees in the Latin East, let us turn to the knightly orders. The Council of Troyes, held January 13, 1129, recognized and confirmed the Order of the Knights Templar, leading to an early draft of the Rule of the Knights Templar that was largely based on the *Rule of St. Benedict*.[143] Around this time Bernard of Clairvaux wrote a treatise praising and promoting the new order, the *Liber de laude novae militiae ad milites Templi* ("Book of praise for the new knighthood, directed to the Knights of the Temple").[144]

The book begins by discoursing generally on the new order, on the differences between secular and Christian warfare, and on the way of life of the new knights (*De conversatione militum Christi*). The latter chapter is perhaps the most important of the treatise, in which

---

[143] The most recent edition is: *Règle et statuts de l'ordre du Temple*, ed. L. Dailliez, rev. J.-P. Lombard (Paris, 1998).

[144] Bernard of Clairvaux, *Liber ad milites Templi sive de laude novae militiae*, ed. J. Leclercq, *Opera*, vol. 3 (Rome, 1963), pp. 213–239.

Bernard proclaims the Knights Templar to be "true Israelites," who rely on the might of the Lord of Hosts rather than their own valor, after the example of the Maccabees.[145]

This leads organically into a comparison with the Maccabees: although the Knights Templar may be outnumbered by their enemies, they may take courage from the example of the Maccabees. The treatise then proceeds on an entirely different principle of organization, which is now spatially rather than thematically determined. Starting with the Temple of Solomon (better known as the Aqṣā Mosque), and proceeding through Bethlehem, Nazareth, the Mount of Olives, the Valley of Josaphat, the Jordan River, Calvary, the Holy Sepulcher, Bethphage, and Bethany, Bernard offers brief expositions on the biblical history associated with each site and their significance for a Christian knight. As becomes clear from Bernard's encomium, from the very first, the Knights Templar were brought into connection with the biblical landscape of the Holy Land, who, after all, derived their name from their association with Solomon's Temple.

By combining the praise of the Knights Templar with a pilgrim guide, Bernard set a precedent for Rorgo Fretellus, who chose to single out the Knights Templar in the preface to his pilgrim guide, couched in language closely resembling that of Bernard. He writes:

> Cum ad orientalem ecclesiam delendorum causa tuorum peccaminum confugisti et in terra promissionis, patria videlicet Salvatoris nostri Ihesu Christi, peregrinaris, ex qua secundus Israel Parthos eiecit et Arabes, sollerter considera sanctam Iherusalem, contemplare et ipsam Syon, que celestem paradysum allegorice nobis figurat et in qua modo fortiores ex Israel, novi Machabei scilicet, veri Salomonis lectulum excubant,[146] expugnantes inde Ydumeum et Amalech.[147]

> Since you have fled to the Eastern Church for the sake of purging your sins, and have come on a pilgrimage to the Promised Land—that is to say, the land of our Savior Jesus Christ—out of which a second Israel has cast the Parthians and Arabs, consider carefully holy Jerusalem, behold Zion itself, which signifies the

[145] Bernard of Clairvaux, *Liber ad milites Templi sive de laude novae militiae* 4.8.

[146] Compare Song 3:7: *En lectulum Salomonis sexaginta fortes ambiunt ex fortissimis Israel . . .*

[147] RF, *Comte-R.*, 2.

> heavenly paradise to us through allegory, and in which now the heroes of Israel, the new Maccabees, keep watch over the bed of the true Solomon, driving out both Idumea and Amalek.

Rorgo allegorizes the crusaders as a "second Israel" and portrays the Knights Templar, who now keep watch over the "resting-place of the true Solomon" (i.e., their headquarters in the Aqṣā Mosque, named "Solomon's Palace by the Franks), as "new Maccabees," a phrase that may have been borrowed from the papal bull *Milites Templi*, issued by Innocent II in either 1133 or 1137, which gave formal recognition to the Order of the Knights Templar.[148] Rorgo chose to employ this phrase in both of the prefaces to his two different redactions of his pilgrim guide. In the redaction dedicated to Rodrigo González de Lara, once count of Toledo, Rorgo references the Maccabees once again when toward the end of the preface he discusses his addressee's personal circumstances:

> Ergo, quoniam devote, prout nobis visum est, immo catholice, huc transfretans de longe remotis Hyspaniarum finibus, tu qui et largus egenis necnon omnibus in ecclesia Dei Deo militantibus, impiger Machabeorum commilito, hospitatus ante Bethel, regis Salomonis in atrio . . .[149]

> Since, as it seems to me, you have sailed here from the faraway lands of Spain out of devotion—nay, Catholic devotion—you, who are generous to the needy and to all who do battle for God in His Church, as a tireless fellow-knight of the Maccabees, staying as a guest in front of Bethel, in the hall of King Solomon . . .

Count Rodrigo appears to have been staying as a guest of the Knights Templar, as corroborated by the *Chronicle of Alfonso VII*, which reports that he went to fight alongside the Knights Templar and built the castle of Toron (now Latrun) on the way to Jerusalem, which he handed

[148] It was originally issued on February 12 of either 1133 or 1137 and renewed on January 6 of 1139 or 1143; the oldest version preserved is the one issued by Celestine II on January 9 of 1144. See R. Hiestand, *Papsturkunden für Templer und Johanniter*, vol. 1 (Göttingen, 1972), no. 8, pp. 214–215.

[149] RF, *Comte-R.*, 4.

over to the Templars.[150] What Rorgo's text shows is that, by the late 1130s, the notion that those Christians who fought in the Holy Land shared a typological connection with the Maccabees had been well established in the Crusader States, and had come to be applied in a more specialized manner to the Knights Templar.

Perhaps under influence of the Knights Templar, other knightly orders also identified themselves with the Maccabees, even those whose mission was not (at least originally) principally a military one. A fourteenth-century account of the foundation of the Order of the Knights Hospitaller, which may have been originally composed as early as the late twelfth century, gives a fanciful narrative involving Judas Maccabeus.[151] The foundation of the Hospital in Jerusalem is placed in the time of the Hasmoneans, and is portrayed as a divine act, through the agencies of Antiochus (presumably the IV) and the otherwise unknown high priest Melchiar, who were told in a divine vision to settle their quarrel and build a house for the poor. The account expands on a passage in 2 Maccabees, in which Judas Maccabeus is said to have sent a large sum of money to Jerusalem for making sacrifices to honor the dead. In the end the account claims that the Hospital had been granted sizeable donations by Judas.[152] Clearly, by the time this account was written, the figure of Judas Maccabeus had such great prestige that the

---

[150] *Chronica Adefonsi Imperatoris*, ed. J.E. Estévez Sola in *Chronica Hispana saeculi XII*, ed. J. Gil and A. Maya, CCCM 71 (Turnhout, 1990), 1.48: *Comes vero Rodericus Gundisalvi, postquam osculatus est manum regis et gentibus et amicis suis valere dixit, peregre profectus est Hierosilimis, ubi et commisit multa bella cum Sarracenis fecitque quoddam castellum valde fortissimum a facie Ascalonie, quod dicitur Toron, et munivit eum valde militibus et peditibus et escis tradens illud militibus Templi*. See also the discussions in Hiestand 1994, pp. 30–31; J. Phillips, *The Second Crusade: extending the frontiers of Christendom* (New Haven, Conn., 2007), p. 49; S. Barton, "From tyrants to soldiers of Christ: the nobility of twelfth-century León-Castile and the struggle against Islam," *Nottingham Medieval Studies* 44 (2000), pp. 28–48, n. 35. On this fort, see D. Pringle, *Secular buildings in the crusader kingdom of Jerusalem* (Cambridge, 1997), no. 136, pp. 64–65.

[151] J. Riley-Smith, *The Knights of St. John in Jerusalem and Cyprus, c. 1050–1310* (London, 1967), pp. 32–33; Minervini 2001, p. 624 and note. For the text and translation, see A. Luttrell in *Les Légendes de l'Hôpital de Saint-Jean de Jérusalem*, ed. A. Calvet (Paris, 2000).

[152] 2 Macc 12:43.

Hospitallers felt it necessary to backdate the founding of their order so as to attach a Hasmonean pedigree to it—possibly in response to the Templar claim to be "new Maccabees."[153]

Too much has been made of the fact that the Maccabees are barely mentioned in the literature of the Levant after the first generation of settlers had died.[154] We possess very few sources from the intervening period between ca. 1137 and 1187. In terms of narrative history, we have only the *Historia Nicaena* and William of Tyre. Such scant evidence cannot be used to draw more generalizing conclusions about the status of the figures of the Maccabees in the Crusader States—although, even if they could, the fact that the Maccabees are referenced in William of Tyre does not speak in favor of a theory of decline.

9. Conclusion

The Franks had a long tradition of appropriating the concept of *populus Dei*, and by the time of the First Crusade, this concept was adapted to designate specifically those who participated in the crusade. Later authors who chronicle the crusade increasingly draw parallels between the First Crusade and the Israelite Exodus from Egypt into the Promised Land; such a depiction reinforces their conception that they have been chosen by God and that Jerusalem belongs to their rightful patrimony. The connection is frequently made by associating the spiritual leader of the crusade, the papal legate Adhémar of Le Puy, with Moses.

---

[153] H.J. Nicholson, *Templars, Hospitallers, and Teutonic Knights: images of the military orders, 1128–1291* (London, 1995), pp. 112–114; S. Schein, "The *Miracula* of the Hospital of St. John and the Carmelite Elianic tradition—two medieval myths of foundation?," in M. Goodich, et al. (ed.), *Cross cultural convergences in the crusader period: essays presented to Aryeh Graboïs* (New York, 1995), pp. 288–289; A. Luttrell in *Les légendes de l'Hôpital de Saint-Jean de Jérusalem*, ed. A. Calvet (Paris, 2000), p. 10.

[154] So Morton 2010, p. 285: "it is striking that, after the death of the first generation of settlers, only a few Latin writers living in the Levant continued to make any reference to the Maccabees and the vast bulk of the evidence originates from Western sources."

The motif of Moses develops from simple comparisons between Adhémar and Moses in Raymond of Aguilers to extended comparisons and complex allusions in Ralph of Caen, who greatly expands on the motif by composing a rhetorical *synkrisis* between the two figures in the form of elegiac couplets. The obvious literary potential is fully utilized by Ralph of Caen, but also affords him an opportunity to further his own rhetorical purpose: given that the poem occurs immediately after Adhémar appoints Arnulf of Chocques as his successor, the comparisons to Moses could considerably increase the status of Arnulf. Ralph therefore builds on what was, by this point, a cultural memory in which the crusaders had been brought into connection with the Israelites as a People of God, and their spiritual leader with Moses, and fully exploits the typological implications of the comparison for his own rhetorical purposes.

William of Tyre also linked the crusaders to the Israelites, but instead of highlighting their status as a people chosen by God, he emphasizes their bickering and infighting, using the same phrases that appear in Exodus to describe the quarrelling Israelites. When William uses this phrase later on to describe a political opponent of King Fulk intent on causing division, William appears to use the biblical context to argue that the Franks are in need of unity and spiritual leadership.

Albert of Tarsus utilized the cultural memory in which the crusaders were associated with the Israelites during Exodus in his lament on the collapse of the Crusader States, building on the biblical model of Lamentations in the context of the Babylonian Captivity to present recent events as an ironic reversal of the Israelites' previous success under God's guidance.

Unlike comparisons with the Israelites, Frankish authors in the Levant only gradually begin to liken the Jerusalemite kings to their Old Testament forbears, perhaps owing to apocalyptical concerns, in which a new (and last) king of Jerusalem signaled the arrival of the

Antichrist. This development is evident in Fulcher of Chartres, who gradually and implicitly associates the reign of Baldwin I with Solomon and Samson, before comparing him explicitly to Joshua in an epitaph composed upon his death.

Achard of Arrouaise addresses King Baldwin I as "David's successor" as part of a strategy to associate both his addressee and the site of his institution, the *Templum Domini*, with Old Testament biblical history. This is the earliest extant occurrence in the Latin literature from the East where a Frankish king is considered to be a successor of the biblical king David.

Ralph of Caen draws an implicit comparison between David and Bohemond, by means of a sermon that he attributes to Adhémar of Le Puy, as part of a politically-motivated rhetorical ploy to assert Bohemond's rightful claim to Antioch, while elsewhere, he explicitly associates the kingdom of Jerusalem under Baldwin I with David, speaking for the first time of "David's throne" within the context of Frankish rule.

Rorgo Fretellus may be the first to speak explicitly of "the kingdom of David" when referring to the crusader kingdom, and even writes that Godfrey of Bouillon wanted to restore the kingdom of David and the rule of Solomon. By the late 1130s, therefore, all former hesitation had disappeared: a few decades after the establishment of the kingdom of Jerusalem, authors clearly felt more at ease to make the connection with the biblical rulers, now that the Antichrist had failed to appear.

In contradistinction to Fulcher of Chartres and Rorgo Fretellus, William of Tyre typically does not compare the Frankish and biblical kings. The exceptions are his treatment of the ascension of King Baldwin I and King Fulk, and in the latter instance, William's account may well reflect a cultural tradition in which Fulk had become associated with King David—a tradition possibly precipitated by royal propaganda. When William does make Old Testament

comparisons, they have the character rather of moral exempla than claims of theological import: this has to do with his linear view of history and the didactic purpose of his work.

The remainder of this chapter focused on the reception of the Maccabees as cultural and literary figures. The Maccabees, initially viewed as rallying points of Jewish identity over against gentile oppression, eventually came to be considered Christian examples of pious martyrdom in the face of Roman persecution. From the Carolingian period onward, they increasingly became the models of Christian warriors, while both imperial and papal parties appropriated these figures during the Investiture Contest in the eleventh century.

In describing the crusaders' miraculous victory at Antioch, Raymond of Aguilers turned to these well-established models of Christian warfare (who were particularly associated with the motif of being outnumbered in combat), and even claimed that the crusaders faced superior odds when compared to the Maccabees. Fulcher is more cautious in the prologue to his history, emphasizing instead the commemoration of the Maccabean martyrs as a model for commemorating the fallen of the First Crusade. William of Tyre, finally, includes a reference to the Maccabees in his version of the speech of Pope Urban II at Clermont, indicating that the Maccabees continued to be considered models of Christian warfare within the context of the First Crusade.

Even after the First Crusade, the Maccabees were held up as models in the Latin East. Fulcher points out the example of the Maccabees and of Gideon when describing the outcome of the First Battle of Tall Danith, while Achard of Arrouaise suggests to Baldwin I that, like Judas Maccabeus, he should strive to return the treasures that had been taken from the *Templum Domini*. His successor, Geoffrey the Abbot, further developed Achard's use of the Maccabees in Jerusalemite politics with a versification of 1 and 2 Maccabees that sought to criticize the

practice of simony in Jerusalem. He ends his poem by urging his audience to study the history of the Maccabees diligently out of interest for the present.

Over the course of the twelfth century, the Maccabean warriors become particularly associated with the military orders in the Crusader States. The connection is made at an early stage by Bernard of Clairvaux, who claims that the Knights Templar follow the example of the Maccabees in trusting on God's aid instead of their own valor in combat. A papal bull then describes the Knights Templar as "new Maccabees," a term also used by Rorgo Fretellus to describe the same order shortly afterward in his pilgrim guide. Possibly influenced by the Knights Templar, the Knights Hospitaller may also have sought to establish a connection between their order and the Maccabees by issuing a document that backdates the foundation of their order to the time of Judas Maccabeus.

In conclusion, biblical imagery offered a wealth of opportunities for writers to define their own culture and to make claims about their place within history. More often than not, however, biblical imagery was used within the very specific context of the rhetorical purpose of the author or institution from which these texts issued, given that a connection with the Bible could serve as a powerful argument for legitimacy. In this the writers of the Frankish East resembled closely the Carolingians with whom they sought to associate themselves. This leads into our final chapter, in which we will examine the role of medieval models in crusader literature, with particular attention to the figure of Charlemagne.

4. In the footsteps of Charlemagne? Latin authors between East and West

> There mildly dimpling, Ocean's cheek
> Reflects the tints of many a peak
> Caught by the laughing tides that lave
> These Edens of the Eastern wave. . .[1]

1. INTRODUCTION

In a famous passage, Fulcher of Chartres writes shortly after 1120 that those who settled in the East had "already forgotten the places of their birth," which had become utterly alien to them in a mere two decades:

> Considera, quaeso, et mente recogita, quomodo tempore in nostro transvertit Deus Occidentem in Orientem. Nam qui fuimus occidentales, nunc facti sumus orientales. Qui fuit Romanus aut Francus, hac in terra factus est Galilaeus, aut Palaestinus. Qui fuit Remensis aut Carnotensis, nunc efficitur Tyrius vel Antiochenus. Iam obliti sumus nativitatis nostrae loca; iam nobis pluribus vel sunt ignota, vel etiam inaudita. Hic iam possidet domos proprias et familias quasi iure paterno et hereditario, ille vero iam duxit uxorem non tantum compatriotam, sed et Syram aut Armenam et interdum Saracenam, baptismi autem gratiam adeptam . . . Diversarum linguarum coutitur alternatim eloquio et obsequio alteruter. Lingua diversa iam communis facta utrique nationi fit nota, et iungit fides quibus est ignota progenies. Scriptum quippe est: *leo et bos simul comedent paleas* [Is 65:25]. Qui erat alienigena, nunc est indigena, et qui inquilinus,[2] est utique incola factus. Nos nostri sequuntur de die in diem propinqui et parentes, quaecumque possederant relinquentes, nec etiam volentes. Qui enim illic erant inopes, hic facit eos Deus locupletes. Qui habuerant nummos paucos, hic possident bisantios innumeros, et qui non habuerat villam, hic Deo dante iam possidet urbem. Quare ergo reverteretur in Occidentem, qui hic taliter invenit Orientem? . . . Percipitis igitur esse hoc miraculum immensum et universo mundo valde stupendum. Quis audivit hactenus tale?[3]

> Consider, I ask, and reflect, how in our age God has transformed the West into the East. For we who were Westerners have now been turned into Easterners. He who was a Roman or Frank has become a Galilean in this land, or a Palestinian. He who was from Reims or Chartres has now become a citizen of Tyre or Antioch. We have already forgotten the places of our birth; already they have become unknown to many of us, and even unheard of. Some already own their own homes and households as if by hereditary right, while others have already married—and not just women of their own people, but even Syrian and Armenian women, and sometimes even Saracens, after they have received the grace of baptism . . . Each uses the

[1] Lord Byron, *The Giaour*, ll. 12–15.

[2] I have altered the punctuation here from that of Hagenmeyer (who places a comma after *inquilinus est*), as it makes better sense in the Latin by preserving the parallelism.

[3] FC, 3.37.2–8.

> idioms and expressions of various languages in conversing. A mixed language has become a common tongue known to each nationality, and faith unites those who are of unknown descent. For it is written: *the lion and the bull shall eat straw together*. He who was born a stranger has now become a native, and he who was a foreigner has become indigenous. Day after day, [more of] our next of kin and parents follow us, leaving behind all they possessed—indeed, not desiring it. For those who were poor there have been made wealthy by God here. Those who had but a few coins, here possess innumerable bezants, and he who did not have an estate, here, by God's generosity, owns a city. Indeed, why would one return to the West, who found the East to be like this? . . . You perceive, then, that this is a great miracle to be marveled at by the entire world. Who has ever heard such a thing?

Fulcher claims to be describing a state of affairs: those who have come from the West have become Easterners—so much so, in fact, that they have all but forgotten their places of origin. There is a sense that they have "gone native," much as James of Vitry would accuse the *pullani* or acculturated Franks of the Levant of having done some hundred years later.[4]

Although the passage has generally been interpreted as hyperbolic, in some ways it seems that Fulcher did try to bring about a process of "forgetting" the past: when he revised the first book of his history, he eliminated a sentence in which he dated the Capture of Jerusalem by the Crusaders with reference both to Charlemagne and William the Conqueror.[5] This is certainly at odds with the injunction that Pope Urban II is reported by Robert the Monk to have issued when he preached the First Crusade at the Council of Clermont, urging his audience to remember the deeds of their ancestors, of Charlemagne and Louis the Pious, and others, "who laid waste to the kingdoms of the pagans and extended the borders of the sacred Church."[6]

Yet, some seventy years after Pope Urban preached the crusade, memory of the past forms a crucial part of the history of the Holy Land of William of Tyre, inasmuch as remembering and the fear of forgetting are central to his activity as a historiographer. But the

---

[4] James of Vitry, *Historia orientalis* 1088.31–35.

[5] FC, 1.30.1. See also the discussion below in 2.2.

[6] RM, 728: *Moveant vos et incitent animos vestros ad virilitatem gesta predecessorum vestrorum, probitas et magnitudo Karoli Magni regis et Ludovici filii eius aliorumque regum vestrorum, qui regna paganorum destruxerunt, et in eis fines sancte ecclesie dilataverunt.*

focus has shifted from remembering the examples of distant ancestors in Europe to remembering the past of the new *patria* or homeland. In the prologue, William writes that love for his *patria* urges him not to allow the recent past to suffer oblivion, but instead to entrust it to memory:

> Inter tot igitur periculorum insidias et anceps discrimen tutius fuerat quievisse silendumque erat et ocium calamis indicendum: sed urgentissimus instat amor patrie, pro qua vir bene dispositus etiam, si id necessitatis articulus exigat, vitam tenetur impendere. Instat, inquam, et auctoritate qua preminet imperiose precipit ut que apud se centum pene annorum gesta sunt curriculis, silentio sepulta non patiamur sentire posse oblivionis incommodum, sed stili exarata diligenter officio posteritatis memorie conserventur.[7]

> Amid such treacherous dangers it would have been safer to keep my peace and be silent, and to lay my pen to rest; but the love of my fatherland urges me greatly, for which a morally upright man would be held to expend his life, if a moment of necessity should require it. It urges me, I say, and with its lofty authority it imperiously orders me not to allow those things, which have occurred in my fatherland over the course of almost a hundred years, to lie buried in silence and suffer the damage of oblivion, but to set them down diligently with my pen and to preserve them for the memory of posterity.

Furthermore, in his presentation of the Council of Clermont, he has Urban remind his audience of the central place—literally, as the *umbilicus mundi* ("navel of the earth")—that the Promised Land has and continues to play in salvation history; in fact, the city of Jerusalem is personified as having been consciously aware of the great mysteries that occurred in it. The city is compared to a *cella familiaris*, or a private store chamber, a metaphor often applied to memory, so that the city as a whole is perceived to be a kind of memory-storehouse of the biblical events that transpired there, the implication being that one would merely have to enter such a cell to retrieve the memories.[8]

---

[7] WT, Prol. 64–72. See the discussion of this passage in Vessey 1973, pp. 439–440.

[8] WT, 1.15.16: *De qua* [sc. Ierusalem] *gloriosa dicuntur, videlicet quod in ea docens, passus et resurgens Salvator salutem operatus est in medio terre, ad hoc a seculis preelecta, ut tantorum esset conscia et cella familiaris mysteriorum.* Compare Fulcher of Chartres' use of the phrase *mentis armariolum* (FC, Prol. 1). For the metaphor of the *cella* in medieval discourses on memory, see M. Carruthers, *The book of memory: a study of memory in medieval culture* (Cambridge, 2008), pp. 40–41.

The guiding questions throughout this final chapter will be: How do authors remember the West, and how do they perceive it in relation to themselves? Or, in other words, what is the dynamic between Eastern and Western culture as expressed in Latin literature from Outremer? How do Latin authors view their literary activity in terms of Western and Eastern constructs of culture? Do they consider themselves part or an extension of European cultural traditions, a component of local, Eastern culture, or something else altogether?

In the first part of the chapter, I demonstrate that one of the ways that authors situated themselves in relation to the West was by evoking the figure of Charlemagne and figures associated with him, given that, as recent studies have shown, the legend of Charlemagne had come to represent a set of pan-European cultural notions, involving claims to Christian imperial rule. Since an integral part of the legend was establishing a connection between Charlemagne and the Holy Land, it made sense that those Europeans who settled in the Holy Land exploited this particular element of the legend.

I will also argue that, much as the figure of Charlemagne represented a set of cultural notions for those living in the East (as he did for many in the West), the chief protagonists of the First Crusade were remembered as heroic figures that supported a particular Frankish narrative of history; frequently such "memories" developed around particular sites, which became a locus—not always uncontested—of cultural identity.

The second half of the chapter will center on the two major historiographers of the Latin East and how their work espouses two very different constructs of the East, and how this impacts their view of Latin literary culture in the East. We will further explore this particular aspect in a short case study, illustrating William of Tyre's approaches toward the place of Latin intellectualism with respect to competing ideologies.

2. Charlemagne in the Latin East

2.1 Pre-crusade traditions linking Charlemagne to the Holy Land

Later traditions closely linking Charlemagne and the Holy Land ultimately derive from Charlemagne's own demonstrated interest in the Holy Land. Portraying himself as a Christian ruler who looks out for the interests of the larger Christian oecumene, Charlemagne was particularly concerned with the Christians living in the Holy Land, and sent a delegation to compile an inventory of the churches there shortly after his coronation as Holy Roman Emperor in 800.[9] Moreover, Charlemagne entertained frequent diplomatic relations with Caliph Hārūn al-Rashīd on behalf of the Christians in the Holy Land: the *Annales regni Francorum* ("Annals of the kingdom of the Franks") record the arrival in Aachen of two different embassies sent by Hārūn al-Rashīd, in 802 and 807, as a result of an initiative by Charlemagne in 799.[10] These diplomatic relations would become famous in the Middle Ages, finding wide circulation in the account of Einhard's *Vita Karoli Magni* ("Life of Charlemagne"), and would later lead a life of their own in the form of fantastical elaborations.[11]

---

[9] Edited in *Charlemagne's survey of the Holy Land: wealth, personnel, and buildings of a Mediterranean church between antiquity and the Middle Ages*, ed. and tr. M. McCormick (Washington, D.C., 2011).

[10] *Annales regni Francorum*, ed. F. Krauze, MGH SS Rer. Germ. 6 (Hanover, 1895), pp. 108, 117, 123.

[11] On Einhard, see section 2.4 below. The starting point for discussions of Charlemagne's relations with the Holy Land remain: S. Runciman, "Charlemagne and Palestine," *The English Historical Review* 50:200 (1935), pp. 606–619; M. Borgolte, *Der Gesandtenaustausch der Karolinger mit den Abbasiden und mit den Patriarchen von Jerusalem* (Munich, 1976). A useful and more recent survey is: A. Latowsky, "Foreign embassies and Roman universality in Einhard's Life of Charlemagne," *Florilegium* 22 (2005), pp. 25–57. See also the studies of A. Graboïs, "Charlemagne, Rome and Jerusalem," *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire* 59:4 (1981), pp. 792–809; J. Flori, *La guerre sainte: La formation de l'idée de croisade dans l'Occident chrétien* (Paris, 2001), pp. 30–31; A.C. Oellers, "Karl und die Christen im Heiligen Land," in Minkenberg, Dreßen, and Oellers 2003, vol. 3, pp. 108–121; Gabriele 2011, pp. 33–34 (especially the bibliography on p. 33 n. 103); A. Latowsky, *Emperor of the world: Charlemagne and the construction of imperial authority, 800–1229* (Ithaca, NY, 2013).

Some seventy years after Charlemagne's death, Notker Balbulus, a monk from St. Gall, dedicated his reworking of Einhard to Charles the Fat, Charlemagne's great-grandson (ca. 885). He embellishes Einhard's account, in which Charlemagne was granted jurisdiction over the Holy Sepulcher, by claiming that Hārūn al-Rashīd was so impressed by the hunting dogs Charlemagne had sent him as a gift that he recognized Charlemagne to be a superior ruler. Wishing to offer him a fitting tribute, Hārūn al-Rashīd surrendered the entirety of the Holy Land to him, but for pragmatic reasons appointed himself its governor.[12]

From the tenth century onward, textual traditions on Charlemagne's relations with the Holy Land began to lead a life of their own. Around the year 968, Benedict, a monk at the monastery of St. Andrew on Monte Soratte near Rome, enhanced the existing narrative by claiming that Charlemagne himself traveled to the Holy Land out of concern for the Christians there, stopping over in Constantinople before returning to Rome.[13] Two late-eleventh century documents dealing with the foundation of the monastery of Charroux (in the diocese of Poitiers), also refer to this journey, but add that Charlemagne brought back a number of relics with him to Aachen.[14] Another late-eleventh century account, the *Descriptio qualiter Karolus Magnus* (ca.

[12] Notker Balbulus, *Gesta Karoli Magni imperatoris*, ed. H.F. Haefele, MGH SRG N.S. 12 (Berlin, 1959), p. 64. The terms used are *procurator* and *advocatus*, the latter of which was also the title Godfrey of Bouillon is reported by some sources to have received after the Liberation of Jerusalem.

[13] *Il Chronicon di Benedetto: Monaco di S. Andrea del Soratte e il Libellus de Imperatoria Potestate in urbe Roma*, ed. G. Zucchetti (Rome, 1920); selections are printed in Benedict of Monte Soratte, *Chronicon*, ed. G.H. Pertz, MGH SS 3 (Hanover, 1839), pp. 695–719. See B. Sholod, "Charlemagne: Symbolic link between the eigth and eleventh century crusades," in I.A. Langnas and B. Sholod (eds.), *Studies in honor of M.J. Bernardete: Essays in Hispanic and Sephardic culture* (New York, 1965), pp. 33–46; J. Stuckey, "Charlemagne as crusader? Memory, propaganda, and the many uses of Charlemagne's legendary expedition to Spain," in M. Gabriele and J. Stuckey (eds.), *The legend of Charlemagne in the Middle Ages: power, faith, and crusade* (New York, 2008), pp. 137–152, at 137–138; Gabriele 2011, pp. 41–44.

[14] The first is: *Liber de constitutione, institutione, consecratione, reliquiis ornamentis et privilegiis. Chartes et documents pour servir à l'histoire de l'Abbaye de Charroux*, ed. D.P. de Monsabert, *Archives historiques du Poitou* 39 (1910), pp. 1–7; the second occurs at pp. 29–41. They are respectively referred to by scholars as the *Privilegium* (ca. 1045) and *Historia* (ca. 1095); see the discussion in Gabriele 2011, pp. 27–28, 44–51.

1080–1095), relates a variant of this story; as it was written in a Capetian context, it was likely intended to legitimize the relics at Saint-Denis, and constituted the source of the late-twelfth-century *Voyage de Charlemagne à Jérusalem et à Constantinople* ("Voyage of Charlemagne to Jerusalem and Constantinople"), a humorous elaboration of the original in Old French.[15]

By the time of the First Crusade, not only were Charlemagne's political relations with and religious concerns for the Holy Land well known, there were several accounts that elaborated on this connection for the purpose of more localized, institutional interests. With the background of this established tradition in mind, let us turn to the ways in which the figure of Charlemagne is evoked in narratives of the First Crusade.

2.2 Charlemagne and the First Crusade

Some of the earliest accounts of the First Crusade involve Charlemagne in the expedition from the very beginning: when the armies of Godfrey of Bouillon and his brother Baldwin of Boulogne travel to Constantinople, we are told that they do so on a road built by Charlemagne:[16]

[15] *Descriptio qualiter Karolus Magnus*, ed. G. Rauschen, *Die Legende Karls des Grossen im 11. und 12. Jahrhundert* (Leipzig, 1890), pp. 95–125. For more extensive discussion of this text, see A.G. Remensnyder, *Remembering kings past: monastic foundation legends in medieval southern France* (Ithaca, NY, 1995), pp. 150–211; Stuckey 2008, p. 138; A. Latowsky, "Charlemagne as pilgrim? Requests for relics in the *Descriptio qualiter* and the *Voyage of Charlemagne*," in Gabriele and Stuckey 2008, pp. 153–167; M. Gabriele, "The provenance of the *Descriptio qualiter Karolus Magnus*: Remembering the Carolingians in the entourage of King Philip I (1060–1108) before the First Crusade," *Viator* 39:2 (2008), pp. 93–118; Gabriele 2011, pp. 51–60.

[16] On the routes taken to Constantinople during the First Crusade, see E. Koytcheva, "Logistics of the early Crusades in the Balkans on *Via Militaris*," in K. Holzner-Tobisch (ed.), *Die Vielschichtigkeit der Straße: Kontinuität und Wandel im Mittelalter und der frühen Neuzeit*, Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Realienkunde des Mittelalters und der Frühen Neuzeit 22, Sitzungsberichte der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse 826 (Vienna, 2012), pp. 209–232; A.V. Murray, "Roads, bridges and shipping in the passage of crusade armies by overland routes to the Bosporus 1096–1190," in Holzner-Tobisch 2012, pp. 183–208. It is unclear which road is meant here; possibly the Via Militaris, which was followed by the party of Godfrey southward through the Balkans from Belgrade to Sardika (mod. Sofia, Bulgaria) and eventually to Constantinople, but it was built by the Romans. Gabriele (2011, p. 65 n. 97) offers the suggestion that perhaps this remark indicates a connection with the *Descriptio qualiter*.

> Fecerunt denique Galli tres partes. Una pars Francorum in Hungariae intravit regionem, scilicet Petrus Heremita, et dux Godefridus, et Balduinus frater eius, et Balduinus comes de Monte. Isti potentissimi milites et alii plures quos ignoro venerunt per viam quam iamdudum Karolus Magnus mirificus rex Franciae aptari fecit usque Constantinopolim.[17]
>
> The Franks divided themselves into three parties. One party entered the region of Hungary—that is to say, Peter the Hermit, Duke Godfrey his brother, and Baldwin count of Mons. These most valiant knights and many others (whose names I do not know) came by the road which long ago Charlemagne, that wondrous king of Francia, had built all the way to Constantinople.

This particular detail is salient, for it brings the expedition into connection with Charlemagne and makes an implicit argument for Frankish presence in the East, while tying into popular legendary traditions surrounding Charlemagne and his supposed visit to the Holy Land by way of Constantinople. As we have seen, such traditions claimed that Charlemagne governed a portion of the Holy Land; the reference to this story points to a precedent of Frankish rule in the East and offers a rationale for the crusaders' expedition. Quite literally, the crusaders are presented as following in the footsteps of Charlemagne, while the fact that precisely the contingent of Godfrey and Baldwin is associated with Charlemagne is highly relevant, for the two brothers claimed to trace their lineage back to Charlemagne.[18] In a sense, therefore, Charlemagne was perceived to be present among the crusaders through the figures of Godfrey and Baldwin.

Charlemagne's connection with the Holy Land prior and during the First Crusade may help to explain a curious reference to Charlemagne in an earlier version of Fulcher's poem commemorating the capture of Jerusalem in 1099. The poem highlights the significance of the event by giving the day, month, and year in verse, while a comment in prose (dividing the poem)

---

[17] *GF*, 1.2. The same remark occurs in PT, p. 33, and later also in *HN*, 9 (via RM, 732). Compare also Ekkehard of Aura, *Hierosolymita*, ed. H. Hagenmeyer (Tübingen, 1877), p. 19.

[18] Compare the remark in *ChA*, 300, and see P. Aubé, *Godefroy de Bouillon* (Paris, 1985), pp. 26–27. The classic study on the life of Godfrey of Bouillon remains: J.C. Andressohn, *The ancestry and life of Godfrey of Bouillon* (Bloomington, Ind., 1947, repr. 1972); for more recent discussions, see also Winkler 2006, pp. 455–465; Crouzet-Pavan 2013, pp. 128–137.

dates the event by stating that it took place in the 285th year since Charlemagne's death (814), as well as the twelfth year after the death of William the Conqueror (1087), who is hailed as "the first (!) king of Anglia."[19] The poem and the comment occur immediately before Fulcher describes Godfrey's election as *princeps regni* ("the foremost of the kingdom"), to preserve and rule the kingdom, so that the reference to two prominent kings could have had a legitimizing force for Godfrey, who was, after all, not of royal stock—or at least not directly.[20]

2.3 Charlemagne and the relic of the Sacred Foreskin

For an example of a treatment of Charlemagne as a purveyor of relics, we may turn to the pilgrim guide of Rorgo Fretellus. In his description of the *Templum Domini*, Rorgo relates the site to the Herodean Temple that had stood there in the time of Jesus, and forges a connection between the site and the Carolingian empire:

> Presens utique hoc templum quartum predicatur. Cuius in penultimo octavo die natalis sui puer Ihesus circumcisus est. Prepucium eius in Iherusalem in templo de celis ab angelo Karolo Magno regi presentatum fuit et ab eo delatum in Galiis: Aquisgrani. Postea quidem a Karolo Calvo, pii Lodovvici filio, translatum Aquitanie in pago Pictaviensi apud Carrosium, in ecclesia quam in honore sancti Salvatoris construxit, in eo largisque bonis et amplissimis sub monachali religione ditavit. Quod et tunc usque modo sollempniter ibi veneratur.[21]

[19] See the apparatus in FC, 1.30.1. The lines in question are: *Anno ab obitu Karoli magni ducentesimo et octogesimo quinto, et a morte Guilelmi, Angliae regis primi, anno duodecimo* . . . For the revised, shorter version of this epigram, see the discussion below in section 4.

[20] For the title Godfrey is reported to have assumed (generally given as *advocatus Sancti Sepulchri* rather than *princeps regni*), see Chapter 3, section 6 above. The reference to William the Conqueror (and as the "first" king of Anglia, no less) has puzzled scholars. Caspar Barth suggested (FC, p. 307) that the fact that Robert of Normandy, one of the chief leaders of the crusade, was William's son may have had something to do with it. See also the discussion of this poem in Epp 1990, pp. 164–165.

[21] RF, 54.

> The current Temple is said to be the fourth one.[22] In the previous one, the baby Jesus was circumcised on the eighth day after his birth. His foreskin was presented to King Charlemagne in the Temple in Jerusalem by an angel from heaven, and it was brought by him to Gaul, to Aachen. Afterward it was transferred by Charles the Bald, son of Louis the Pious, to Aquitaine, to the region of Poitiers near Charroux, in a church which he built in honor of the holy Savior, enriching it with copious and generous grants under a monastic rule. The foreskin is solemnly venerated there even now.

The relic of the Sacred Foreskin—and particularly that of the monastery of Charroux—was well known in the Middle Ages, though the earliest account that mentions it is a foundational document of the abbey of Charroux that dates to the late eleventh century.[23] This account discourses on the dignity of the abbey, and particularly that of its treasures and relics, in a bid to increase the institutional prestige of Charroux. For this purpose, it is necessary to legitimize the relics under discussion, and so the account launches into a narrative explaining their origins: after Charlemagne had founded the monastery (in reality, it had been founded by Roger of Limoges), he embarked on a journey to Jerusalem in search of relics befitting the dignity of the site.[24] There he was received by Basilius, the patriarch of Jerusalem, and the pair instituted a fast while praying at the Church of the Holy Sepulcher for three days.[25] On the third day, their piety was rewarded and the relic of the Sacred Foreskin (here described as *sanctissima virtus*, "most

[22] Like Achard of Arrouaise, Rorgo subscribes to the tradition that, before the Temple of Herod, there were three temples: that of Solomon, Ezra and Nehemiah, and Judas Maccabeus (AP, 570–573).

[23] G. Schwering-Illert, *Die ehemalige französische Abteikirche Saint-Sauveur in Charroux (Vienne) in 11. und 12. Jh.: Ein Vorschlag zur Rekonstruktion und Deutung der romanischen Bauteile* (Ph.D. Diss., Bonn, 1963), at pp. 31–34; J. Cabanot, "Le trésor des reliques de Saint-Sauveur de Charroux, centre et reflet de la vie spirituelle de l'abbaybe," *Bulletin de la société des antiquaires de l'Ouest et des musées de Poitiers*, 4th ser., 16 (1981), pp. 103–123; R.P. Palazzo, "The veneration of the Sacred Foreskin(s) of baby Jesus—a documented analysis," in J.P. Helfers (ed.), *Multicultural Europe and cultural exchange* (Turnhout, 2005), pp. 155–176; R. Lützelschwab, "Zwischen Heilsvermittlung und Ärgernis—das *preputium Domini* im Mittelalter," in J.-L. Deuffic (ed.), *Reliques et sainteté dans l'espace médiéval* (Saint-Denis, 2005), pp. 601–628; J.J. Mattelaer, R.A. Schipper, S. Das, "The circumcision of Jesus Christ," *Journal of urology* 178:1 (2007), pp. 31–34; Gabriele 2011, pp. 45–46.

[24] For this account, see: Ed. D.P. de Monsabert, *Archives historiques du Poitou* 39 (1910), pp. 29–41. For Charlemagne as the alleged founder of Charroux, see the discussion in Gabriele 2011, pp. 24–25.

[25] There was no patriarch called Basilius during the lifetime of Charlemagne; several years later, however, there was a Patriarch Basileus (820–838).

sacred virtue") appeared on the Holy Chalice; subsequently, the baby Jesus appeared and announced the relic to be of his own "true flesh and blood." Eventually, the relic is brought to Charroux by Charlemagne, where it performs numerous miracles.

Rorgo's text has been overlooked by scholars treating the legend of Charroux, who usually point to a late twelfth-century gloss on Peter Comestor's *Historia scholastica* as the earliest reception of the version related in the *Historia* of Charroux.[26] Some trace the source of the gloss to a pilgrim guide generally known by the equally infelicitous titles of *Innominatus VI* or *Ps.-Bede*, usually dated around 1187; however, this guide, including the passage on the Sacred Foreskin, derives almost verbatim from Rorgo's text, or his source.[27] There are two implications for the fact that this story occurs in Rorgo: firstly, the reception of this legend took place much earlier than previously assumed (at least half a century earlier); secondly, the reception of the story was not confined to Francia, or even Europe, but had made its way over to the Latin East.

As opposed to the earlier version of the story, Rorgo (or his source) changes the site of the miracle from the Church of the Holy Sepulcher to the *Templum Domini*. The alteration is logical, given that Jesus was circumcised in the Temple. Whereas in pre-crusade traditions, the main focal point in Jerusalem for Christians in the West was the Church of the Holy Sepulcher, over the course of the twelfth century the *Templum Domini* gradually began to grow in prominence.[28] The effect of Rorgo's alteration is that a stronger link between biblical past, Frankish past, and Frankish present is formed: by having the episode take place in the *Templum*

[26] For the gloss, see Remensnyder 1995, p. 155 n. 23.

[27] Remensnyder 1995, p. 155. For this guide, see W.A. Neumann, "Drei mittelalterlichen Pilgerschriften," *Österreichische Vierteljahresschrift für katholische Theologie* 7 (1868), pp. 397–438; for the dating, see Graboïs 1998, p. 212—although it is unclear on what basis this date is assigned.

[28] See Busse 1982; Schein 1984; *eadem* 2005, pp. 91–108; B.Z. Kedar and D. Pringle, "1099–1187: The Lord's Temple (Templum Domini) and Solomon's Palace (Palatium Salomonis)," in B.Z. Kedar and O. Grabar (eds.), *Where Heaven and Earth Meet: Jerusalem's Sacred Esplanade* (Jerusalem, 2009), pp. 133–49.

Domini, Rorgo suggests that the physical site is of importance, functioning as a gateway to biblical history.

Matthew Gabriele emphasizes the importance of the figure of Charlemagne in the legend of Charroux, who stands for a Carolingian Golden Age into which the eleventh-century monastery of Charroux is drawn:

> Charroux's *Historia* and the *Descriptio qualiter* . . . suggested continuity, creating memory by fixing history . . . [t]he narrative creates horizontal links (similarities) between Charroux and Jerusalem and between Charlemagne's Golden Ages and the time of the text's composition, with the Holy Virtue as the bridge between them. In other words, the author attempted to create an equivalence: Charroux was just like Jerusalem, and Charlemagne's Golden Age was just like the author's own time, all because of the Holy Virtue.[29]

With Rorgo Fretellus, we have come full circle: here the bridge is made in a reverse direction, where Jerusalem is equivalent to Charroux, and the Franks of the East are just like those of the West. Rorgo marshals the cultural memory of popular traditions on Charlemagne to legitimize Frankish rule in Jerusalem. If, as Raymond of Aguilers claimed, the capture of Jerusalem by the crusaders signified a *renovatio fidei* ("renewal of the faith"), from a political and cultural standpoint it also heralded a *renovatio imperii* ("renewal of empire") of the Carolingian type—or so the implicit claim is—, allowing Rorgo to describe the current phase of Levantine history as a *tempus Francorum* ("era of the Franks").[30]

2.4 Charlemagne as a model for kingship, Einhard as a model for biography

[29] Gabriele 2011, p. 67.

[30] RF, c. 26: *Tyrum beate memorie patriarcha Warmundus Domini preeunte gratia viriliter tempore Francorum terra marique Veneticorum auxilio obsedit et cepit, regnum inde David sublimans et accrescens.*

In the prologue to his monumental history of the Latin East, William of Tyre offers a rationale for his adopted literary style, which, as ancient precepts teach, should be appropriate to the subject matter. For this William adduces an authority from classical antiquity:

> Nam, ut ait orator eximius in Tusculanarum primo, "mandare quemquam litteris cogitationes suas, qui eas nec disponere nec illustrare possit nec delectatione aliqua lectorem allicere, hominis est intemperanter abutentis et litteris et ocio."[31]

> For, as the excellent orator says in the first book of the *Tusculan* [*disputations*], "it is the mark of a man who immoderately abuses both literature and leisure to entrust his thoughts to writing, if he is unable either to arrange or polish them, or to entice the reader with any kind of delight."

The "excellent orator" is, of course, Cicero. While the quotation is certainly apposite to William's point, there is more behind it. For the same quote was used by Einhard in the prologue to his celebrated biography of Charlemagne.[32] Einhard had used this quote to argue that, if this precept was valid for Roman authors (he uses the phrase *Latini scriptores*, "Latin writers"), he too should follow it; the implicit claim being that Charlemagne—his subject matter—stood in the tradition of Roman emperors, and therefore his biographer should follow the same literary conventions as Roman biographers, particularly Suetonius. To put it another way, Einhard lays claim both to a *translatio imperii* as well as a *translatio studii*.[33]

By quoting the same phrase from Cicero as Einhard had, particularly in such a prominent position as the prologue (also like Einhard), William makes two implicit claims: firstly, that his own work stands in the same literary tradition as Einhard, which ultimately goes back to Roman

[31] WT, Prol. 42–46; Cic., Tusc. 1.3.6.

[32] Einhard, *Vita Karoli Magni*, ed. H.W. Garrod and R.B. Mowat, *Einhard's Life of Charlemagne: the Latin text* (Oxford, 1915), 1.3. Note that William inverts the word order of the final phrase, which reads, in both Cicero and Einhard: *et otio et litteris*.

[33] For a discussion of these terms, see Chapter 2, section 8.

imperial biography, and secondly, that his own subject matter is as dignified as Einhard's and bears a relation to it. In a sense, therefore, William, like Einhard, appears to lay claim to a dual *translatio*—not one that is directly tied to classical antiquity, but is instead filtered through Carolingian claims to imperial and cultural supremacy, to the Carolingian model of empire and historiography. Such a pretense, in a work chronicling the kingdom of Jerusalem, had the potential to be all the more convincing because of Charlemagne's association with the Holy Land.

To what extent William models his history on Einhard becomes clear once the narrative of the First Crusade ends and the kingdom of Jerusalem is established. Arguably the most famous section of Einhard's biography is the description of Charlemagne's physical appearance and personal traits:

> Corpore fuit amplo atque robusto, statura eminenti, quae tamen iustam non excederet—nam septem suorum pedum proceritatem eius constat habuisse mensuram—, apice capitis rotundo, oculis praegrandibus ac vegetis, naso paulum mediocritatem excedenti, canitie pulchra, facie laeta et hilari. Unde formae auctoritas ac dignitas tam stanti quam sedenti plurima adquirebatur; quamquam cervix obesa et brevior venterque proiectior videretur, tamen haec ceterorum membrorum celabat aequalitas. Incessu firmo totaque corporis habitudine virili; voce clara quidem, sed quae minus corporis formae conveniret.[34]

> He was of a large and strong build, a tall stature, which nonetheless did not surpass proper proportion—for it is a fact that his height measured seven of his feet—, he had a round head, very large and lively eyes, a nose that somewhat exceeded the average size, charming grey hair, and a happy and cheerful face. His appearance, therefore, had great authority and dignity both when he was standing and sitting down; although his neck seemed stout and too short, and his belly to be overly protruding, still the proportionality of his other body parts hid these things. He had a firm gait and an entirely manly comportment; but a clear voice, such that it did not seem to match his physical appearance.

We may compare this description with the descriptive vignette of Godfrey of Bouillon in William of Tyre:

[34] Einhard, *Vita Karoli Magni* 22.

> Fuit autem et corpore procerus, ita ut et maximis minor et mediocribus maior haberetur, robustus sine exemplo, membris solidioribus, torace virili, facie venusta, capillo et barba flavus mediocriter, in usu armorum et exercitio militari omnium iudicio quasi singularis.[35]
>
> He had a tall body, such that he was considered shorter by the tallest but taller by those of average height, he was strong without parallel, possessing rather thick limbs, a manly torso, a charming face, somewhat blond hair and beard, and in facility with weapons and combat experience he was unique in everyone's opinion.

William does not exactly copy word-for-word Einhard's physical description of Charlemagne, but he does adopt the descriptive framework, using the same grammatical structures and categories.[36] William found in Einhard's description a model for royal biography and consequently inserts descriptive vignettes of each of the Frankish rulers of Jerusalem at the start of their reign. These structural elements are so evidently indebted to Einhard that they frequently employ identical or nearly identical phrases. The clearest example is perhaps William's description of Baldwin III, whose love of listening to histories and ancient *res gestae* ("deeds done") echo Charlemagne's interests, while Baldwin's moderation in drink corresponds nearly verbatim to Einhard's description of Charlemagne.[37] In a way, William's approach to Einhard's treatment of Charlemagne mirrors that of Einhard with respect to Suetonius' descriptions of the Roman emperors, both in terms of the piecemeal cribbing to create a patchwork evoking the source material, as well as with regard to the overall cultural and political program inherent in such a strategy.

Yet William is indebted to Einhard for more than structural elements. At the start of his history, William offers a diachronic perspective on the relations between Christians and Muslims

---

[35] WT, 9.5.44–48.

[36] See also the discussion of William's royal portraits and their rhetorical structure (without reference, however, to the Einhardian tradition) in W. Giese, "Stadt- und Herrscherbeschreibungen bei Wilhelm von Tyrus," *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 34 (1978), pp. 381–409, at 398–400.

[37] WT, 16.2.16–18, 16.2.54–57 (=19.2.29–30, the description of King Amaury); Einhard, *Vita Karoli Magni* 24.1–2.

in the Levant, starting with the reign of the Byzantine emperor Heraclius. Specifically, William is concerned with the plight of the Christians living in the East after the Muslim conquests of the seventh century, and quotes two extended passages from Einhard dealing with Charlemagne's diplomatic relations with Caliph Hārūn al-Rashīd. The first passage forms part of Einhard's general treatment of Charlemagne's foreign policy, intended to demonstrate Charlemagne's sphere of influence and the high esteem he enjoyed among foreign rulers.[38] As a result, Einhard describes how even the mighty Hārūn al-Rashīd respected Charlemagne above all other rulers, so that, when Charlemagne's embassy, which he had sent with gifts to the Church of the Holy Sepulcher, pleaded to the caliph that the church be surrendered to Charlemagne's authority, the caliph did so willingly, and even sent back magnificent gifts to Charlemagne (among which, most famously, the elephant 'Abū-l-'Abbās).

William changes the force of Einhard's words by introducing the quote with the claim that Charlemagne's frequent diplomatic relations with Hārūn al-Rashīd were so successful on behalf of the local Christians (whom he calls *plebs Dei*, "people of God"), that "it appeared that they were governed more by Emperor Charles than by the aforementioned ruler [i.e., the caliph]."[39] William shortly afterward subjoins another passage, in which Einhard portrays Charlemagne as a Christian ruler who looks out for the greater Christian oecumene, giving alms not only to the Christians in his own realm but even to those living *trans maria* ("across the seas") in Syria, Egypt, Africa, Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Carthage.[40] Although Einhard's passage occurs in a longer list of Charlemagne's benefactions to the Christian commonwealth,

[38] Einhard, *Vita Karoli Magni* 16.3 in WT, 1.3.21–34.

[39] WT, 1.3.19–21: . . . *ita ut magis sub imperatore Karolo quam sub dicto principe degere viderentur*.

[40] Einhard, *Vita Karoli Magni* 27.1 in WT, 1.3.38–47.

including building churches in Aachen, Ravenna, and Rome, William uses it here to demonstrate Charlemagne's active involvement in the political and religious life of Outremer.

William transforms the thrust of Einhard's passages, which were originally part of a larger narrative intended to showcase the various military, political, and religious achievements of Charles as a Christian emperor, so that they fit into his own argument that the Franks have always had a vested interest in the Christians of Outremer, and particularly that Charlemagne had such political influence that he almost became the *de facto* ruler of Jerusalem—an element that, as we have seen, did not originate with Einhard, but was a later elaboration of Notker Balbulus. In this way William creates a trajectory whereby the Franks' participation in the First Crusade seems a logical and inevitable consequence of the Christians' maltreatment at the hand of the Seljuk Turks in the eleventh century.

Elsewhere, William does not so much quote as paraphrase Einhard. Reflecting on the Byzantine role in the First Crusade, William draws a hostile picture of Alexios Komnenos, claiming that he thwarted the crusaders ("our men," he calls them) at every turn, intending deceit even when bestowing gifts—somewhat predictably, William concludes that the platitude *timeo Danaos et dona ferentis* ("I fear the Greeks, even when they bear gifts") is indeed true.[41] William explains:

> Suspectum enim habens omnium Latinorum generaliter processum, nec eorum vires multiplicari nec dilatari potestatem, ubicumque ministrare poterat impedimentum, patiebatur.[42]
>
> Fearfully regarding the progress of all Latins, he did not permit their strength to grow or their influence to expand, impeding them wherever he could.

[41] WT, 11.6.15. The line is a quotation from Virgil, Aen. 2.49. William again quotes this half-line at 20.2.7–8.

[42] WT, 11.6.15–18.

William's words echo those of Einhard, who offered the following explanation for the diplomatic animosities between Charlemagne and the Byzantine court:

> Erat enim semper Romanis et Graecis Francorum suspecta potentia.[43]
>
> For the might of the Franks had always been feared by the Romans and Greeks.

William subscribes to Einhard's interpretation of the diplomatic struggles between the Byzantines and the Franks, implicitly claiming that the conflict between Byzantines and crusaders goes back to Carolingian times: the Byzantines feared the growing might of the Franks and took affront at their use of the title *imperator* ("emperor") and their claim to be the successors of the Romans. For William's explanation to make sense, however, the Franks of the Levant would have to be considered the cultural and political descendants of the Carolingians—a claim he is all too happy to make, even if, as we will see below, by the time William wrote his history the term *Francus* had evolved to describe a more specific and geographically constrained group of people (roughly equivalent to our modern "French"), so that, for William, those who lived in the Latin East who came from the West or were descended from those who did, were no longer "Franks" but rather "Latins."[44]

Lastly, William borrows from Einhard a key methodological term indicating his *modus operandi* as a historiographer. The phrase *fides oculata* ("reliability of sight") was used by the Carolingian biographer in his prologue to designate his own status as eyewitness to the events he

[43] Einhard, *Vita Karoli Magni* 16.4.

[44] For instance, *regnum Francorum* signifies for William always "the kingdom of the French" rather than that of Jerusalem (e.g., WT, 1.rubr.17, 1.11.1, 1.14.1, 3.6.35, 9.5.8). See section 4 below.

related.[45] Although the phrase has a few earlier attestations and did not originate with Einhard, I would argue that, given the context in which the phrase occurs and the evidence presented thus far, William adopts it from Einhard when he, like Einhard, discusses his authority as an eyewitness in his prologue.[46] Again, when William's account reaches the point where he himself served as an eyewitness or was able to interview those who were, William uses this key term.[47]

In sum, William of Tyre considered Einhard's life of Charlemagne one of his chief models, as shown by William's incorporation of structural components, methodological terminology, and practice of quotation and paraphrase. The fact that, of all the extant authors of the twelfth-century Latin East, Charlemagne is most visibly present in William is not a coincidence, given that those who would benefit most from the cultural memory of Charlemagne were kings. William's close association with the royal court and the patronage he enjoyed would have been a significant factor in his use of Einhard as a model.[48]

---

[45] Einhard, *Vita Karoli Magni* Praef. 2: . . . *quaeque praesens oculata, ut dicunt, fide cognovi* . . .

[46] WT, Prol. 89. For earlier instances of this phrase, see: Tert., *Adv. Marc.*, ed. E. Kroymann, CCSL 1 (Turnhout, 1954), 4.36; Cyprian, *Ad Fortunatum*, ed. R. Weber, CCSL 3 (Turnhout, 1972), 13.3. For more background on the history of the phrase, see the remarks in James of Vitry, *Epistulae*, ed. R.B.C. Huygens (Leiden, 1960), p. 73. The phrase also occurs once in another text used by William, the compilation and translation of three Greek chronicles produced under the direction of Cassiodorus and titled *Historia ecclesiastica tripartita* ("Ecclesiastical history in three parts"). See *Historia ecclesiastica tripartita*, ed. W. Jacob and R. Hanslik, CSEL 71 (Vienna, 1952), 1.10.6.56. For William's use of the text, see Edbury and Rowe 1988, pp. 34–36. Benjamin Kedar has pointed out to me that the phrase also occurs in a twelfth-century descripton of the hospital in Jerusalem by an anonymous author (ca. 1182–1187): B.Z. Kedar, "A twelfth-century description of the Jerusalem hospital," in H. Nicholson (ed.), *The Military Orders*, vol. 2 (Aldershot, 1998), pp. 3–26 (repr. in Kedar 2006, no. X), at 17.

[47] WT, 16.Pref.7–8. See also WT, 1.11.14; 4.11.24; 12.21.43; 13.1.82.

[48] This was true also in Europe; see the remarks in Fentress and Wickham 1992, p. 160.

3. Excursus I: An Antiochene song of Roland

The importance of the Carolingian connection during the First Crusade becomes most evident in Ralph of Caen, who offers in his description of the aftermath of the siege of Tarsus fulsome praise for Baldwin of Boulogne, king of Jerusalem at the time he wrote:

> Nec mirum tot vitae intervallum ornari dotibus, quae a Francorum sceptro lucem ingressa, ab Hierusolimitanorum erat egressura: utque liquidius clarescat, a magno illo rege Carolo genus trahens, super solium David sessurus divinitus trahebatur! Iure igitur ac merito Alexandrum vincebat, cuius illustrabant Carolus ortum, David occasum . . .[49]

> And it is no wonder that his [i.e., Baldwin of Boulogne's] earthly life was adorned with such a wealth of riches, seeing as how it had come into existence under the scepter of the Franks and would leave this existence under the scepter of the Jerusalemites. And, in order that this might be the clearer, deriving his descent from Charlemagne, he was born divinely as one who was to take his seat on David's throne. Rightly and deservedly so did he, whose birth was illuminated by Charlemagne and his death by David, surpass Alexander . . .

In this catalogue of the greatest heroic figures of biblical, classical, and Frankish culture, Charlemagne is the representative of Frankish valor and imperial might. In fact, there is a continuum between the biblical king David and the Frankish king Charlemagne. Unusually, the continuum does not flow chronologically, as one would expect: Frankish culture is superimposed on biblical past, and if Baldwin began his days in Francia as a "second Charlemagne," he would end them in Jerusalem as a "second David."[50] To an extent, therefore, Baldwin had outdone his ancestor Charlemagne: even if, according to some sources, Charlemagne's influence in the Holy Land was so great that its citizens seemed to be under his authority, Baldwin was in fact crowned king of Jerusalem.

[49] RC, 1142–1145.

[50] See the remarks of Edoardo D'Angelo: RC, p. 142.

There are other instances in the *Tancredus* in which Ralph draws on traditions associated with the figure of Charlemagne, not just in order to claim continuity, but to vie with it. He relates that, in the night of June 30, 1097, the forces of Qilij ʾArslān, the Seljuk general who had massacred the forces led by Peter the Hermit at Nicaea the year before, prepared to attack the crusaders on their way to Antioch, lying in ambush near Dorylaeum, an old Roman trading post. The crusader army had, for reasons unknown, divided into two columns, the first being led by Bohemond of Taranto and his Norman contingent. Commanding roughly a third of the crusader army, Bohemond realized that their only chance for survival was to hold out until the remainder caught up. Ralph of Caen, who fittingly treats this battle in epic hexameters, exclaims with the relief Bohemond must have experienced when catching sight of Count Hugh of Vermandois, Robert of Flanders, and Godfrey of Bouillon, who led the main army:

> En iterum viresque novas animosque recentes
> congressusque manus avidas, et cetera ad usum
> congrua bellorum: nova cuncta recentia nostri
> inveniunt, multaque licet iam cede gravati,
> accipiunt acres et reddunt acriter ictus.
> Rollandum dicas Oliveriumque renatos,
> si comitum spectes hunc hasta, hunc ense, furentes.[51]
> Dux Godefridus, homo totus bellique Deique,
> cuius non fervor, non vires, non animosus
> spiritus Hectoreis cessit, sed prefuit armis,
> letus adest: o quas acies, quae pectora ferri,
> quam longum chalybem, lateris munimina levi,
> cernere erat comitata ducem, quis flatus equorum,
> qui fremitus hominum, quae gloria Lotharidarum![52]

> Lo! Again, new strength and fresh spirits, hands hungry for battle, and all other things useful in warfare: our men discover all the newly-transpired events, and even though they have already been beset by much slaughter, they receive fierce blows and return them fiercely. You would say that Roland and Oliver were

[51] Compare *La chanson de Roland*, ed. G.J. Brault, *The song of Roland: an analytical edition*, vol. 2 (University Park, Penn., 1978), ll. 1680–1681: *Ki puis veïst Rollant e Oliver* / *De lur espees e ferir e capler!* ("One could see then Roland and Oliver / Striking and slashing with their swords!")

[52] RC, 918–931.

> reborn, if you saw the raging counts, this one with the spear, that one with the sword. Duke Godfrey is happily present, a man completely devoted to both war and God, whose fire, strength, and brave spirit was not inferior to that of Hector, but excelled him in arms. O, what battle lines, what breastplates, what a long sword, what well-armored left flanks could one see accompanying the duke; what snorting of horses, what growling of men, what glory of the Lotharingians!

Ralph draws on the contemporary vernacular tradition associated with the story of Roland, centering on the massacre in 778 of Charlemagne's rearguard when the army passed over the Pyrenees after an expedition into Spain.[53] The earliest reference to these events occurs in Einhard, who tells us that, among others, one *Hruodlandus Brittannici limitis praefectus* ("Hruodlandus, prefect of the Breton march") was killed in an ambush prepared by the Basques.[54] The story was embellished upon and cast in the form of an Old French *chanson de geste*, probably largely assuming the form we know today as the *Chanson de Roland* ("Song of Roland") by the end of the eleventh century. Certainly, the oldest version—preserved in the Oxford manuscript dating to roughly the first quarter of the twelfth century—breathes the atmosphere of the First Crusade, focusing as it does on Christian Franks pitted against Muslim "Saracens" (who have replaced the Basques in Einhard's account), and given the reference to a relic of the Holy Lance in Joyeuse, Charlemagne's legendary sword.[55] This connection with crusading ideology made the figures of Roland and Oliver meaningful in a history of the First Crusade, while the Battle of Dorylaeum in particular was a relevant episode in which to engage with the tradition of Roland: despite similar situations of a smaller force separated from the main

[53] For another shared element with the *Chanson de Roland*, see Ralph's passage (again in a poetic segment) describing Tancred's reaction upon first entering the *Templum Domini*, wondering if the statue he (supposedly) encountered there represented Apollo (RC, 3636–3645, and see Chapter 2, section 8 above). In the *Chanson de Roland*, the Saracens are depicted as worshipping a trinity comprising Muḥammad, Tervagant, and Apollo.

[54] Einhard, *Vita Karoli Magni* 9.

[55] The dating of the Oxford Roland is notoriously controversial, but the general consensus places it in the first quarter of the twelfth century. See the discussion in I. Short, "Part 1: The Oxford version," in J.J. Duggan, et al. (eds.), *La Chanson de Roland = The Song of Roland: the French corpus*, vol. 1 (Turnhout, 2005), pp. I/19–20. For the relic of the Holy Lance, see *La Chanson de Roland* 183.

army being outnumbered by the enemy, the Christian Franks beat back their foes in a *revanche* of the tragic fate suffered by Roland.

In the first extended poetic segment of the *Tancredus*, the implicit claim is that the leaders of the First Crusade match Roland and Oliver as much as Ralph matches the poet of the *Chanson de Roland*, as part of a strategy by Ralph to appeal to an audience of Norman nobility, who formed the majority of the ruling class in Antioch. From other sources, we know that Norman identity was closely bound up with the song of Roland: the Norman historian William of Malmesbury wrote ca. 1125 that a *cantilena Rollandi* ("song of Roland") was sung to incite the Normans to fight before the Battle of Hastings, while ca. 1160 the Norman poet Wace also claimed that a song of Roland was sung to the Normans before this battle.[56]

4. Contesting Frankish identity

In a moment of personal reminiscence, Peter Tudebode relates how his brother Arvedus Tudebode died after sustaining wounds at the siege of Antioch during the First Crusade:

> In sexta vero feria, similiter preliaverunt per totum diem, occideruntque multos ex nostris. In illo die fuit sauciatus quidam probissimus miles, videlicet nomine Arvedus Tudebovis, quem detulerunt socii eius usque deorsum in civitatem. Ibique fuit vivus in sabbato, et inter nonam et sextam horam migravit a seculo, vivens in Christo. Corpus eius sepelivit quidam sacerdos frater eius ante occidentalem portam beati Petri apostoli, habens maximum timorem sicuti amittendi caput, et omnes alii qui in civitate erant. Omnes legentes et audientes deprecamur ut dent elemosinas et orationes dicant pro anima eius et pro omnium defunctorum animabus qui in Ierosolimitana via mortui fuerunt.[57]

> On Friday, they fought similarly for the entire day, and many of our men fell. On that day was wounded one most valiant knight by the name of Arvedus Tudebodus, whom his companions carried down to the city. There he remained alive until Saturday, when he passed from this world between the ninth and the sixth hour to live in Christ. A priest, who was his brother, buried him in front of the West gate of St. Peter

[56] See D. Douglas, "The 'Song of Roland' and the Norman conquest of England," *French Studies* 14:2 (1960), pp. 99–116.

[57] PT, p. 97.

> the Apostle, although he feared greatly as though he would suffer death by decapitation—and so did all others in the city. I beseech those reading and listening to offer alms and prayer for his soul and for all souls of those who died on the way to Jerusalem.

Peter records the precise location of the burial site, calling on his readers to pray for his soul, and perhaps harbors the hope that others proceeding on the *Ierosolimitana via* ("road to Jerusalem"), will seek out the grave and offer prayers on site. But would such a grave have been marked or identified in some way?

An answer may be found in Ralph of Caen, who relates how the Franks at the siege of Antioch made a surprise sortie against the Turks; because of the frenzied attack and the element of surprise the Franks lost but a few men, among whom Conan of Lamballe, count of Brittany, who was the first to charge at the Turkish army and was killed on February 9, 1098.[58] Some ten years later, when Ralph came to Antioch, his tomb was shown to him:

> Illius michi iuxta pontem in via, longo tempore post, ostensus est tumulus, quantum licuit, ut est gentis pietas, saxo et cruce decoratus.[59]

> His burial mound, next to a bridge on the road, was much later shown to me; it was adorned as well as possible, in accordance with the pious observance of people, with a stone marker and a cross.

What does it mean for an author to mention such a site? In the case of Ralph of Caen, the remark gives his account a degree of veracity: although he cannot claim to have autopsy of the siege of Antioch, he can vouch for the fact that Conan died during this siege, for he has seen his tomb. At the same time, the remark takes the reader out of the narrative, juxtaposing the past with the author's present, enshrining the commemoration of the fallen in a textual monument.

---

[58] On Conan III of Lamballe (dépt. Cotes d'Armor), also known as Conan of Brittany, see C.W. David, *Robert Curthose* (Cambridge, Mass., 1920), p. 222. For other testimonies, see: AA, 2.23, 4.47, 5.46; *ChA*, 50; OV, 54.58.

[59] RC, 1791.

Inasmuch as commemoration of the fallen represents an appropriation of both place and history, there is the potential for dispute and contention, the clearest instance of which can be found in the account of John of Würzburg. He was a German pilgrim who traveled to the Holy Land in ca. 1160, and described in his pilgrim account the festivities surrounding the annual Feast of the Liberation of Jerusalem, during which the capture of Jerusalem by the crusaders on July 15, 1099 was commemorated. On the following day, people would give alms and offer prayers as a way of "commemorating all the faithful who had died, and especially those who died at the siege of the city [of Jerusalem], many of whom are famously said to have been buried near the Golden Gate."[60] On the third day, the entire city of Jerusalem commemorates Godfrey of Bouillon, and large sums of alms are distributed to the poor in the Church of the Holy Sepulcher from the generosity of Godfrey, instituted by him when he was still alive. Commemoration of the fallen, John explains, does not occur in equal measure to all parties, however:

> Verumtamen, quamvis sic ibidem quasi de suo honoretur [Gotefridus], tamen expugnatio civitatis non ei cum Alemannis, non minime in ea expeditione laborantibus et exercitatis, sed solis ascribitur Francis. Unde etiam in detractione nostrae gentis epytaphium illius famosi Wiggeri, per multa forcia facta approbati, quia non poterant eum denegare esse Alemannum, deleverunt et cuiusdam militis de Francia superposuerunt, sicut adhuc a presentibus videri potest. Nam eius sarcophagus extra in angulo quodam inter maiorem aecclesiam et Sancti Iohannis Baptistae capellam adhuc hodie extans apparet, deleto inde nomine suo et apposito alieno. Ad comprobationem et indicium despectus nostrorum virorum et ad commendationem Francorum tale epygramma ad monumentum in latere extra legitur appositum . . .[61]

> However, even though at this occasion Godfrey is recognized as though on his own merits, still the capture of the city is not attributed to him along with the Germans, who expended a considerable amount of effort and exertion during that expedition, but it is solely ascribed to the Franks. For this reason, in order to denigrate our people, they have erased the epitaph of Wigger, a man who proved himself by many a valiant deed, since they could not deny that he was German; instead, they have placed one of a certain knight from Francia on top of it, as can still be seen today. For his tomb is still visible in a corner between the Church of

[60] JW, 1119–1123. For the Golden Gate, see Pringle, *Churches*, vol. 3, no. 293.

[61] JW, 1127–1140. For further discussions of this passage, see most notably Graboïs 1974, pp. 367–376; Murray 1991, p. 71; Minervini 1995, p. 158; Murray 2011, pp. 119–120.

> the Holy Sepulcher and the chapel of Saint John the Baptist, from which his [Wigger's] name had been removed and that of another man placed on it. As proof and evidence of the disdain toward our men and of the commendation of the Franks, the following epigram can be read, located on the side of the monument . . .

John proceeds to quote the following epigram, as well as his own suggestion of what might replace it:

> ANNO MILLENO CENTENO QVO MINVS VNO
> VIRGINIS A PARTV DOMINI QVI CLARVIT ORTV,
> QVINDECIES IVLIO IAM PHEBI LVMINE TACTO
> HIERVSALEM FRANCI CAPIVNT VIRTVTE POTENTI
>
> Contra quod ego:
>
> Non Franci sed Francones, gladio potiores,
> Hierusalem sanctam longo sub tempore captam
> a paganorum solvere iugo variorum:
> Franco, non Francus, Wigger, Gundram, Gotefridus
> dux argumento sunt haec fore cognita vero.

> In the year one thousand, one hundred, minus one since the Virgin gave birth to the Lord who was celebrated for his origins, when July had been touched fifteen times by the light of Phoebus, the Franks capture Jerusalem with valiant might.
>
> In opposition to which I [write]:
>
> Not the Franks but the *Francones*, who are better with the blade, set holy Jerusalem free from the yoke of various pagans, after it had been captive for a long time: as a *Franco*, not a Frank, Wigger, Guntram, and Duke Godfrey are real proof that this is well known.[62]

[62] JW, 1141–1150. See also De Sandoli, no. 76, p. 66. De Sandoli reports (no. 73, p. 63) that on the bronze gate of the basilica of the Holy Sepulcher an additional variant of Fulcher's epigram (although Fulcher is not identified as the source) was inscribed, the third line being entirely different: *VITAE PLVS SACRAE STVDIO QVAE MITIGAT ACRE*. De Sandoli lists three primary and one secondary source as evidence for this: the first is John of Würzburg, and is simply the Wigger passage (i.e., not with the variant that De Sandoli prints here); the second is Ludolf of Suchem/Sudheim (the edition printed in *AOL* that is cited is incorrect, as it does not contain these verses; rather, one should turn to *Ludolphi, rectoris ecclesiæ parochialis in Suchem, De itinere Terræ Sanctæ liber*, ed. F. Deycks (Stuttgart, 1851)), none of whose extant manuscripts have this version, although a printed edition of ca. 1468 and a translation of 1584 present it; the third is Felix Fabri, who does offer this version, but says that he did not see it *in situ* (and presumably got it from an earlier description); the fourth reference is Thomsen's résumé of the evidence, in which he concludes that "Wahrscheinlich ist das überhaupt keine Inschrift, sondern ein aus der Historia Hierosolymitana des Fulchers Carnotensis (I, 30) entlehnter Merkvers, der in zahlreiche Chroniken übergegangen ist." See P. Thomsen, "Die lateinischen und griechischen Inschriften der Stadt Jerusalem und ihrer nächsten Umgebung (Fortsetzung)," *ZDPV* 44:1 (1921), pp. 1–61, at 43–44.

John goes on to explain that even though the first two rulers of Jerusalem—Godfrey of Bouillon and Baldwin of Boulogne—were Germans (not an uproblematic claim, given that, besides duke of Lotharingia, Godfrey was lord of Bouillon and count of Verdun), still the German people receive little recognition for their part in the First Crusade, since they all returned home after helping to liberate Jerusalem. And so, while the city is inhabited by various nationalities, such as Franks, Lotharingians, Normans, Provençals, Spaniards, and Burgundians, there is not a single street that is allotted to Germans. John considers this a missed opportunity, for he reckons that this "outpost of Christianity" (*Christianitatis provincia*) would long ago have extended its borders beyond the Nile to the south and Damascus to the east, if a number of Germans equal to the other nationalities still remained in Outremer.[63]

This passage is highly complex, and it will require some unpacking in order to appreciate its full significance. Firstly, let us begin with the figure of Wigger (alternatively spelled as *Wicher* and *Guicher*). He is known from a variety of other sources, including Baudri of Bourgueil, Robert the Monk, Gilo of Paris, and most importantly Albert of Aachen, who relates that Wigger was renowned for his heroic deeds—specifically slicing in twain an armored Turk and killing a lion.[64] Albert also reports that Wigger died of fever at Jaffa in August 1101, and was buried in the same city.[65] Further traces as to Wigger's identity are provided by Metellus of Tegernsee, who describes him as a Swabian *pauper minister* ("poor ministerial") from the abbey of Fulda.[66]

---

[63] JW, 1151–1167. Compare for a similar sentiment (but here applied to Tancred and Arnulf of Chocques) RC, 3945–3948: *"Si duo preterea misisset Gallica tales Terra viros," iam dudum Gallos habuissent reges Memphys et Babylon*.

[64] For a list of primary sources, see Murray 2000, no. 134, pp. 235–236.

[65] AA, 7.71.

[66] Metellus of Tegernsee, *Expeditio Jerosolimitana*, ed. P.C. Jacobsen (Stuttgart, 1982), pp. 125–126, 128.

Given the very specific information regarding the date of Wigger's death and the location of his burial supplied by Albert of Aachen, some scholars have questioned the accuracy of John of Würzburg's information, while his apparent misidentification of the north chapel of the Holy Sepulcher as that of John the Baptist casts further doubts.[67] Who are we to believe? While it was indeed rare for non-royalty to be buried in the Holy Sepulcher, there is some evidence of knights' burials at this location in the early twelfth century: Rorgus or Rorgius, lord of Haifa, died ca. 1106 and was buried in this church, according to Albert of Aachen, *in stilicidio porticus ecclesie dominici sepulchri* ("in the courtyard of the narthex of the Church of the Holy Sepulcher"), while one of the manuscripts of Raymond of Aguilers' account relates that Galdemar Carpenel was buried *contra morem illius loci ante sanctum Sepulchrum* ("against the custom of that site in front of the Holy Sepulcher").[68]

To complicate matters, the epitaph that John of Würzburg quotes is in fact identical (minus an additional fifth line) to an epigram occurring in the second redaction of Fulcher's history, which serves to date and add emphasis to the Liberation of Jerusalem by the crusaders—a fact hitherto almost entirely unnoticed.[69] Could it be that John's entire anecdote is in fact a literary invention? It would seem unlikely—but a question that is, in the end, unanswerable. Our interest here lies in the act of remembering First Crusade history, and the contestation of the Frankish narrative told in Jerusalem—indeed, the contestation of the very meaning of the word

[67] Pringle, *Churches*, vol. 3, no. 283, p. 16.

[68] For Rorgus/Rorgius of Haifa, see: AA, 10.17; Murray 2000, no. 117, p. 228; on the dating to 1106, rather than 1107 (as Murray has it), see Edgington in AA, p. 735 n. 21. For Galdemar (or Geldemar) Carpenel, see Pringle, *Churches*, vol. 3, no. 283, p. 16; Murray 2000, no. 44, p. 198. The account is not in the Hills' edition of Raymond, but instead to be found in *RHC Occ*, vol. 3, p. 308.

[69] For the epigram, see FC, 1.30.1. The only scholar to identify the epigram as Fulcher's is, to my knowledge, Peter Thomsen (cited above in n. 61). One could raise the possibility that Fulcher copied the epigram from the tomb in question, but this is highly unlikely: there is an earlier version of the epigram in Fulcher's first recension, which he must have adapted significantly for the later redaction, so that we possess evidence of the poem's development by Fulcher that would preclude it simply being copied by him.

"Frank," which John takes in a much more limited and specific sense than earlier writers had done.

Although it is impossible to determine exactly how John's version of the story came about, I would propose the following scenario: by ca. 1160 various oral traditions concerning the heroes of the First Crusade circulated; someone may have pointed out to John the tomb in the Holy Sepulcher, the original epitaph of which had by that point been erased or become illegible (whether or not the historical Wigger had been buried there is not relevant for our purposes). Either John or his guide may then have decided to attach Wigger's name to the tomb.

Fulcher's history had become monumental by the mid-twelfth century, hypostatized into a "fixed" and "official" version of history—a fact one may also witness in a sermon from the same period, which quotes extensively from Fulcher and would have been delivered by the patriarch of Jerusalem during the very same feast of the Liberation of Jerusalem.[70] This Frankish-sanctioned version is contested in literary space by John of Würzburg, who replaces it with a poem of his own.

Let us examine precisely what John is contesting. John first contrasts *Alemanni* with *Franci*, implicitly claiming that Wigger (and presumably, he himself) belongs to the former. In the epigram, however, he juxtaposes *Francones* and *Franci*. Is the motivation to switch from *Alemanni* to *Francones* merely determined by that most pedestrian of factors, *metri causa* ("because of the meter")?[71] Not necessarily, although meter was undoubtedly a consideration. John himself was a cleric from Würzburg, chief city of the region then known as *Franconia* or *Francia Orientalis*. Other sources from the twelfth century inform us that the term *Franco* could

[70] See Chapter 1, section 5.2.

[71] Carlrichard Brühl argues that *Alemannia* was a synonym for *Franconia*, while in the course of the twelfth century it could also be used to refer to Germany in general. See C. Brühl, *Deutschland—Frankreich. Die Geburt zweier Völker*, 2nd ed. (Cologne, 1995), pp. 237–239.

be used to refer to inhabitants of this region—though this would not necessarily preclude them being *Franci* in addition.[72] While Metellus reports that Wigger was a Swabian ministerial from Fulda, John could have been motivated by patriotic sentiments to claim him as a Franconian. For much the same reason Godfrey of Bouillon is also claimed by John to be both *Alemannus* and *Franco*, to the exclusion of being *Francus*. John's intent to claim Godfrey and Baldwin as "German" is, I would suggest, what motivates him to omit the fifth and final line of Fulcher's epigram: John wanted both to claim Godfrey of Bouillon as a German and to claim that the Germans were entirely ignored in the Holy Land; for this reason, it was necessary to leave out Fulcher's final line, since it explicitly mentions Godfrey, bringing him both into connection with the *Franci* evoked earlier and with his new *patria* ("fatherland," i.e., Jerusalem) in the same line.

Still, John may have had cause to complain about French aggrandizement at the cost of German fame. It has been pointed out that William of Malmesbury (deliberately or not) attributed the exploits of Wigger, which included defeating a lion and cutting in twain a mailed Turk, to Godfrey.[73] Due to the greater renown Godfrey came to enjoy by the end of his life as ruler of Jerusalem, it appears that he eclipsed the more obscure members of his retinue, even attracting to himself some of their fame. But although John may have had a point in the specific instance of Wigger, his larger discussion appears to be founded on a fundamental misapprehension of the term *Francus*: evidently, in his understanding, the term designated solely

---

[72] J. Petersohn, *Franken im Mittelalter: Identität und Profil im Spiegel von Bewusstsein und Vorstellung* (Ostfildern, 2008), pp. 89–91.

[73] William of Malmesbury, *Gesta regum Anglorum*, ed. and trans. R.A.B. Mynors, R.M. Thompson, and M. Winterbottom (Oxford, 1998–1999), 1.658–659. See the recent discussion in N. Hodgson, "Lions, tigers, and bears: Encounters with wild animals and bestial imagery in the context of crusading to the Latin East," *Viator* 44:1 (2013), pp. 65–94, at 82–92.

what we would describe as "French," even though Fulcher's epigram implies a much broader sense of the word.[74]

Another twelfth-century source uses the term *Franco* in juxtaposition to *Francus*, and may be relevant to our present discussion. Guibert of Nogent relates a debate he once had with an archbishop of Mainz:

> Audivi anno preterito, dum cum archidiacono quodam Maguntino super sua ipsorum rebellione congrederer, quod regem nostrum cum populo in tantum vilipenderit, ob hoc solum, quia domnum papam Paschalem cum suis principibus grate ubique susceperit, ut eos non modo Francos sed irrisorie Francones vocaverit. Cui inquam: "Si ita eos inertes arbitraris et marcidos ut celeberrimum usque in Oceanum Indicum nomen fede garriendo detorqueas, dic michi ad quos papa Urbanus contra Turcos presidia contracturus divertit: nonne ad Francos? Hi nisi preissent et barbariem undecumque confluentium gentium vivaci industria et impavidis viribus constrinxissent, Teutonicorum vestrorum, quorum ne nomen quidem ibi sonuit, auxilia nulla fuissent."[75]

> Last year, when I was discussing with a certain archdeacon of Mainz his rebellion, I heard that he despised our king and people to such an extent, for no other reason than because he graciously received Lord Pope Paschal along with his chief members of court wherever they went, that he called them not just Franks but, mockingly, *Francones*. I said to him: "If you consider them so weak and effete that you shamefully slander in jest a name celebrated even to the Indian Ocean, tell me to whom Pope Urban turned when he sought to bring together defensive forces against the Turks: was it not the Franks? If they had not preceded and checked with tireless effort and fearless strength the barbarous nations convening from all parts, the auxiliary forces of your Teutons, whose name has not even been heard in those parts, would have been worth nothing.

Guibert goes on to say that for other nations to be called *Franci* is a great compliment:

> Quibus proprium cum sit nomen, quarumcumque nationum homines mutuato, immo prestito ipsorum agnomine honorantur: quos enim Britones, Anglos, Ligures, si bonis eos moribus videamus, non ilico Francos homines appellemus?[76]

> Even though they have their own name, people are honored by the borrowing of—or indeed, by being granted—the name of the Franks: for if we should see Britons, Angles, or Ligurians of good character, would we not immediately call those men Franks?

[74] For the fullest treatment of the use of the term *Francus* and related words of the same stem during the First Crusade, see Bull 1997.

[75] Guibert of Nogent, *Dei gesta per Francos*, ed. R.B.C. Huygens, *CCCM* 127A (Turnhout, 1996), 2.42–55. See also the discussion of this passage in Murray 2011, pp. 107–110.

[76] Guibert of Nogent, *Dei gesta per Francos* 2.74–78 .

Guibert, an abbot of Nogent-sous-Coucy writing in 1108, offers a heavily-revised version of the *Gesta Francorum* narrative that focuses strongly on the contribution of the French Franks to the exploits of the First Crusade. In his discussion with the archbishop of Mainz—a diocese situated in Franconia—the archbishop mocks the *Franci* by calling them *Francones*. Robert Huygens surmises that the pejorative force of the term *Francones* derives from the fact that the Franks are no longer considered a supranational people, but to be regarded on a par with smaller regions, such as Franconia.[77] Both Guibert's passage and that of John of Würzburg demonstrate that during the twelfth century, the precise semantic range of terms such as *Francus* and *Franco* was still in flux, and part of a hotly-contested nexus of developing proto-nationalistic terms of cultural identification. Whereas for Guibert *Francus* is a term that can be used to describe peoples from a wide variety of geographical regions, based less on kinship than on shared values, half a century later the terms *Francus* and *Franco* were considered by John to be mutually exclusive. If, as Matthew Gabriele writes,

> "[a]t the end of the ninth century, being a Frank seems to have meant consciously associating oneself with a larger, European identity and with an idealized memory of Charlemagne's reign,"

by the 1160s, at least for John of Würzburg, this was no longer true.[78]

William of Tyre appears to have been sensitive to the semantic development of the term *Francus* over the course of the twelfth century, given that he exclusively uses the term to mean "French." For him, the *rex Francorum* was never the king of Jerusalem but rather the king of

[77] Guibert of Nogent, *Dei gesta per Francos*, note on 2.47.

[78] Gabriele 2011, p. 23.

France, and the only instances where *Francus* is used in the earlier sense to designate inhabitants of the Latin East, is when he directly quotes an earlier source.[79] Instead, William uses the word *Latinus* or Latin to describe his compatriots. A transition toward this practice may be found in the *Tractatus de locis et statu Sancte Terre Ierosolimitane* ("Treatise concerning the geography and conditions of the Holy Land of Jerusalem"), written ca. 1168–1187, where the author indicates awareness of the term *Franci* but considers *Latini* more appropriate.[80]

5. Marvels in the East: Between Paradise and the court of al-ʿĀḍid

After digressing in his discussion of the siege of Antioch in the years 1097–1098 of the First Crusade, Ralph of Caen berates his own long-windedness, but excuses himself for largely focusing on Tancred to the exclusion of the other leaders of the crusade:

> Horum, ut dixi, via centifida iturum me revocat, ne, dum singulis vagabundus insistam, a cepto tramite devius aberrem. Celebrent suos Normannia, Flandria, Robertos; reliquos duces Occidens reliquus; michi unus Marchisides sufficit, cui non sufficio vel totus. Ignosce, Gallia, scriptoribus dives: iuvat me Antiocheno vacare principi; presente me gesta liberius persolvam debitor creditori. Verumtamen, ne nulla bene meritos silencium meum mercede remuneret, compendiosum quippiam conabor perstringere, quod scriptura posteritas prolixiori valeat stilo explicare.[81]

> The hundred-fold journey of these men recalls me to proceed on my way, and not to go wandering over each and every one of them and so to lose my way by drifting off the path I have set out on. Let Normandy and Flanders celebrate their Roberts; let the rest of the West celebrate the rest of the leaders; the scion of a marquis by himself suffices for me, although I by myself do not suffice for him. Forgive me, Gaul, you

[79] As in a letter of Baldwin I to the church of Bethlehem (WT, 11.12.25 = Mayer, *Urkunden*, vol. 1, no. 40, p. 162) and in a privilege granted to the Venetians before the capture of Tyre (WT, 12.25.100 = Mayer, *Urkunden*, vol. 3, no. 764, p. 1335).

[80] This treatise was written sometime in the years 1168–1187 by a visitor from Europe. See B.Z. Kedar, "The *Tractatus de locis et statu Sancte Terre Ierosolimitane*," in J. France and W.G. Zajac (eds.), *The crusades and their sources: essays presented to Bernard Hamilton* (Aldershot, 1998), pp. 111–133, especially 124: *Quorum primi sunt Franci, qui Latini verius appellantur . . .* See also the more recent discussion in L. Minervini, "La costruzione dell'identità franca nell'Oriente latino nel *Tractatus de locis et statu terre Sancte* (ca. 1170-1186)," in M. Cassarino (ed.), *Lo sguardo sull'altro, lo sguardo dell'altro. L'alterità in testi medievali* (Soveria Mannelli, 2011), pp. 89–103.

[81] RC, 1714–1723.

> who are rich in writers: I have decided to dedicate myself to the prince of Antioch; the deeds he has done in my presence I will out of my own free will repay to him as one who owes a debt.[82] However, to prevent me from rewarding their good service with silence, I will briefly try to go over that which posterity will be able to expand upon with a lengthier pen.

In his enterprise, the poet sees himself chiefly in an Antiochene context: although Tancred was, like Robert of Normandy, a Norman, he is identified here as, above all, a prince of Antioch. Moreover, Ralph leaves it to the West (*Occidens*) to celebrate its heroes, of which he no longer considers him or Tancred to be a part. In this light, Ralph's authorial statement prompts a series of key questions when it comes to the literary output of the Latin East more generally: how do Latin authors view their literary activity in terms of geographically determined constructs of culture? For instance, do they consider themselves part or an extension of European cultural traditions, a component of local, Eastern culture, or something else altogether?

To answer these questions, let us begin by returning to Fulcher's oft-quoted passage with which we began this chapter. The passage, in which Fulcher declares that all those who had come from the West felt themselves at home in the East, has often been interpreted as a piece of propaganda, intended to encourage immigration to a land whose foreign overlords were far outnumbered by their indigenous subjects. Indeed, William of Tyre later informs us that the city of Jerusalem was in dire need of repopulation after its capture in 1099, writing that, after most of the crusaders set out on their return voyage, a mere three hundred knights and two thousand infantry were left to garrison the town.[83] Even in 1116, four years before Fulcher wrote his famous passage, Baldwin I resettled groups of Syrian Christians from Transjordan in

---

[82] Bachrach and Bachrach's (2005, p. 80) rendering of "[t]hrough the present *Gesta* I as a debtor will rather easily pay off my creditor" cannot be justified by the syntax.

[83] WT, 9.19.445. For a more detailed discussion of the number of troops available in the kingdom of Jerusalem, see A.V. Murray, "The origins of the Frankish nobility of the kingdom of Jerusalem, 1100–1118," *Mediterranean Historical Review* 4 (1989), pp. 281–300.

Jerusalem.[84] Some scholars have therefore suggested not taking Fulcher's passage at face value, pointing rather to the idealizing portrait of crusader life in the East as an encouragement to immigration to the Holy Land at a time when prospects were not quite as rosy as Fulcher made them out to be.[85] A particularly strong argument here is the fact that Fulcher places much emphasis on the economic advantages, and especially the newly-acquired lands held by the crusaders.[86] The resulting picture is that of a land of opportunity not all that dissimilar from New World propaganda disseminated in Europe to encourage immigration.

Although a propagandistic aspect may certainly be present, such an interpretation alone does not do justice to the complexity of thought expressed here. A fuller analysis should take into account what the passage means in terms of Fulcher's literary endeavor, his cultural and intellectual program. Verena Epp emphasized the theological significance of the passage, reading it in tandem with similar statements in which the term *Oriens* ("East") appears to extend beyond a mere geographical designation, being sublimated to encompass notions of Paradise.[87] I would extend this line of argument to suggest that this notion informs Fulcher's entire literary and narrative project. This becomes all the clearer when one reads the passage within the context in which it occurs, one of miracles bestowed upon the Franks by God:

---

[84] WT, 11.27. See the discussion in J. Prawer, *Crusader Institutions* (Oxford, 1980), "The Latin Settlement of Jerusalem," pp. 92–93.

[85] Hagenmeyer in FC, pp. 61–62; Giese 1987, p. 94; Epp 1990, p. 138.

[86] See FC, 3.37.3–7: *Hic iam possidet domos proprias et familias quasi iure paterno et hereditario . . . hic potitur vineis, ille vero culturis . . . qui enim illic erant inopes, hic facit eos Deus locupletes. Qui habuerant nummos paucos, hic possident bisantios innumeros, et qui non habuerat villam, hic Deo dante iam possidet urbem . . . nec vult eos penuria Deus adfici, qui eum crucibus suis devoverunt eum sequi . . . vult ergo nos Deus omnes lucrifacere . . .*

[87] See especially Epp 1990, pp. 157–158.

> Noli ergo mirari cum signa vides in caelis, quia nihilominus operatur Deus et in terris. Sicut enim in caelestibus, ita et in terrenis transformat et componit quaecumque et quomodo vult. Quod si mira sunt quae fecerit, mirabilior est qui ea fecit. Considera, quaeso, et mente recogita, quomodo tempore in nostro transvertit Deus Occidentem in Orientem. . . [88]
>
> Do not be amazed when you see portents in the heavens, because God performs them equally on earth. Just as in the heavens, so with earthly matters he transforms and arranges whatever he wishes in whatever way he wishes. But if the things he has created are wondrous, even more wondrous is the one who made them. Consider, I pray, and reflect how in our time God has transformed the West into the East. . .

For Fulcher, the greatest wonder of all is the fact that a disparate army of crusaders was able to build a thriving community in Outremer.[89] Indeed, much as for Raymond of Aguilers, the miracle of the Liberation of Jerusalem required *nova verba, nova cantica* ("new words, new songs").[90] The passage should be read together with earlier expressions of wonder at the varied composition of the crusader army, in which the differing cultural and linguistic backgrounds gave rise to a kind of Babylonic confusion as the expedition set out:

> Sed quis umquam audivit tot tribus linguae in uno exercitu, cum ibi adessent Franci, Flandri, Frisi, Galli, Allobroges, Lotharingi, Alemanni, Baioarii, Normanni, Angli, Scoti, Aquitani, Itali, Daci, Apuli, Iberi, Britones, Graeci, Armeni? Quod si vellet me aliquis Britannus vel Teutonicus interrogare, neutro respondere sapere possem. Sed qui linguis diversi eramus, tamquam fratres sub dilectione Dei et proximi unanimes esse videbamur. . .[91]
>
> But who has ever heard so many linguistic communities in a single army, since there were Franks, Flemish, Frisians, French, Allobrogians, Lotharingians, Alamans, Bavarians, Normans, Angles, Scots, Aquitanians, Italians, Dacians, Apulians, Iberians, Britons, Greeks, Armenians? But if some Briton or Teuton wanted to ask me a question, I would be unable to respond to either of them. But though we were diverse with respect

[88] FC, 3.37.2–3.

[89] This sentiment is expressed already in the Prologue. See FC, Prol. 4: *Quis potest non mirari, quomodo nos, exiguus populus inter tot hostium nostrorum regna, non solum resistere, sed etiam vivere poteramus? Quis audivit unquam talia?*

[90] RA, p. 151.

[91] FC, 1.13.4–5. Compare *Sermo Fulcheri*, p. 163: . . . *paulatim de innumera gente conglobatus est illic exercitus exercituum undique convenientium, ut de linguis plurimis videretis infinitam multitudinem. Quid ergo inde dicemus? "A domino factum est hoc, est mirabile in oculis nostris"* [Ps 118:23; Mt 21:42].

> to language, we seemed to be unanimous and as brothers with respect to our love of God and our neighbor. . .

By an act of God, all of these disparate elements had united as brothers. Yet at this early stage in the expedition, they still lacked the ability to communicate properly with one another. In this light, the later passage, in which the crusaders have achieved mutual intelligibility on both cultural and linguistic levels, can be interpreted as the culmination of the crusader expedition of 1096, a fulfillment of its promise, and a sign of its divine election: after the conquest of Jerusalem and the Liberation of the Holy Sepulcher, the Babylonic confusion rife in the crusader army as a result of their native cultures had given way to mutual understanding as compatriots of a new society.[92]

The ramifications of such a reading for Fulcher's role as historiographer are not insignificant, in that he has become the author of a sanctified history. Precisely how Fulcher manages to combine historiography and sacred geography becomes clear when he describes the Red Sea, writing that it surrounds "Egypt, Numidia, and Ethiopia, which Gihon, the river of Paradise, encircles, which is also the Nile."[93] When his attempts to plumb the question of the course of this river founder, Fulcher exclaims:

> Possum mirari, sed numquam rimari, quomodo vel qualiter fluvius iste Geon, qui de Paradiso cum tribus aliis legitur emanare, ortum suum videatur iterum recuperare, cum ab orientali parte habeat mare Rubrum, et ab occasu, in quo incidit, mare nostrum. Habet enim inter se et Orientem mare Rubrum, in quo Oriente intelligimus esse Paradisum. Quomodo ergo citra mare illud Rubrum resumit ortum suum et quomodo transit illud mare vel non transit, vehementer admiror.[94]

[92] FC, 1.13.4–5; see also the earlier passage in 1.6.9.

[93] FC, 2.57.2. The same identification is made in *HN*, 77.

[94] FC, 2.58.1.

> I can marvel at, but never reveal, how and in what fashion that river Gihon, which, one reads, flows from Paradise with three other rivers, appears to revisit its source again, since it has the Red Sea in the East and the Mediterranean, into which it flows, in the West. For between it and the East it has the Red Sea, and in that East we understand Paradise to be. How then it revisits its source on this side of that Red Sea, and how it traverses that sea or does not, I greatly wonder at.

Fulcher's history lays bare two constructs: that of the West, an earthly realm, and that of the East, a realm that flows into Paradise. If such a construct of the locale in which he was writing could draw in more Franks from the West, so much the better.

Fulcher's notion of the East as coextensive with Paradise was an old concept, occurring in Josephus' identification of the river Gihon with the Nile in the *Jewish Antiquities*,[95] and is also reflected in medieval world maps produced in Europe, tending to represent the Tigris, Euphrates, Gihon (often identified with the Nile), and Phison (frequently identified with the Ganges) flowing from Paradise into Asia.[96] So, for example, the *mappa mundi* ("world map") in the famous *Liber floridus* ("book of flowers"), compiled ca. 1120 by Lambert of St. Omer, represents the Tigris, Euphrates, Nile, and Ganges flowing from Paradise into Asia.[97] Later, as geographical knowledge of the East increased in the West, Paradise began to be cordoned off, separated onto an island, as in the Hereford world map of the thirteenth century.[98]

An allied notion to the earthly paradise is the allegory of Jerusalem as a heavenly city, the most influential and evocative expression of which is found in the book of Revelations, which

[95] Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* 1.1.3, discussing Gn 2:13.

[96] See the recent discussion and collection of plates in P.D.A. Harvey, *Medieval maps of the Holy Land* (London, 2012), especially pp. 10–16. For a discussion of possible uses of maps during the crusades, see Kedar 2006b.

[97] See the facsimile in C. Heitzmann and P. Carmassi, *Der Liber floridus in Wolfenbüttel: eine Prachthandschrift über Himmel und Erde* (Darmstadt, 2013), fol. 69v.

[98] See the useful overview in F. Schmieder, "Paradise islands in the East and West—tradition and meaning in some cartographical places on the medieval rim of the world," in T. Jørgensen and G. Jaritz (eds.), *Isolated islands in medieval nature, culture and mind* (New York, 2011), pp. 3–22.

speaks of a "new Jerusalem, coming down out of heaven from God."[99] The notion, which became a common trope in liturgy, exegesis, and historiography, was used in the context of pilgrimage and crusade to indicate that travel to the earthly Jerusalem can signify a journey to the heavenly city. For instance, a twelfth-century sequence from a liturgy used at the Church of the Holy Sepulcher begins as follows:

> Manu plaudant omnes gentes ad nova miracula
> Vicit lupos truculentos agnus sine macula
> Paganorum nunc est facta humilis superbia
> Quam reflexit virtus Dei ad nostra servicia.
> O nova milicia!
>
> Paucis multa milia sunt devicta.
> Venit hec victoria a Christi potencia benedicta.
> Ecce signum est levatum ab antiqua presignatum
> profecia.
>
> Quisque portat signum crucis dum requirit summi ducis
> loca pia.
> . . .
> Crucifixum adoremus
> per quem demonum videmus
> destructa imperia.
> Adoremus resurgentem iter nobis facientem
> ad regna celestia.[100]

> Let all peoples applaud the new miracles; the lamb without stain has defeated deadly wolves; the pride of the heathens has now been humbled, and been turned to servitude to us by God's virtue. O what novel armed service!
>
> Many thousands have been defeated by few; this victory has come to us blessed by Christ's power. Lo! the sign, foretold by ancient prophecy, has been raised aloft!
>
> Each carries the sign of the cross as he seeks out the holy sites of the highest Ruler . . . Let us worship him who was crucified, through whom we see the empires of demons destroyed. Let us worship him who rises again to make a journey to the kingdom of heaven for us.

[99] Rev 3:12, 21:2. For similar passages, see Heb 12:22; Jn 14:2–3.

[100] "Manu plaudant," ll. 1–11, 20–28.

Drawing a parallel between Christ's ascension to Heaven (*resurgentem iter nobis facientem* / *ad regna celestia*) and the crusaders and pilgrims who travel to the Holy Land (*Quisque portat signum crucis dum requirit summi ducis* / *loca pia*), the journey to Jerusalem becomes a passage to heaven.

Still more explicit is the hymn *Hierusalem, letare* ("Rejoice, Jerusalem"):

> Iherusalem terrestris
> principium celestis
> letare novis festis
> Iherusalem, exulta![101]
>
> Earthly Jerusalem, starting-point of the heavenly [Jerusalem], rejoice in the new celebrations, exult, Jerusalem!

In other words, Jerusalem represents the intersection of the earthly and the heavenly. At the end of the hymn, the capture of Jerusalem is likened to Christ's crucifixion:

> Sexta die suspensus
> sexta fuit defensus
> eius locus immensus.
> Iherusalem, exulta!
>
> Meridies dum splendet,
> Christus in luce pendet,
> ut sic suos emendet.
> Iherusalem, exulta!
>
> Urbs capitur hac ora,
> nulla sit ergo mora,
> nostra sit vox canora,
> Iherusalem, exulta![102]

[101] Ripoll hymn, 22. Compare the similar sentiment in WC, 1.7.8, discussed above in Chapter 3, section 3.

[102] Ripoll hymn, 27–29.

> Crucified on the sixth day, that immense place was defended on the sixth [day]. Exult, Jerusalem! While noon shines forth, Christ hangs [on the cross] in broad daylight, so as to redeem his own. Exult, Jerusalem! On this hour the city was captured, so let there be no delay, let our voice be sonorous, exult, Jerusalem!

The Liberation of Jerusalem is a mirror of Christ's redemption of mankind, so that commemoration of one implies commemoration of the other.

In none of these instances, however, is there an emphasis on the creation of a cultural identity as there was in Fulcher of Chartres. For this, we will have to turn to Antioch. At the end of his first book, Walter the Chancellor paints a picture of joyful celebration of Prince Roger's victory at the Battle of Tall Danith in 1115. As we saw in the previous chapter, Walter constructs a narrative of a people of God in the first book of the *Bella Antiochena*: struck by calamitous events sent by God to reprimand them for their sins, they repent and eventually vanquish their foes on the battlefield. Striking about this narrative arc is the creation of a single *populus Dei* out of various ethnically diverse groups. Both the local, indigenous inhabitants of Antioch (*Syri*) and their Frankish overlords (*dominatores*) suffered a cataclysmic earthquake in 1114. Consequently, Latins, Greeks, Syrians, Armenians, foreigners and pilgrims alike confess their sins, proclaiming in the streets, each in their own tongue (*pro diverso linguarum genere*): "Lord, spare your people!"[103] They flock to the church of St. Peter, where they confess to the Latin patriarch and promise to lead a more virtuous life. "Through his faith, merits, and prayers," concludes Walter, "as well as the humble prayers of the rest of the clergy and other faithful, I believe, the Lord had pity on what remained of His people of Antioch."[104] The unity achieved after the earthquake is crowned in the hymn at the conclusion of the first book: though of various ethnicities, the people strive as one to decorate the streets of Antioch in celebration of the triumphal procession of

[103] WC, 1.2–3.

[104] WC, 1.2.

Roger. Through their combined efforts, the entire city has become so fragrant that "one might very well say that it was an earthly paradise" (*tantus odor funditur, / quod terrestris paradisus / possit dici penitus*).[105] Walter, who does not even so much as mention the First Crusade, has perhaps outdone Fulcher of Chartres in forgetting the Frankish past and creating a narrative of a new, unified people inhabiting an earthly paradise.

Where does this leave William of Tyre? Does he follow Fulcher up the river Gihon into the Garden of Eden? One passage in particular will shed more light on the matter. In book 19, William narrates how Hugh Grenier, lord of Caesarea, and Geoffrey Fulcherii, a Knight Templar, were sent by King Amaury in 1167 on an embassy to the court of the Fāṭimid caliph al-ʿĀḍid in Cairo, to renew an earlier treaty in the face of the advancing threat posed by the Seljuk sultanate, particularly by the commander of their forces, the Ayyubid Shīrkūh (*Siracunus*), uncle of Saladin.[106] He writes:

> Et quoniam singularem et seculis nostris incognitam habet illa principis domus consuetudinem, libet diligenter adnotare que fida relatione eorum, qui ad illum tantum principem sunt ingressi, de statu et magnificentia et inmensitate divitiarum et glorie multiplicitate comperimus: non enim erit minimum profecisse, hec intellexisse diligentius . . . Erant ibi piscine marmoree aquis redundantes limpidioribus, erant avium multimodarum, quas noster non novit orbis, varii garritus, forme incognite et peregrini coloris, figurarum quantum ad nos prodigiosarum, cuique gustus iuxta speciem suam et edulium cuique varietati eorum consanguineum . . . Hic quadrupedum stupenda varietas, qualem pictorum solet manus lasciva depingere, qualem solet poetica licentia mentiri aut sompniantis animus visionibus imaginari nocturnis, qualem Orientis et Austri solent dioceses ministrare, Occidens autem videre nunquam, audire rarius consuevit: videbatur proculdubio quod ex his locis Solinus noster *Polistoris* sui deduxerit historiam.[107]
>
> And since that princely palace has a nature unknown to our world, I decided to make careful observations concerning its magnificent condition, immense wealth, and abundance of glory, all of which I have

[105] WC, 1.7.8.

[106] For Hugh Grenier, see J.L. LaMonte, "The lords of Caesarea in the period of the Crusades," *Speculum* 22:2 (1947), pp. 145–161, esp. 149–151. For a useful summary of the career of Geoffrey Fulcherii, who became proctor and preceptor of the Temple in Jerusalem in 1164, see: J. Burgtorf, *The central convent of Hospitallers and Templars: history, organization, and personnel (1099/1120–1310)* (Leiden, 2008), pp. 533–534.

[107] WT, 19.18.22–36.

> discovered from the reliable testimony of those who visited so great a prince; for it will be quite beneficial to have a careful understanding of these things . . . There were marble pools filled with rather clear water, the various sounds made by manifold birds, unknown to this world, with unknown shapes and exotic color, and designs marvelous to us, each with an appetite in accordance with its species and with food that corresponded to each variety . . . Here there was a stupendous variety of steeds, such as the playful hand of painters is wont to paint, or poetic license conjures up, or the mind of someone asleep is wont to dream up in nocturnal visions, such as the regions of the East and the South are wont to supply, but which the West is not accustomed ever to see, and only rarely to hear about; undoubtedly it seemed that it was from these places that our Solinus drew his history titled *Polyhistor*.

William's distinction between the marvels of the Egyptian court and "our world" signifies that Fulcher's conception of *Oriens* ("East") as permeable to, or indeed coextensive with Paradise has been undone. The *Oriens* William lives in is a qualified one: his compatriots are *Orientales Latini*, ("Latin Easterners") not *Orientales* tout court, while the East that he inhabits is *noster Oriens* ("our East").[108] The "Frankish" East as understood by William is therefore a *tertium quid*: existing in the earthly realm and standing in the Western intellectual tradition, it makes claims to conceptions of empire and cultural superiority drawn from Carolingian models but at the same time has access to more exotic locales. In this sense, William considers himself to be a "new Solinus": like him, William has privileged access to information that is beyond the ken of the West. At the same time, William dispossesses the East of Paradisiacal associations: the distinction is between the world of the West and the Latin East on the one hand, and the world of fable on the other, a world one can but dream of or compose mendacious poetry about—or, perhaps more accurately, where poetry comes to life.

Such an exoticizing conception is not confined to descriptions of the Fāṭimids, for William's portrayal of the Byzantine court bears some striking similarities. In 1171, Amaury

[108] See for this observation R.C. Schwinges, "Regionale Identität und Begegnung der Kulturen der Stadt und 'Kreuzfahrerkönigreich' Jerusalem," in A. Meyer, C. Rendtel, and M. Wittmer-Butsch (eds.), *Päpste, Pilger, Pönitentiarie: Festschrift für Ludwig Schmugge zum 65. Geburtstag* (Tübingen, 2004), pp. 237–251, at 238–239. For instances of *Orientales Latini*, see WT, 12.5.3; 16.29.8 (with slight variation); 17.9.1; 22.6.1; 22.29.25; for *noster Oriens*, see WT, 21.25.1; 22.11.1; 23.prol.10. See also WT, 18.34.6, for use of *nostri . . . Orientales principes*.

journeyed to Constantinople by way of Acre in order to propose plans for another large-scale effort into Egypt, for which he required the support and resources of the Byzantines. As with the embassy to al-ʿĀḍid in 1167, William probably did not accompany Amaury and so relied on second-hand testimony of the wondrous sights at the Byzantine court.[109] He relates in some detail how Amaury was received by the royal attendants and brought, by way of various alleyways "of wondrous variety," to the imperial court. William describes the veils that hung before the consistory, crafted from precious materials with equally precious workmanship, such that, William remarks, Ovid's phrase—used to describe the palace of the Sun when Phaëthon ascends to his father's court to ask for permission to hold the fateful reins of his chariot—that "the workmanship trumped the material" was quite apropos.[110]

The description of the Byzantine court bears a number of striking similarities to that of the Fāṭimid palace. As in Cairo, the Latins were received in Constantinople by attendants, who led them through narrow passageways (*per angiportus* in both passages).[111] Eventually, the Latin king is brought inside and he and the Byzantine emperor appear in a dramatic display, seated side by side on thrones (*apparuit dominus imperator . . . et iuxta eum dominus rex*), much as the

[109] So Edbury and Rowe (1988, p. 55), but contrast the view of Runciman (who does not, however, offer any evidence to support it): S. Runciman, "The visit of King Amalric I to Constantinople in 1171," in B.Z. Kedar, H.E. Mayer, and R.C. Smail (eds.), *Outremer: Studies in the history of the crusading kingdom of Jerusalem presented to Joshua Prawer* (Jerusalem, 1982), pp. 153–158. Although William was sent on an embassy by Amaury to Manuel Komnenos earlier in 1168, William did not go to Constantinople at this time, since Manuel was in Serbia. In 1179–1180, however, William did spend seven months in Constantinople as an ambassador, but this was presumably after he had written his account of the 1171 embassy.

[110] WT, 20.23: *Dependebant ante consistorium velaria materie preciose et operis non inferioris, immo quibus illud Nasonis merito posset aptari: "materiam superabat opus"* [Ov., *Met*. 2.5]. Walter Map, a contemporary of William of Tyre, (d. ca. 1208), also refers to this passage when describing the fabulous palace of the pygmy in the story of King Herla: Walter Map, *De nugis curialium*, ed. M.R. James, rev. C.N.L. Brooke and R.A.B. Mynors (Oxford, 1983), dist. i, c. 11: *mansionem quidem honestam per omnia qualem Naso regiam describit Solis*.

[111] WT, 19.18.11; 20.23.10–11.

caliph appeared when the curtains were drawn back (*apparuit calipha*).[112] Finally, in both passages the association with poetry is made as the true vehicle to express the wonders of the scene.

What can the similarity between these two descriptive vignettes tell us? From the author's perspective, one may conclude that William employed similar descriptive techniques for similar scenes, which tells us something about William's compositional practice as a historiographer, while from the reader's point of view, the shared characteristics strengthen the conception that the Latins were surrounded by fabulous "Others." If, as Ralph Davis suggested, William's history was—particularly in the Old French translation in which it was predominantly read—appreciated in Europe as a collection of tales of Oriental "*chinoiserie*," it was in part due to William's own portrayal of the cultural landscape of the East.[113]

6. Excursus II: Arabic philosophy and Latin intellectual authority

In his character portrait of Amaury, fifth king of Jerusalem and successor to his brother, Baldwin III, William of Tyre remarks that he possessed little of the affable charm of his brother, being instead "taciturn beyond decency and wholly lacking that quality of wit and charm that can soothe the hearts of one's subjects." According to William, he rarely spoke to anyone "unless driven out of necessity or badgered" by someone.[114] When he did speak, however, he enjoyed

[112] WT, 19.18.16; 20.23.24–25.

[113] See Davis 1973, p. 74.

[114] WT, 19.2.38–41.

posing difficult questions and relished in discussing their solution.[115] An example of such a discussion is given later on, when William recounts a conversation between him and Amuary:

> Prudentibus et discretis viris et locorum remotorum peritiam habentibus et externarum consuetudinum tenentibus experientiam libentissime confabulabatur. Memini me semel, ab eo familiariter evocatum dum in castello Tyrensi febricula lenta non multum periculose laboraret, horis quietis et lucido intervallo, sicut interpolatis febribus solet contingere, secretis cum eo multa contulisse et ad quasdam eius questiones, quantum pro tempore occurrebat, adhibuisse solutiones: multum enim nostra collatione recreabatur. Inter quas unam nobis obtulit questionem unde me multum movit interius, tum quia inusitatum erat illud queri, quia nec questione dignum videbatur quod fides universalis edocebat et firmissime tradiderat credendum, tum quia animo graviter vulnus imprimebat si princeps ortodoxus et ortodoxorum filius in re tam certa pateretur scrupulum et in conscientia dubitaret. Quesivit sane si preter doctrinam Salvatoris et sanctorum qui Christum sequuti sunt, de qua non dubitabat, posset ratio inveniri, qua posset probari argumentis evidentibus et necessariis resurrectionem futuram.[116]

> He delighted in conversing with prudent and intelligent men who possessed familiarity with distant places and had experience with foreign customs. I remember once kindly being summoned by him when he suffered—not in any great danger—from a slight fever while he was in Tyre, and having conversed with him in private about many things during the calmer periods when he would have a time of clarity (as is usual with intermittent fevers), and I remember having provided answers to some questions he had—to the extent that time allowed for it—for he was greatly entertained by our conversations. Among them, there was one he posed to me that upset me greatly, both because it was an unusual thing to ask, since it seemed unworthy to ask that which the universal faith teaches and has entrusted as something to be believed most firmly, as well as because it delivered a grave blow to my heart if an orthodox ruler and son of orthodox parents should entertain doubts and hesitation in his heart about a matter that is so certain. Well now, he asked whether it were possible to find a logical proof—apart from the teachings of the Savior and of the saints who followed Christ, about which he had no doubts—of the future resurrection through evident and necessary arguments.

William then relates that, somewhat taken aback by this unusual question, he replied that the doctrine of Christ should be sufficient, as explained in the gospels, as well as the teachings of the apostles and the patriarchs of the Old Testament. This, however, was not exactly the answer that Amaury was looking for. He responds:

> "Hec omnia firmissime teneo, sed rationem quero, qua alicui hec neganti et doctrinam Christi non recipienti futuram resurrectionem et aliam vitam post istam mortem probari possit." Cui ego: "Assumite ergo vobis huius hominis sic affecti personam et temptemus aliquid circa hoc invenire." "Placet," inquit. Tum ego:

[115] WT, 19.2.16–17.

[116] WT, 19.3.8–26.

> "Deum iustum confiteris esse?" Tum ille: "Nichil verius confiteor." Tum ego: "Iusti autem est pro bonis bona, pro malis mala retribuere." Tum ille: "Verum est." "In presenti autem vita non fit istud. Nam et boni quidam in presenti seculo nonnisi molestias patiuntur et adversa, mali vero quidam felicitate gaudent continua, sicut rerum cotidianarum exempla nos edocent." Tum ille: "Certum est." Ego vero processi: "Ergo in alia vita fiet, quia non potest deus non esse iustus retributor. Ergo alia vita erit et huius carnis resurrectio, in qua meruit quis bonum vel malum, in ea debet recipere premium et remunerari." Tum ille: "Placet supra modum et omnem detersisti de corde meo dubietatem."[117]

> "All of these things I hold to most firmly, but I seek a logical proof by means of which it might be possible to prove the future resurrection and life after death to one who denies it and refuses the teachings of Christ." I said to him: "Why don't you take on the role of such a person, so that we may try to find [an answer] regarding this matter." "Agreed," he said. Then I said: "Do you confess that God is just?" He said: "I confess that nothing is more true." Then I said: "It is the mark of a just man to return good for good, and bad for bad." He said: "That is true." "In the present life, however, this does not happen, since some good persons suffer only misery and adversity in this world, while some wicked persons enjoy continuous happiness, as examples from daily life show us." He said: "That is beyond doubt." I continued: "Therefore, this will take place in some other life, since God is unable to not be one who gives just recompense. Therefore, there will be another life; and the resurrection of this body, in which a person has deserved well or ill, in that must one receive reward and recompense." Then he said: "This pleases me exceedingly, and you have wiped away from my heart any doubts."

The passage demonstrates William's consummate rhetorical skill as an author, by casting a mock dialogue within his character description of Amaury. But what does this passage, the manner in which it is framed, and William's decision to include it in his narrative, say about him as an author writing in the Latin East? This fascinating exchange sheds light not only on King Amaury's inquisitive nature, but also on William as an instructor, willing to set aside his initial reaction to appeal to scriptural authority in order to provide rational and necessary proof of the future resurrection in the style of an almost Socratic philosophical dialogue—something he may have picked up at the school of Chartres.[118]

But there are cracks, hints that more is going on here than meets the eye: William is disturbed that an orthodox king should harbor such doubts, implying fears that the king may wander off into heresy, or—even worse—apostasy. There is the emphasis on Amaury as an

[117] WT, 19.3.34–50.

[118] See the brief discussion in M.-D. Chenu, "Nature and Man—the renaissance of the twelfth century," in *Nature, Man, and society in the twelfth century*, tr. J. Taylor and L.K. Little (Chicago, 1968), pp. 1–48, at 14–15.

orthodox king and the nature of his concerns, presented as "unusual" (*inusitatum*), touching as they do on basic tenets of orthodox Christendom—contained in the Credo, no less.[119]

In fact, Amaury's preoccupation with the resurrection of the flesh, as represented by William, touches upon a debate that was current in Islamic theology in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, between the so-called *falāsifa* or philosophers in the classical Greek tradition and *mutakallimūn* or Islamic theologians, as can be witnessed in the work of Ibn Sīnā (Avicenna), who argued for a non-literal interpretation of Qur'ānic passages dealing with the future bodily resurrection, and his refutation by al-Ghazālī (see especially his *Tahāfut al-falāsifa* or "Incoherence of the philosophers"), whose positions were in turn refined and reformulated by Ibn Rushd (Averroës), in the *Tahāfut al-tahāfut* ("Incoherence of the incoherence").[120] The question was also taken up by the Jewish philosopher Maimonides, who, writing from Cairo, sought to defend himself from accusations that he denied the bodily resurrection.[121]

If we are dealing with ideas from the discourses of Arabic philosophy and theology, where could Amaury have picked them up, and what can William's presentation of them tell us? As William described in his character portrait of Amaury immediately preceding the anecdote, Amaury enjoyed conversing with those who possessed knowledge of foreign customs. We may perhaps combine this with the fact that Amaury is known to have associated with an Arabic physician by the name of Abū Sulaymān Dāwūd (who would later be the physician of the leper

[119] *Credo in Spiritum Sanctum, sanctam Ecclesiam catholicam, sanctorum communionem, remissionem peccatorum, carnis resurrectionem, vitam aeternam.*

[120] A good introduction to this debate is I.A. Bello, *The medieval Islamic controversy between philosophy and orthodoxy: ijmā' and ta'wīl in the conflict between al-Ghazālī and Ibn Rushd* (Leiden, 1989), pp. 126–141. Benjamin Kedar made this point briefly (1998, p. 134) and will expand on it in his forthcoming book on the culutre of the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem.

[121] See *Moses Maimonides' Treatise on resurrection*, ed. F. Rosher (Northvale, N.J., 1997).

king Baldwin IV).[122] It is possible, therefore, that this physician was one of the individuals from whom Amaury learned of this philosophical question, which would give an added dimension to an earlier remark of William of Tyre. Earlier, William had observed that it had become customary for the Latin rulers of the Levant to employ non-Latin physicians:

> Nostri enim Orientales principes, maxime id efficientibus mulieribus, spreta nostrorum Latinorum phisica et medendi modo solis Iudeis, Samaritanis, Syris et Sarracenis fidem habentes, eorum cure se subiciunt inprudenter et eis se commendant, phisicarum rationum prorsus ignaris.[123]

> For our Eastern rulers have (particularly at the behest of their wives) spurned the medical knowledge and techniques of our Latins, trusting only Jews, Samaritans, Syrians, and Saracens, foolishly submitting to their care and entrusting themselves to them, even though they are utterly ignorant of the methods of healing.

For William, Arabic medicine was not to be trusted, and undoubtedly he felt the same about Islamic theology and philosophy.[124] William's framing of the anecdote becomes significant: the entire conversation occurred when Amaury was ill. Although we may assume that Amaury had his physicians looking after him, William portrays himself as concerned with the king's spiritual well-being. This explains why William effectively ignores Amaury's entire question and sets up an easily-trounced strawman. For while William's syllogism could be used to argue for an afterlife in which just retribution is rendered, it in no way addresses the specific matter of bodily resurrection. With this vignette, however, William shows himself to be the king's spiritual councillor, and reclaims intellectual and spiritual authority in a move that could be deemed vital

[122] For Abū Sulaymān Dāwūd, see Chapter 1, section 8.1.

[123] WT, 18.34.6; for other instances of non-Frankish physicians being employed by Franks, see WT, 18.34.1; 20.31.27.

[124] One wonders whether William's evident mistrust of Arabic medicine influenced the later Old French continuations of his history, relating that he was poisoned by a physician. For this passage, see *La continuation de Guillaume de Tyr (1184–1197)*, ed. M.R. Morgan (Paris, 1982), p. 51.

to an author concerned with establishing a royal history that contains beneficial and morally sound examples (that is to say, according to Latin Christian morality) for future kings such as Baldwin IV, Amaury's son and William's tutee.

7. Conclusion

Although Fulcher of Chartres may have tried to bring about a process of "forgetting" Frankish identity, other writers in the Crusader States appear more willing to reach back to the cultural traditions of Western Europe, opting for a more integrative approach. For them, the bridge between European and Levantine Frankish culture is formed by the figure of Charlemagne: a figure who had, by the end of the eleventh century, accumulated close associations with the Holy Land in a variety of spheres, by embodying chivalric ideals bound up in holy warfare as presented in *chansons de geste*, but also by virtue of his political aspirations to a Christian empire, as presented by Einhard, in which association with the Holy Land was central in acquiring legitimacy over against the Byzantine Empire. Rorgo Fretellus, on the other hand, appealed to Charlemagne's legacy as a patron of religious institutions, particularly in the relics from the East he was thought to have given them.

Ralph of Caen, Rorgo Fretellus, and William of Tyre all draw on preexisting, post-Carolingian narrative traditions linking Charlemagne to the Holy Land, which they exploit to claim that the Franks in the East possess a cultural pedigree associated with a Carolingian golden age. Ralph of Caen does so with an emphasis on the chivalric aspects, appealing perhaps to Norman nobility in Antioch, while William's royal patronage, instead, may have motivated him to focus more on the political aspects of Charlemagne's relations with the Holy Land. As a

historian, he had a *longue durée* view of history and incorporates passages from Einhard into his work to explain and legitimize Frankish presence in the East.

The extent to which this Frankish presence was commemorated, and the very nature of the term *Francus* becomes a matter of debate in the pilgrim guide of John of Würzburg, who argues that the German contribution to the efforts of the First Crusade continues to be ignored and usurped by the French. This shows that by the mid-twelfth century, commemoration of the First Crusade had assumed a key part in defining cultural identities—both in Europe and in the Latin East.

For Fulcher, the crusaders have, through a divine miracle, settled in a holy land as new citizens with new identities. This East is a realm filled with marvels, and at times even blends into Paradise. For William, there is a clear distinction between the East and the more familiar Latin East, which has close ties with Europe and the European cultural and intellectual tradition. There are still marvels to be had, things bordering on fable and fiction, but they lie outside the Latin East, to be found instead among their more exotic neighbors, for knowledge about whom William presents himself as its mediator.

In relating a philosophical discussion with his former patron and king of Jerusalem, William does much more than relate an anecdote to flesh out a character portrait, but asserts his claim as a Latin intellectual and a religious authority in an environment of competing ideologies, given that his representation of the issues at stake in the debate appears to touch on a topic current in Islamic and Jewish theology and philosophy.

5. Conclusion

In surveying all of the surviving Latin literary evidence together, we have assembled what amounts to the first literary history of the Crusader States in the twelfth-century Levant. We are now in a far better position to judge the extent of the literary output: this includes two sermons, a pilgrim guide, an *inventio* account and various other fragments of monastic literature, a hymn, a short political poem, a lament, and three long biblical and historical poems. Above all, there are historiographical works, ranging from abbreviated histories, to works with lengthy poetic interludes, and a sprawling, comprehensive history of the Holy Land.

Enumerations of what there is inevitably raises the question of what is lacking: it is perhaps striking to note the absence of original theological and philosophical works, especially on matters of dialectic, which was particularly in vogue in Paris at the time, while more practical works such as treatises on *ars dictaminis* (the art of letter composition) and *ars versificationis* (the art of versification)—up-and-coming genres in twelfth-century Europe—might also have been expected. More appropriate to the situation in the Levant, however, might have been religious polemic works, such as those of Peter the Venerable against Jews and Muslims.

An argument *ex silentio* is precarious and almost certainly misleading, however, and given the tumultuous and eventually catastrophic fortunes of the Crusader States, it is perhaps surprising that anything survives at all. The loss of texts must have been amplified by the practicalities involved in writing at the time: the high cost of writing supports meant that, even if texts from the Latin East were brought over to the West, they were likely to be repurposed unless they were of interest to a particular individual or institution, or at least they would be less likely to be copied to ensure their survival. We must account, therefore, for a selection bias. This

selection bias included a demand for narratives from the Latin East, particularly those that treated the First Crusade. The survival of the highly original history of Walter the Chancellor, which deals with a few key events in and around Antioch in the second and early third decades of the twelfth century and may not have been of much interest to a Western audience, is quite possibly the result of its transmission along with the works of Fulcher of Chartres and Raymond of Aguilers, which did treat the First Crusade.

A literary history of the Latin East is of key importance to historians of the crusades: not only does it bring together all of the literary sources, several of which have been largely or entirely ignored, but it drives home the point that these texts are not unbiased witnesses of historical events, but rather rhetorically constructed texts within a specific cultural milieu, composed with the interests in mind of particular institutions and patrons. Drawing up a literary history arranged by genre, moreover, allows one to make certain observations heretofore impossible to make: it enables us to trace the development of genres over time, and to discern how each successive author's agenda informed the use of earlier texts.

In the genre of historiography, Fulcher's history of the First Crusade (and to a lesser extent his continuation in the three decades that followed) proved influential in the Latin East to a degree that has yet to be fully acknowledged by scholarship. His interpretation of the events of the crusade and its participants was retold in at least two abbreviations (Bartolf of Nangis, *Balduini III. Historia Nicaena*), incorporated in William of Tyre's history, quoted in a sermon, and was even inscribed on a tomb of a hero of the First Crusade.

The three poems associated with the priory (later abbey) established at the *Templum Domini* demonstrate a similar degree of coherence, as Geoffrey built on his predecessor Achard's poem, which had made the initial connection between the Maccabees and the Latin kingdom of

Jerusalem in a panoramic view of the biblical history of the Temple, thus allowing Geoffrey to take for granted the connection between the Maccabees and the *Templum Domini* to provide a lengthy poem combining the canonical books of the Maccabees, following it with a versification of Josephus' *Jewish War*, a subject that had only briefly been touched upon by Achard. The three poems thus represent a coherent poetic program promoting the central religious and political importance of the *Templum Domini* within Frankish Jerusalem.

Having outlined the extent of the literary output of the Latin East, the question looming over the second half of our study was: how did Latin literary works use and appropriate preexisting materials and develop strategies of their own to construct a Frankish cultural identity of the Levant? What do the literary and rhetorical strategies employed in these texts tell us about Frankish culture of the Latin East in the twelfth century? We began in chapters two and three by exploring how the possibilities of Latin literature, along with its classical and biblical associations, were utilized by authors to fashion a Frankish identity of the Levant.

In assessing the classical texts available to authors we may not have dispelled the persistent notion of the Latin East as an intellectual backwater—the fact remains that there were no centers of higher education such as there were in the West or in the Muslim world—but we have provided positive evidence for an interest in reading, teaching, and copying classical literary and rhetorical texts. Even apart from the evidence of library holdings, the manifold and complex engagement with the classical tradition in authors such as Ralph of Caen and William of Tyre should give us pause in dismissing their literary aspirations. As classical myth and history alike are employed in valorizing persons and events of recent history, the classical past forms the lens through which the Frankish present is viewed: it provides an intellectual framework and a way for Latin authors to understand their surroundings in the Levant. But it is

also a way to avoid the recent past, and to consign the centuries of both Byzantine and Muslim history in the Levant to a *damnatio memoriae*. This happens in Ralph of Caen, the pilgrim guides of Rorgo Fretellus, the poems of Achard and Geoffrey, and to some extent even in the history of William of Tyre. William especially, who certainly did not ignore the Muslim past and present of the Levant, proves a complicated case: he dedicated an entire history to Muslim rulers of the East, and does include digressions on the history of the Turks and the conflict between Sunni and Shī'a, yet in his geographical *tours de force* of ekphrasis typically elides the Byzantine and Muslim periods intervening between the biblical and classical past and the Frankish present. The overall effect is that the economy of space of the Levant is decidedly in favor of those who claim to be the descendants of the classical traditions used to describe it.

A detailed examination of the classical and biblical motifs reveals that these are not stable, fixed topoi, but dynamic rhetorical strategies open to adaptation to differing political, religious, and institutional exigencies, and even to problematization and destabilization. In tracing the motif of the Roman sack of Jerusalem by Titus and Vespasian, we encounter typological interpretations of the First Crusade, but also an implicit condemnation of external interference by secular and ecclesiastical Frankish authorities with regard to the relics of the Patriarchs in Hebron. Similarly, comparisons with the Maccabees can offer praise to the exploits of the crusaders and the Franks in the Levant, or an implicit criticism of King Baldwin I's failure to live up to Judas Maccabeus' example of protecting the dignity of the Temple.

Biblical imagery was also employed to make more wide-ranging statements about the Franks who lived in the twelfth-century Levant. The most prevalent notion was that of the Franks as a People of God, drawing on ideas that were already circulating during and certainly shortly after the First Crusade, in which the crusaders were conceived of as Israelites led by a new

Moses to the Promised Land, in a new Exodus. By the second decade of the twelfth century, Walter the Chancellor had drawn the comparison to its logical conclusion and depicted the people of Antioch as God's People, as did Fulcher of Chartres with the Franks of Jerusalem. But as the Canons of Nablus demonstrate, this *populus Dei* stretched beyond individual lordships to encompass all of the Crusader States, so that sins committed by the Franks in Antioch were considered to have repercussions for the larger Frankish community. This notion was further adapted by Geoffrey the Abbot in the late 1130s to portray the safekeeping of the *Templum Domini* as vital to the survival of the Franks. William of Tyre expanded the chronological constraints of the *populus Dei*, no longer associating it exclusively with the crusader army and its descendants, but including also the local Christians of Palestine, at least as far back as the age of Charlemagne.

This brought us to the fourth and final chapter, where we explored how authors viewed themselves and their literary activity in relation to the West, particularly by drawing on the legend and cultural memories of Charlemagne, as well as in relation to various geographical and cultural constructs of "the East." The extensive associations with the Carolingian legacy in Rorgo Fretellus and especially William of Tyre imply, so I argued, a claim to a shared cultural tradition and to an intellectual authority. The idea that Frankish Jerusalem—in some ways a frontier outpost with limited opportunities for intellectual activity—could claim to be a cultural and political capital, may appear ridiculous to modern historians of the Middle Ages, who point instead to such cosmopolitan centers as Palermo, Salerno, Toledo, and Paris (to name a few). One motive for such claims to cultural supremacy may have been to increase the prestige of Outremer so as to render it more attractive to European nobility. For instance, we know that Geoffrey, abbot of the *Templum Domini*, maintained contacts with Europe and sought to promote

his institution, not only within the Latin East, but also in a letter to Count Geoffrey of Anjou. Moreover, during the course of the twelfth century, the throne of Jerusalem, which was in perpetual need of reinforcement with persons, wealth, and supplies, was repeatedly offered to European rulers, among them the French king Louis VII. At the same time, aggrandizement of the Latin East meant a promotion of (largely) Catholic Christians over the Byzantines—who also claimed continuity with the classical and biblical past. Thus, there is a cultural competition within the East, but also with the West, where it represents a bid to be part of the Western intellectual tradition by tapping into the same authorities and sources, but emphasizing those that touch upon the Holy Land.

The most fully-developed strategy in such a bid is that of William of Tyre, who projects an image of himself as a privileged mediator between an exotic and potentially dangerous East and the West. He does so by building on Fulcher, who also laid claim to an intellectual authority of the East by relating the Franks to the biblical and classical past of the Levant. But unlike William, Fulcher had one foot in Paradise and summoned his brethren in the West to join him. Walter the Chancellor similarly saw Antioch (at least for the duration of the first half of his history) as an earthly Paradise, but does not project an outward gaze, appearing only concerned to write the history of a new unified people of Antioch under the spiritual guidance of a Latin patriarch and the secular leadership of a Norman prince. William, who inherits Fulcher's outward gaze, instead integrates the Latin East within the "known world" and within Western frameworks of knowledge and history. This explains William's extensive use of Einhard as a model for royal biography: he fits the kingdom of Jerusalem within a historical arc that extends from Charlemagne to Godfrey of Bouillon. Early instances of such a trajectory are found in Ralph of Caen and later Rorgo Fretellus, but William is the first to conceive of a coherent

intellectual and historiographical project that situates the Latin East as part of the history of the Frankish (or more precisely: Carolingian) West.

A fruitful line of further inquiry might be to study the extent to which the mediations of Fulcher of Chartres and William of Tyre proved successful in the West, and to what degree and in which way their narratives were received and adapted in turn. For instance, an analysis of Walter Map's reworking of episodes of William of Tyre, or that of Matthew Paris and Vincent of Beauvais, may reveal how medieval interests and selection criteria decided what sources are available to us now and shaped the future of crusade studies.

It is worthwhile to return to some of the issues outlined in the introduction to Part II of our study. Does our analysis shed any light on either of the models of cultural integration (Rey) or disintegration (Prawer) outlined? Although we have not set out to describe whether there was in fact any acculturation, the current study places us in a position to make statements regarding cultural attitudes and perceptions. In this, we must largely concur with the observations of the recent studies of Ellenblum and MacEvitt, and conclude that there is no single, overarching model that does justice to the variety of attitudes adopted in even the limited set of sources that survives. Clearly Antioch offered a different cultural setting than Jerusalem in this period, where figures such as Walter the Chancellor and Stephen of Antioch display more of a tendency to interact with Syrian Christians—even if under the aegis of the Latin patriarch, not the Orthodox patriarch, who had been ousted—and to engage with Arabic science and medicine. The danger is—and has been in the past—to consider any one of these sources as typical or representative. William of Tyre especially is often deemed the touchstone of cultural and historical realities in the East, but it is worthwhile to consider to what extent William's intellectual and cultural outlook can really be considered "typical" of the Latin East (if there even is such a thing) at all.

Having spent twenty years of his adult life in the West, he must have been in a disadvantaged position when it came to the absorption of new cultural values. The practicalities alone of acquiring (or possibly re-acquiring) linguistic knowledge of Arabic, Greek (let alone Turkic) at age 35 must have been complicated. Still, a detailed study of William of Tyre's use of Sa'īd ibn Baṭrīq/Eutychius' chronicle has yet to appear, and may reveal more about William's acquaintance with Eastern Christian sources and knowledge of Arabic.

I propose for the Latin literature of Outremer a decentralized model, in which authors subscribe to more or less common notions, such as that of the Franks as *populus Dei*, or incorporate motifs and comparisons, such as those involving Titus and Vespasian or the Maccabees, but each within a setting and rhetorical situation specific to the author. For example, the canons of Hebron express criticisms of the Latins who had looted the site of their church, while the local Frankish lord is depicted as purely interested in treasure rather than the hallowed remains of the Patriarchs. Thus, while they proclaim that the Latins have incurred divine favor and have been elected before all others (Jews and Muslims) who had held the site before them, the limits of this Latin exceptionalism are much more confined than one might imagine, chiefly designating the community of canons of Hebron rather than the larger Latin oecumene of Outremer.

To conclude, a study of cultural self-fashioning adds an entirely new line of inquiry to a field in which it continues to be common practice to privilege a positivistically-inclined reading of the sources, leading to a neglect of certain sources less useful for an analysis based upon these grounds. My approach instead favors recognition of the sources as valuable cultural witnesses in and of themselves: their value lies in what they can tell us about cultural perceptions, not necessarily if they accord with modern understandings of "historical truth."

Since this study is concerned with rhetorical strategies and cultural identity, the conclusions drawn here will be relevant beyond the immediate field of crusade studies, to the study of medieval literature and culture more generally. Given that the majority of the authors of the texts under discussion came from Europe to settle in the Levant, those aspects of Western culture that they brought with them and chose to highlight in defining their own cultural identity tell us as much about cultural pretensions of the Frankish Levant as they do about Western culture: evidently these particular aspects were considered crucial in allying oneself to or distancing oneself from the West, and were therefore considered representative and unifying elements of Western culture.

I therefore conceive of the current project as facilitating further study of the cultural developments, perceptions, and constructs during the Middle Ages. Promising future lines of enquiry may be found in extending the scope of the current project to incorporate recent work on Latin literature and intellectual culture in the thirteenth-century Levant, and to broaden the linguistic parameters to include vernacular texts. Great leaps are currently being made in the study of Old French in Outremer in particular. Another promising avenue is to compare Frankish culture in the East to similar situations in the Mediterranean, especially Sicily. How do cultural attitudes in the cosmopolitan Sicilian court stack up to those in Jerusalem and Antioch of the same time? Alternatively, a comparative analysis taking into account Byzantine intellectual developments or the courts in Baghdad or Cairo during the twelfth century may offer fruitful results.

Ultimately, what emerges from all of the literary sources of the Latin East is not a single coherent, unified picture of claims to a Latin identity, but rather a kaleidoscopic panoply of partly overlapping notions. What all have in common, however, is the idea that there *is* such a

thing as a Latin cultural identity of the East, even though the manner in which each author articulates and defines this culture differs. The implications for what is at stake in these Latin writings are significant: for in them, we are confronted with competing cultural paradigms, with different notions of what it means to be writing Latin literature in the Crusader States during the twelfth century.

Appendix: list of manuscripts cited

Achard of Arrouaise, *Super Templo Salomonis*.

Besançon, Bibl. mun., MS 187 (second half 12th c.)

Braunschweig, Stadtbibl., Fragment (24) (mid-12th c.)

Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS 603 (late 12th, early 13th c.)

Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Laud. misc. 406 (late 12th, early 13th c.)

Rome, BAV, MS Reg. lat. 150 (late 12th c.)

Albert of Tarsus.

Lugent Sion et Iudaea

Zwettl, Bibl. des Stiftes MS 262, f. 2r (13th c.)

Plange, Syon, et Iudea

Salzburg, St. Peter, MS a. IX 20 (13th c.)

Balduini III Historia Nicaena vel Antiochena necnon Ierosolymitana.

Paris, BnF, MS fr. 9077, ff. 180–205 (18th c.)

Paris, BnF, MS fr. 9080, ff. 254–257 (18th c.)

Bartolf of Nangis (?), *Gesta Francorum expugnantium Iherusalem*.

Cologne, Historisches Archiv, MS W 35, 24r–76r (12th / 13th c.)

Copenhagen, MS 2159 (13th c.)

Douai, Bibl. mun., MS 838 (12th c.)

London, British Library, MS Stowe 56 (12th c.)

Montpellier, Faculté de Médecine, MS H. 139 (14th c.)

Munich, Universitätsbibl., MS 2° 672, ff. 262r–302v (15th c.)

Munich, Universitätsbibl., MS 8° 178 (second half 12th c.)

Saint-Omer, Bibl. mun., MS 8° (12th c.)

St.-Petersburg, Rossijskaja Nacional'naja Biblioteka, MS lat. Q.v.IV.3, ff. 1r-21v (early 12th c.)

Carmina Burana.

Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibl., MS 4660 (1230)

Erfurt Catalogue.

Erfurt, Stadtbücherei, MS Ampl. Q. 102 (second half 12th c.)

Fulcher of Chartres, *Historia Hierosolymitana*.

First redaction:

Bern, Burgerbibliothek, MS 261 (12th/13th c.), fol. 4v–91v

Clermont-Ferrand, Bibl. mun., MS 262 (14th c.), fol. 2r–71r

London, British Museum, MS Addit. 8927 (13th c.), fol. 1r–64r

London, British Museum, MS Kings Library 5 B XV (12th c.), fol. 65r–134v

Paris, Bibl. de l'Arsenal, MS 1102 (late 12th/early 13th c.), fol. 1r–47r

Paris, BnF, MS lat. 14378 (ca. 1137–1146), fol. 5r–113v

Paris, BnF, MS lat. 5131 (12th c.), fol. 1r–109v

Second redaction:

Brussels, Bibl. nat., MS 9823-34 (12th c.), fol. 58r–123r

Cambridge, MS UL Ji. IV.4 (12th c.), fol. 1r–57r

Douai, Bibl. mun., MS 882 (12th c.), fol. 70v–109r

Paris, BnF, MS lat 18415 (12th c.), fol. 56r–93v

Paris, BnF, MS lat. 12945 (13th c.), fol. 65r–112v

Paris, BnF, MS lat. 15038 (late 12th/early 13th c.), fol. 97v–172v

Paris, BnF, MS nouv. acquis. lat. 692 (13th c.), fol. 81r–107v

Geoffrey the Abbot.

Super libris Machabeorum and *De septem libris Iosephi*

Besançon, Bibl. mun., MS 187 (late 12th c.)

Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS 603 (late 12th, early 13th c.)

Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Laud. misc. 406 (late 12th, early 13th c.)

Super libris Machabeorum

Saint-Omer, Bibl. mun., MS 776, f. 65r (late 12th c.)

De septem libris Iosephi

Cambridge, Emmanuel College, MS 1.3.3 (James 56), f. 128r–139v (15th c.)

Carpentras, Bibliothèque municipale (Inguimbertine), MS 168, f. 73v–82v (late 12th c.)

Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland, MS 6121, f. 18r–25r (late 12th c.)

London, British Library, MS Royal 8 F.ix, f. 1v (12th c.)

Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolymitanorum

Berlin, Staatsbibl., MS Lat. 4° 503 (13th c.)

Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College, MS 162/83 (13th/14th c.)

Madrid, Bibl. de El Escorial, MS D.III.ii (late 12th c.)

Madrid, Bibl. Nacional, MS E.e. 103 (9783) (early 14th c.)

Paris, Bibl. de l'Arsenal, MS 1100, f. 1r–33r (1418)

Rome, BAV, MS Reg. lat. 572 (first half 12th c.)

Rome, BAV, MS Reg. lat. 641 (late 12th c.)

Hierusalem, letare

Paris, BnF, MS Lat. 5132 (late 12th c.)

Inventio Patriarcharum I

Brussels, *Collectanea Bollandiana* 162, ff. 53–60 (1671)

Douai, MS 851, f. 93v–103v (shortly after 1200)

Leiden, Universiteitsbibl., MS Voss. lat. 4° 125, ff. 195r–205v 9 (14th c.)

Paris, Sainte-Geneviève, MS 693 (17th c.)

Manu plaudant omnes

London, British Library, Addit. 8927, f. 134r–135r (13th c.)

Pensate, karissimi

Paris, BnF, MS Lat. 5132 (late 12th c.)

Peter Tudebode, *Historia de Hierosolymitano itinere*.

London, British Museum, MS Harley Lat. 3904 (12th c.)

Montpellier, Faculté de Médecine, MS Lat. 142 (13th c.)

Paris, BnF, MS Lat. 4892 (12th c.)

Paris, BnF, MS Lat. 5135 A (12th c.)

Ps.-Fulcher, *Sermo de Ierosolimitana civitate quomodo capta est a Latinis*

Paris, Bibl. Mazarine, MS 1711 (12th c.)

Ralph of Caen, *Tancredus*.

Brussels, Bibl. royale, MS 5369–5373 (first half 12th c.)

Raymond of Aguilers, *Historia Francorum qui ceperunt Iherusalem*

Bern, Burgerbibliothek, MS 261 (12th/13th c.)

Clermont-Ferrand, Bibl. de la Ville, MS lat. 262 (14th c.)

London, British Museum, MS lat. Add. 8927 (13th c.)

Paris, Bibl. de l'Arsenal, MS lat. 1102 (late 12th, early 13th)

Paris, BnF, MS lat. 14378 (1137–1149)

Paris, BnF, MS lat. 5131 (12th c.)

Paris, BnF, MS lat. 5511A (13th c.)

Rorgo Fretellus, *Descripcio cuiusdam de locis sanctis*.

Henri-Sdyck-version

Amiens, Bibl. mun., MS 84 (Fonds L'Escalopier 4961), f. 13r–17r (13th c.)

Berlin, Deutsche Staatsbibl., MS lat. qu. 291, f. 61r–66r (14th c.)

Douai, Bibl. mun., MS 882, ff. 35v–48r (1162–1173)

London, British Library, MS Add. 38112, ff. 121v–123v (1160–1164)

Montpellier, Faculté de Médecine, MS 39, f. 1r–15v (1153–1160)

Paris, Bibl. de l'Arsenal, MS 1100, f. 33v–45r (1418)

Reims, Bibl. mun., MS 1414, f. 54r–63r (late 13th c.)

Rome, BAV, MS Reg. lat. 712, f. 72r–84r (late 12th c.)

Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibl., MS 369, ff. 48r–52r (14th c.)

Count-R.-version

Berlin, Deutsche Staatsbibl., MS lat. f. 198, f. 268r–277r (15th c.)

Berlin, Deutsche Staatsbibl., MS lat. qu. 686, f. 158v–160r (13th c.)

Cambrai, Bibl. mun., MS 360 (341), f. 153v–157r (late 12th c.)

London, British Library, MS Harley 5373, f. 53v–59v (early 13th)

Montpellier, Faculté de Médecine, MS 142, f. 174r–181v (after 1227)

Oxford, Bodl.lib., MS Canonic. Miscellan. 220, f. 26v–30r (14th/15th c.)

Paris, BnF, MS lat. 16331, f. 163v–170v (13th c.)

Paris, BnF, MS lat. 18108, f. 107 (late 12th c.)

Troyes, Bibl. mun., MS 294, f. 157v–163v (12th c.)

Wroclaw, bibl. de l'Université, MS 262, f. 64r–69v (15th c.)

Seneca the Elder, *Excerpta Controversiarum* and Seneca the Younger, *De beneficiis*.

Rome, MS Vat. lat. 2220 (12–13th c.)

Stephen of Antioch

Almagest (translated)

Dresden, Landesbibl., MS Db. 87, ff. 1–71 (13th c.)

Liber Mamonis in Astronomia

Cambrai, Bibl. Mun., MS 930 (first half 12th c.)

Rhetorica ad Herennium (copied)

Milan, Bibl. Ambrosiana, MS E. 7 sup. (first half 12th c.)

Walter the Chancellor, *Bella Antiochena*.

Bern, Burgerbibliothek, MS 261 (12th/13th c.)

Clermont-Ferrand, Bibl. mun., MS 262 (14th c.)

London, British Library, MS Addit. 8927 (13th c.)

Paris, Bibl. de l'Arsenal, MS 1102 (late 12th, early 13th)

Paris, BnF, MS lat. 14378 (1137–1146)

Paris, BnF, MS Reg. lat. 5131 (13th c.)

Rome, BAV, MS Reg. Christ. 547 (14th c.)

William of Tyre, *Historia Hierosolymitana*.

Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 95 (14th c.)

Cambridge, Magdalene College, MS F.4.22 (13th c.)

Chambéry, MS B 3240 (1200)

London, British Library, MS Royal 14 C. X (13th c.)

Montpellier, Bibl. de la Faculté de Médecine, MS 91 (13th c.)

Paris, BnF, MS lat. 17153 (15th c.)

Paris, BnF, MS lat. 17801 (1197–1207)

Paris, BnF, MS lat. 6066 (13th c.)

Rome, BAV, MS lat. 2002 (1200)

Rome, BAV, MS Reg. lat. 690 (13th c.)

Bibliography

1. ABBREVIATIONS

AH = G.M. Dreves, C. Blume, H.M. Bannister (eds.), *Analecta hymnica medii aevi*, 55 vols. (Leipzig, 1886–1922, repr. New York, 1961)

AOL = Archives de l'Orient latin

BHL = Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina

Bongars = Bongars, J. (ed.) *Gesta Dei per Francos* (Hanau, 1611).

Bresc-Bautier = Bresc-Bautier, G. (ed.) *Le cartulaire du chapitre du Saint-Sépulcre de Jérusalem* (Paris, 1984)

CCCM = Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio Mediaevalis

CE = Murray, A.V. (ed.) *The Crusades: an encyclopedia*, 4 vols. (Santa Barbara, Calif., 2006)

CSEL = Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum

De Rozière = De Rozière, E. (ed.) *Cartulaire du Saint-Sépulcre* (Paris, 1849)

De Sandoli = De Sandoli, S. (ed.) *Corpus inscriptionum crucesignatorum Terrae Sanctae (1099-1291): testo, traduzione e annotazioni* (Jerusalem, 1974)

IHC = De Sandoli, S. (ed.), *Itinera Hierosolymitana crucesignatorum (saec. XII-XIII): Textus Latini cum versione Italica*, 3 vols. (Jerusalem, 1978)

Jerusalem pilgrimage = Wilkinson, J., Hill, J., Ryan, W.F. (trs.), *Jerusalem Pilgrimage, 1099–1185* (London, 1988)

Manitius = Manitius, M. *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, 3 vols. (Munich, 1911–31)

Mayer, *Urkunden* = Mayer, H.E. (ed.), *Die Urkunden der lateinischen Könige von Jerusalem, MGH* Diplomata regum Latinorum Hierosolymitanorum (Hannover, 2010)

MGH = Monumenta Germaniae Historica

Peregrinationes = Peregrinationes tres: Saewulf, John of Würzburg, Theodericus, ed. R.B.C. Huygens, *CCCM* 139 (Turnhout, 1994)

PL = Patrologiae cursus completus, series latina

Pringle, *Churches* = Pringle, D. *The churches of the Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem: a corpus*, 4 vols. (Cambridge, 1993–2009)

RHC = Recueil des historiens des croisades

Oc = historiens occidentaux

ROL = Revue de l'Orient Latin

Walther = Walther, H. (ed.), *Initia carminum ac versuum Medii Aevi posterioris Latinorum: alphabetisches Verzeichnis der Versanfänge mittellateinischer Dichtungen*, 2nd ed. (Göttingen, 1969)

ZDPV = Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins

2. Repertories and collections

D'Albon, G. (ed.) *Cartulaire général de l'Ordre du Temple, 1119?–1150* (Paris, 1913).

Delaville Le Roulx, J. (ed.) *Cartulaire général de l'Ordre des Hospitaliers de Saint-Jean de Jérusalem, 1100–1310* (Paris, 1894–1905), 4 vols.

Denzinger, H. (ed.) *Enchiridion symbolorum, definitionum et declarationum de rebus fidei et morum*, 34th ed. (Barcelona, 1965).

Du Méril, E. (ed.) *Poésies populaires latines du Moyen Âge* (Paris, 1847).

Hagenmeyer, H. (ed.) *Epistulae et chartae ad historiam primi belli sacri spectantes. Die Kreuzzugsbriefe aus den Jahren 1088–1100* (Innsbruck, 1901).

Hiestand, R. (ed.) *Papsturkunden für Templer und Johanniter*, vol. 1 (Göttingen, 1972).

———. *Papsturkunden für Kirchen im Heiligen Lande* (Göttingen, 1985).

I libri iurium della Repubblica di Genova, 9 vols. (Rome, 1992–2011).

3. Primary sources

3.1 Latin sources from the Crusader States (including *dubia*)

Achard of Arrouaise, *Super Templo Salomonis* (=AP).

Nova patrum bibliotheca, ed. A. Mai (Rome, 1844), vol. 1, part 2, pp. 213–214.

M. de Vogüé, "Achard d'Arrouaise, poème sur le Templum Domini," *AOL* 1 (1881), pp. 562–579. Repr. *IHC*, vol. 2, pp. 51–61.

W. Brandes, “Bruchstück eines rhythmischen Gedichtes, die Geschichte des Tempels zu Jerusalem betreffend,” *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde* 14 (1889), pp. 424–431.

A.C. Clark, “Poème sur le Temple de Salomon par Achard d’Arrouaise,” *ROL* 12 (1911), pp. 263–275.

P. Lehmann, “Die mittellateinischen Dichtungen der Prioren des Tempels von Jerusalem Acardus und Gaufridus,” in *Corona quernea, Festgabe Karl Strecker zum 80. Geburtstage dargebracht* (Leipzig, 1941), pp. 296–330.

Albert of Tarsus, *Plange, Syon et Iudea* (=AT).

De excidio Hierosolymorum, ed. C. Blume in *AH*, vol. 33, p. 315, no. 265.

Schmuck, A. *Mittellateinische Kreuzlieder: poetische Werbung zum Kreuzzug* (Diss., Universität Würzburg, 1954), pp. 128–131, KL 16.

Spreckelmeyer, G. *Mittellateinische Kreuzzugslieder: Texte und Melodien* (Göppingen, 1987), pp. 20–22.

Szövérffy, J. *Secular Latin lyrics and minor poetic forms of the Middle Ages: a historical survey and literary repertory from the tenth to the late fifteenth century* (Concord, NH, 1994), vol. 3, pp. 92–93.

Lugent Sion et Iudaea

AH, vol. 21, pp. 165–166, no. 236.

Schmuck 1954, p. 131, KL 16a.

Bartolf of Nangis (?), *Gesta Francorum Iherusalem expugnantium* (=BN)

Bongars, vol. 1, pp. 561–593.

RHC Oc 3, pp. 487–543.

Balduini III Historia Nicaena vel Antiochena necnon Ierosolymitana (=*HN*).

Amplissima Collectio, ed. E. Martène, vol. 5 (Paris, 1729), p. 536, repr. in *PL*, vol. 155, cols. 1089–1092.

Balduini III, Hierosolymitani Latinorum regis quarti, Historia Nicaena vel Antiochena necnon Jerosolymitana, ed. P. Riant, *RHC Oc*, vol. 5.1, pp. 139–185.

Epistula presbiteri Iohannis.

Die "Epistola presbiteri Johannis" lateinisch und deutsch: Überlieferung, Textgeschichte, Rezeption und Übertragungen im Mittelalter: mit bisher unedierten Texten, ed. B. Wagner (Tübingen, 2000).

Fulcher of Chartres, *Historia Hierosolymitana* (=FC).

A history of the expedition to Jerusalem, 1095-1127 [by] Fulcher of Chartres, tr. F.R. Ryan (Knoxville, Tn., 1969).

Bongars, vol. 1, pp. 381–440.

Chronicle of the first crusade (Fulcheri Carnotensis Historia hierosolymitana), tr. M.E. McGinty (Philadelphia, 1941).

Historia Hierosolymitana, ed. H. Hagenmeyer (Heidelberg, 1913).

Historiae Francorum Scriptores, ed. A. Duchesne, vol. 4 (Paris, 1641), pp. 816–889.

PL, vol. 155, pp. 821–942.

RHC, ed. H. Wallon, vol. 3 (Paris, 1866), pp. 311–485.

Thesaurus novus anecdotorum, ed. E. Martène and U. Durand, vol. 3 (Paris, 1717).

Ps.-Fulcher, *Sermo domini Fulcheri de Ierosolimitana civitate quomodo capta est a Latinis* (=*Sermo Fulcheri*).

C. Kohler, "Un sermon commémoratif de la prise de Jérusalem par les coisés, attribué a Foucher de Chartres," *Revue de l'Orient latin* 8 (1900–1901), pp. 158–164. Reprinted in *Mélanges pour servir à l'histoire de l'Orient latin et des croisades* (Paris, 1906), vol. 2, pp. 330–340.

Geoffrey, prior and abbot of the *Templum Domini* (=GA).

Super libros Machabeorum, ed. E. Poleg, "On the Books of Maccabees: an unpublished Poem by Geoffrey, Prior of the 'Templum Domini,'" *Crusades* 9 (2010), pp. 13–56 (=GA, Macc).

De septem libris Iosephi, ed. J. Yolles, "Geoffrey, prior of the *Templum Domini*, *On the seven books of Josephus*," *Crusades* 13 (2014), pp. 77–118 (=GA, Ios).

Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolymitanorum (=*GF*).

Anonymi Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolymitanorum, ed. H. Hagenmeyer (Heidelberg, 1890).

Bongars, vol. 1, pp. 1–29.

Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolymitanorum, ed. and tr. R. Hill (London, 1962).

Histoire Anonyme de la première Croisade, ed. L. Bréhier (Paris, 1924).

The deeds of the Franks and other Jerusalem-bound pilgrims: the earliest chronicle of the first crusades, tr. N. Dass (Lanham, Md., 2011).

Tudebodus abbreviatus, ed. P. Le Bas, *RHC Oc*, vol. 3, pp. 121–163.

Hierusalem, letare (=Ripoll hymn).

AH, ed. G.M. Dreves, vol. 45b, pp. 76–78, no. 95.

France, J. "The text of the account of the capture of Jerusalem in the Ripoll manuscript, Bibliothèque Nationale (Latin) 5132," *The English Historical Review* 103:408 (1988), pp. 640–657.

Linder, A. "A new day, new joy: the liberation of Jerusalem on 15 July 1099," in *L'idea di Gerusalemme nella spiritualità cristiana del Medioevo: atti del Convegno internazionale in collaborazione con l'Istituto della Görres-Gesellschaft di Gerusalemme* (Vatican City, 2003), pp. 46–64, at 62–64.

Poésies populaires latines du Moyen Age, ed. E. du Méril, (Paris, 1847), pp. 255–260. Repr. *Ekkehardi Uraugiensies abbatis Hierosolymita*, ed. H. Hagenmeyer (Tübingen, 1877), Beilage IX, pp. 385–387.

Schmuck 1954, pp. 95–99.

Spreckelmeyer, G. *Das Kreuzlied des lateinischen Mittelalters* (Munich, 1974), pp. 204–214.

Spreckelmeyer 1987, pp. 4–6.

Inventio Patriarcharum I (=*Inventio I*).

R.B.C. Huygens, "Inventio Patriarcharum," *Crusades* 4 (2005), pp. 131–155.

B.E. Whalen, "*The Discovery of the Holy Patriarchs*: Relics, ecclesiastical politics and sacred history in twelfth-century crusader Palestine," *Historical Reflections* 27:1 (2001), pp. 139–176.

James of Vitry.

Epistulae, ed. R.B.C. Huygens (Leiden, 1960).

Histoire orientale = Historia orientalis / Jacques de Vitry; introduction, édition critique et traduction, ed. J. Donnadieu (Turnhout, 2008).

John of Würzburg, *Peregrinationes tres: Saewulf, John of Würzburg, Theodericus*, ed. R.B.C. Huygens, *CCCM* 139 (Turnhout, 1994) (=JW).

Les Légendes de l'Hôpital de Saint-Jean de Jérusalem, ed. A. Calvet (Paris, 2000).

Peter Tudebode, *Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere* (=PT).

Historia de Hierosolymitano itinere, ed. H. Wallon and A. Régnier, in *RHC Oc*, vol. 3 (Paris, 1866), pp. 1–117.

Historia de Hierosolymitano itinere, ed. J. Besly in A. Duchesne (ed.), *Historiae Francorum scriptores*, vol. 4 (Paris, 1641), pp. 773–815, repr. in *PL*, vol. 155, cols. 757–822.

Historia de Hierosolymitano itinere, ed. J. Hill and L. Hill (Paris, 1977).

Historia de Hierosolymitano itinere, tr. J. Hill and L. Hill (Philadelphia, 1974).

Ralph of Caen, *Tancredus* (=RC).

Rerum Italicarum Scriptores, ed. L.A. Muratori, vol. 5 (Milan, 1724), pp. 285–333. Repr. in *RHC Oc*, vol. 3 (Paris, 1866), pp. 603–716; *PL*, vol. 155, cols. 489–590.

Tancrède, tr. M. Guizot, *Collection des mémoires relatifs à l'histoire de France*, vol. 23 (Paris, 1825, repr. 2004).

Tancredus, ed. E. D'Angelo, *CCCM* 231 (Turnhout, 2011).

The Gesta Tancredi of Ralph of Caen: a history of the Normans on the First Crusade, tr. B.S. Bachrach and D.S. Bachrach (Farnham, 2005).

Thesaurus novus anecdotorum, ed. E. Martène and U. Durand, vol. 3 (Paris, 1717), pp. 107–210.

Raymond of Aguilers, *Historia Francorum qui ceperunt Iherusalem* (=RA).

Bongars, vol. 1, pp. 139–183.

Histoire des Francs qui ont pris Jérusalem, *Collection des memoires relatif à l'histoire de France*, vol. 21, tr. M. Guizot (Paris, 1824).

J. France, *A critical edition of the* Historia Francorum qui ceperunt Iherusalem *of Raymond of Aguilers* (Diss., Nottingham University, 1967).

Le "Liber" de Raymond d'Aguilers, ed. J.H. Hill and L.L. Hill (Paris, 1969).

Raymond d'Aguilers. Historia Francorum Qui Ceperunt Iherusalem, tr. J.H. Hill and L.L. Hill (Philadelphia, 1968).

RHC Oc, vol. 3 (Paris, 1866), pp. 235–309.

Ripoll Sermon.

France 1988.

Linder 2003.

Rorgo Fretellus, *Descripcio cuiusdam de locis sanctis* (=RF).

Rorgo Fretellus de Nazareth et sa Description de la Terre Sainte: histoire et édition du texte, ed. P.C. Boeren (Amsterdam, 1980).

S. Balluzii Miscellanea historica, ed. J.D. Mansi, vol. 1 (Lucca, 1761), pp. 434–440.

Sortes Regis Amalrici.

Brini Savorelli, M. "Un manuale di geomanzia presentato da Bernardo Silvestre da Tours (XII secolo): l'*Experimentarius*," *Rivista critica di storia della filosofia* 14 (1959), pp. 283–342.

Burnett, C. "What is the *Experimentarius* of Bernardus Silvestris? A Preliminary Survey of the Material," *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge* 44 (1977), pp. 62–108.

Walter the Chancellor, *Bella Antiochena* (=WC).

Bongars, vol. 1, pp. 441–467. Repr. *PL*, vol. 155, pp. 995–1038.

Galterii cancellarii Bella Antiochena, ed. H. Hagenmeyer (Innsbruck, 1896).

Quellenbeiträge zur Geschichte der Kreuzzüge, ed. H. Prutz (Danzigt, 1876), vol. 1, pp. 1–55.

RHC Oc, vol. 5, pp. 75–132.

Walter the Chancellor's the Antiochene Wars, tr. T.S. Asbridge and S.B. Edgington (Brookfield, VT, 1999).

William of Tripoli, *Notitia de Machometo; De statu Sarracenorum / Wilhelm von Tripolis; kommentierte lateinisch-deutsche Textausgabe*, ed. P. Engels (Würzburg, 1992).

William of Tyre, *Historia Hierosolymitana* (=WT).

A history of deeds done beyond the sea, by William, archbishop of Tyre, tr. E.A. Babcock and A.C. Krey (New York, 1943).

Belli Sacri Historia, Libris XXIII comprehensa, de Hierosolyma, ac Terra Promissionis . . . (Basle, 1549).

Bongars, vol 1. Repr. *PL*, vol. 201, cols. 201–892.

Historia belli sacri verissima, lectu et iucunda et utilissima, libris viginti tribus ordine comprehensa . . . (Basle, 1564).

RHC Oc, vol. 1.

Willelmus Tyrensis, Archiepiscopus, Chronicon, ed. R.B.C. Huygens, *CCCM* 63–63A (Turnhout 1986).

3.2 Other primary sources

Accessus ad auctores; Bernard d'Utrecht; Conrad d'Hirsau, ed. R.B.C. Huygens (Leiden, 1970).

Adso of Montier-en-Der, *De ortu et tempore Antichristi*, ed. D. Verhelst, *CCCM* 45 (Turnhout, 1976).

Aelfric of Eynsham, *Aelfric's lives of saints*, ed. W.W. Skeat, 2 vols (London, 1881–1900).

Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana = History of the journey to Jerusalem*, ed. S.B. Edgington (Oxford, 2007).

Ambrose of Milan, *Sancti Ambrosii Opera*, ed. C. Schenkl, CSEL 32.2 (Vienna, 1897).

Annales regni Francorum, ed. F. Krauze, MGH SS Rer. Germ. 6 (Hanover, 1895).

Anselm of Canterbury, *Opera omnia*, ed. F.S. Schmitt (Edinburgh, 1946–1951).

Benedict of Monte Soratte.

Chronicon, ed. G.H. Pertz, MGH SS 3 (Hanover, 1839), pp. 695–719.

Il Chronicon di Benedetto: Monaco di S. Andrea del Soratte e il Libellus de Imperatoria Potestate in urbe Roma, ed. G. Zucchetti (Rome, 1920).

Bernard of Clairvaux, *Liber ad milites Templi sive de laude novae militiae*, ed. J. Leclercq, *Opera*, vol. 3 (Rome, 1963), pp. 213–239.

Bordeaux Pilgrim, ed. P. Geyer and O. Cuntz, *CCSL* 175 (Turnhout, 1965), pp. 1–26.

The Cambridge songs (Carmina cantabrigiensia), ed. J.M. Ziolkowski (New York, 1994, repr. 1998).

Carmina Burana, ed. A. Hilka and O. Schumann, 2 vols. (Heidelberg, 1930).

Chanson d'Antioche, tr. S.B. Edgington and C. Sweetenham (Farnham, 2011).

Charlemagne's survey of the Holy Land: wealth, personnel, and buildings of a Mediterranean church between antiquity and the Middle Ages, ed. and tr. M. McCormick (Washington, D.C., 2011).

Chronica Adefonsi Imperatoris, ed. J.E. Estévez Sola in *Chronica Hispana saeculi XII*, ed. J. Gil and A. Maya, CCCM 71 (Turnhout, 1990).

Cyprian, *Ad Fortunatum*, ed. R. Weber, CCSL 3 (Turnhout, 1972).

Descriptio qualiter Karolus Magnus, ed. G. Rauschen, *Die Legende Karls des Grossen im 11. und 12. Jahrhundert* (Leipzig, 1890), pp. 95–125.

Egeria, *Itinerarium*, ed. A. Franceschini and R. Weber, *CCSL* 175 (Turnhout, 1965), pp. 37–90 and 93–103.

Einhard, *Einhard's Life of Charlemagne: the Latin text*, ed. H.W. Garrod and R.B. Mowat (Oxford, 1915).

Ekkehard of Aura.

Ekkehardi Chronicon Universale, ed. G. Waitz, MGH SS 6 (Hannover, 1844).

Ekkehardi Uraugiensies abbatis Hierosolymita, ed. H. Hagenmeyer (Tübingen, 1877).

Ekkehardi Uruagensis Hierosolymita: De oppressione liberatione ac restauratione Jerosolymitanae Ecclesiae, *RHC Oc*, vol. 5 (Paris, 1895), pp. 1–40.

Elzear Horn, *Ichnographiae monumentorum Terrae Sanctae, 1724–1744*, ed. E. Hoade and B. Bagatti, 2nd ed. (Jerusalem, 1962).

Ermoldus Nigellus, *In honorem Hludowici Caesaris Augusti libri iiii*, ed. E. Faral, *Ermold le Noir: poème sur Louis le Pieux et épitres au roi Pepin*, Les classiques de l'histoire de France au Moyen Âge 14 (Paris, 1964).

Eusebius of Caesarea.

Historia ecclesiastica, trans. J.E.L. Oulton (Loeb Classical Library), 2 vols. (Cambridge, Mass., 1932).

Onomasticon, ed. E. Klostermann, *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte*, vol. 3.2 (Leipzig-Berlin, 1904).

Eutychius, *Kitāb al-tārīḵ al-majmūʿ ʿalā'l-taḥqīq wa'l-taṣdīq* or *Naẓm al-jawhar*.

Annales, ed. L. Cheikho, B. Carra de Vaux, H. Zayyat, Corpus SS Christ. Orientalium, SS Arabici, Ser. 3.7 (Beirut, etc. 1909).

Das Annalenwerk des Eutychios von Alexandrien: ausgewählte Geschichten und Legenden / kompiliert von Sa'id ibn Baṭrīq um 935 A.D., ed. M. Breydey (Louvain, 1985).

Gli annali / Eutichio, patriarca di Alessandria, 877-940, tr. B. Pirone (Cairo, 1987).

Flavius Josephus, *The Latin Josephus*, vol. 1, *The Antiquities: Books I–V*, ed. F. Blatt (Copenhagen, 1958).

Gilo of Paris, *Historia vie Hierosolimitane*, ed. and tr. C.W. Grocock, with J.E. Siberry (New York, 1997).

Gregory of Tours, *Libri historiarum x*, ed. B. Krusch and W. Levison, MGH SS Rer. Merov. 1.1 (Hannover, 1951).

Guibert of Nogent, *Dei gesta per Francos*, ed. R.B.C. Huygens, *CCCM* 127A (Turnhout, 1996).

Guy de Bazoches, *Wido von Bazoches, Ex Guidonis de Bazochiis Chronographie libro septimo*, ed. A. Cartellieri and W. Fricke (Jena, 1910).

Ps.-Hegesippus, *Hegesippi qui dicitur historiae libri quinque* I–II, ed. V. Ussani, CSEL 66 (Vienna, 1932–1960).

Hildebert of Lavardin, *Carmina minora*, ed. A.B. Scott, Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana (Munich, 2001).

Historia ecclesiastica tripartita, ed. W. Jacob and R. Hanslik, CSEL 71 (Vienna, 1952).

Hystoria de via et recuperatione Antiochiae atque Ierusolymarum (olim tudebodus imitatus et continuatus): i Normanni d'Italia alla prima crociata in una cronaca cassinese, ed. E. D'Angelo (Florence, 2009).

Innominatus VI or Ps.-Bede, *Incipit Beda de descripcione eiusdem terre sancte*, ed. W.A. Neumann, "Drei mittelalterlichen Pilgerschriften," *Österreichische Vierteljahresschrift für katholische Theologie* 7 (1868), pp. 397–438.

James of Voragine, *Legenda aurea*, ed. P. Maggioni (Florence, 1998–1999), 2 vols.

Jerome, *Liber locorum*, ed. E. Klostermann, *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte*, vol. 3.2 (Leipzig-Berlin, 1904).

La chanson de Roland, ed. G.J. Brault, *The song of Roland: an analytical edition*, vol. 2 (University Park, Penn., 1978).

La continuation de Guillaume de Tyr (1184–1197), ed. M.R. Morgan (Paris, 1982).

Liber de constitutione, institutione, consecratione, reliquiis ornamentis et privilegiis. Chartes et documents pour servir à l'histoire de l'Abbaye de Charroux, ed. D.P. de Monsabert, *Archives historiques du Poitou* 39 (1910).

Liber historiae Francorum, ed. B. Krusch, MGH SS Rer. Merov. 2 (Hannover, 1888).

Liudprand of Cremona, *Antapodosis*, ed. P. Chiesa, CCCM 156 (Turnhout, 1998).

Ludolf of Sudheim, *Ludolphi, rectoris ecclesiæ parochialis in Suchem, De itinere Terræ Sanctæ liber*, ed. F. Deycks (Stuttgard, 1851).

Matthew of Edessa, *Armenia and the Crusades: tenth to twelfth centuries: the Chronicle of Matthew of Edessa*, tr. A.E. Dostourian (Lanham, MD, 1993).

Matthew Paris, *Matthæi Parisiensis, monachi Sancti Albani, Chronica majora*, ed. H.R. Luard (London, 1872–1883).

Metellus of Tegernsee, *Expeditio Jerosolimitana*, ed. P.C. Jacobsen (Stuttgart, 1982).

Ps.-Methodius, *Apocalypse: Pseudo-Methodius; An Alexandrian world chronicle*, ed. and tr. B. Garstad, Dumbarton Oaks Medieval Library 14 (Cambridge, Mass., 2012).

Moses Maimonides, *Moses Maimonides' Treatise on resurrection*, ed. F. Rosher (Northvale, N.J., 1997).

Notker Balbulus, *Gesta Karoli Magni imperatoris*, ed. H.F. Haefele, MGH SS Rer. Germ. N.S. 12 (Berlin, 1959).

Orderic Vitalis, *Historia ecclesiastica*, ed. M. Chibnall (Oxford, 1969–1980), 4.244.

Otto of Freising, *Chronik, oder, Die Geschichte der zwei Staaten*, tr. A. Schmidt, ed. W. Lammers (Berlin, 1960).

Robert the Monk, *The Historia Iherosolimitana of Robert the Monk*, ed. D. Kempf and M.G. Bull (Woodbridge, 2013).

Ps.-Rufinus, *Flavii Iosephi, patria Hierosolymitani, religione Iudaei, inter Graecos historiographos cum primis facundi, opera quaedam Ruffino presbytero interprete, in quibus post ultimam aliorum aeditionem, loca nec pauca, nec omnino levis momenti ex vetustissimorum codicum collatione restituta* (Basle: Johannes Froben, 1524).

Ruodlieb: con gli epigrammi del Codex latinus monacensis 19486: la formazione e le avventure del primo eroe cortese, ed. R. Gamberini (Firenze, 2003).

Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem*, ed. E. Kroymann, CCSL 1 (Turnhout, 1954).

Thegan, *Vita Hludowici imperatoris*, ed. R. Rau, *Quellen zur karolingische Reichsgeschichte*, vol. 1 (Darmstadt, 1969), pp. 215–253.

Theoderich, *Peregrinatio*, ed. R.B.C. Huygens, *Peregrinationes tres: Saewulf, John of Würzburg, Theodericus*, *CCCM* 139 (Turnhout, 1994).

Ps.-Theodulus, *Theoduli Ecloga*, ed. J. Osternacher (Urfahr, 1902).

Tractatus de locis et statu Sancte Terre Ierosolimitane, ed. B.Z. Kedar, "The *Tractatus de locis et statu Sancte Terre Ierosolimitane*," in J. France and W.G. Zajac (eds.), *The crusades and their sources: essays presented to Bernard Hamilton* (Aldershot, 1998), pp. 111–133.

Usāmah ibn-Munqidh, *Kitāb al-i'tibār.*

An Arab-Syrian gentleman and warrior in the period of the Crusades: memoirs of Usāmah ibn-Munqidh, tr. P.K. Hitti (New York, 1929).

Usama ibn Munqidh: warrior-poet of the age of Crusades, tr. P.M. Cobb (Oxford, 2005).

Usāmah's memoirs, entitled Kitāb al-i'tibār, by Usāmah ibn-Munqidh, ed. P.K. Hitti (Princeton, 1930).

Venantius Fortunatus, *Venanzio Fortunato: Opere*, ed. S. Di Brazzano (Rome, 2001).

Walter Map, *De nugis curialium*, ed. M.R. James, rev. C.N.L. Brooke and R.A.B. Mynors (Oxford, 1983).

Widukind of Corvey, *Res gestae Saxonicae*, ed. D.G. Waitz, MGH SS, vol. 3, pp. 408–467.

William of Malmesbury, *Gesta regum Anglorum*, ed. and trans. R.A.B. Mynors, R.M. Thompson, and M. Winterbottom (Oxford, 1998–1999).

Wipo, *Gesta Chuonradi*, ed. H. Bresslau, MGH SS. rer. Germ. 61 (Hannover/Leipzig, 1915).

4. SECONDARY SOURCES

Aigrain, R. *L'hagiographie. Ses sources, ses méthodes, son histoire* (Paris, 1953).

Ainsworth, P.F. "Contemporary and 'eyewitness' history," in D.M. Deliyannis (ed.), *Historiography in the Middle Ages* (Leiden, 2003), pp. 249–276.

Akbari, S.C. "Erasing the Body: History and memory in medieval siege poetry," in N. Paul and S. Yeager (eds.), *Remembering the Crusades: Myth, image, and identity* (Baltimore, MD, 2012), pp. 146–173.

Albu Hanawalt, E. "Norman views of Eastern Christendom: from the First Crusade to the Principality of Antioch," in V.P. Goss and C.Verzar Bornstein (eds.), *The Meeting of two worlds: cultural exchange between East and West during the period of the Crusades* (Kalamazoo, MI, 1986), pp. 115–121.

———. *The Normans in their histories: propaganda, myth and subversion* (Woodbridge, 2001).

Alphandéry, P. "Les citations bibliques chez les historiens de la premiere croisade," *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 99 (1929), pp. 139–157.

Alphandéry, P., Dupront, A. *La chrétienté et l'idée de croisade* (Paris, 1954).

Andressohn, J.C. *The ancestry and life of Godfrey of Bouillon* (Bloomington, Ind., 1947, repr. 1972).

Asbridge, T.S. *The creation of the principality of Antioch, 1098–1130* (Woodbridge, 2000).

———. "The Holy Lance of Antioch: power, devotion and memory on the First Crusade," *Reading Medieval Studies* 33 (2007), pp. 3–36.

———. *The Crusades: The authoritative history of the war for the Holy Land* (New York, 2010).

Aubé, P. *Godefroy de Bouillon* (Paris, 1985).

Auerbach, E. "'Figura,'" in idem, *Scenes from the drama of European literature* (Minneapolis, MN, 1984), pp. 11–78.

Auffarth, C. *Irdische Wege und himmlischer Lohn: Kreuzzug, Jerusalem und Fegefeuer in religionswissenschaftlicher Perspektive* (Göttingen, 2002).

Balard, M. "Gesta Dei per Francos: L'usage du mot 'Francs' dans les chroniques de la première Croisade," in M. Rouche (ed.), *Clovis - histoire & mémoire. Le baptême de Clovis, son écho à travers l'histoire: Actes du Colloque international d'histoire de Reims* (Paris, 1997), pp. 473–484.

———. *Les Latins en Orient, Xe-XVe siècle* (Paris, 2006).

Baldwin, M.W. "Ecclesiastical developments in the twelfth century Crusaders' State of Tripolis," *The Catholic Historical Review* 22:2 (1936), pp. 149–171.

Barber, M. *The Crusader States* (New Haven, 2012).

Barton, S. "From tyrants to soldiers of Christ: the nobility of twelfth-century León-Castile and the struggle against Islam," *Nottingham Medieval Studies* 44 (2000), pp. 28–48.

Baum, W. *Die Verwandlungen des Mythos vom Reich des Priesterkönigs Johannes: Rom, Byzanz und die Christen des Orients im Mittelalter* (Klagenfurt, 1999).

Beckingham, C.F. and Hamilton, B. (eds.), *Prester John, the Mongols, and the Ten Lost Tribes* (Aldershot, 1996).

Beddie, J.S. "Some Notices of Books in the East in the Period of the Crusades," *Speculum* 8 (1933), pp. 240–242.

Bello, I.A. *The medieval Islamic controversy between philosophy and orthodoxy: ijmā' and ta'wīl in the conflict between al-Ghazālī and Ibn Rushd* (Leiden, 1989).

Berschin, W. “Synkrisis in der mittellateinischen Biographie: Paare von Helden im Vergleich (IV.–XII. Jahrhundert),” *Stuttgarter Arbeiten zur Germanistik* 420 (2004), pp. 182–187.

Bhabha, H. *The location of culture* (London, 1994).

Bitton-Askelony, B. and Kofsky, A. “Monasticism in the Holy Land,” M. Stone, R. Ervine and N. Stone (eds.), *The Armenians in Jerusalem and the Holy Land* (Leuven, 2002), pp. 1–17.

Boehm, L. “Die Gesta Tancredi des Radulf von Caen, Ein Beitrag zur Geschichtsschreibung der Normannen um 1100,” *Historisches Jahrbuch* 75 (1956), pp. 47–72.

Borgolte, M. *Der Gesandtenaustausch der Karolinger mit den Abbasiden und mit den Patriarchen von Jerusalem* (Munich, 1976).

Bradbury, J. “Geoffrey V of Anjou, Count and Knight,” in C. Harper-Bill and R. Harvey (eds.), *The ideals and practice of medieval knighthood III: papers from the fourth Strawberry Hill conference*, 1988 (Woodbridge, 1990), pp. 21–38.

Brandon, S.G.F. *The fall of Jerusalem and the Christian church: a study of the effects of the Jewish overthrow of A.D. 70 on Christianity* (London, 1951).

Brodahl, J. *The Melisende Psalter and ivories (BL Egerton 1139): an inquiry into the status and collecting of medieval art in early nineteenth-century France* (Ph.D. diss., Brown University, 1999).

Brundage, J.A. “Latin jurists in the Levant,” in M. Shatzmiller (ed.), *Crusaders and Muslims in twelfth-century Syria* (Leiden, 1993), pp. 18–31.

Buchthal, H. *Miniature painting in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem* (London, 1957).

Bull, M. “Overlapping and competing identities in the Frankish First Crusade,” in *Le concile de Clermont de 1095 et l’appel à la croisade* (Rome, 1997), pp. 195–211.

———. “The eyewitness accounts of the First Crusade as political scripts,” *Reading Medieval Studies* 36 (2010), pp. 23–37.

———. “Historia Hierosolymitana,” in D. Thomas and B. Roggema (eds.), *Christian-Muslim Relations. A Bibliographical History*, vol. 3 (Leiden, 2011), p. 406.

Burgtorf, J. *The central convent of Hospitallers and Templars: history, organization, and personnel (1099/1120-1310)* (Leiden, 2008).

Burnett, C. “What is the *Experimentarius* of Bernardus Silvestris? A Preliminary Survey of the Material,” *Archives d’histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge* 44 (1977), pp. 62–108.

———. “The *Sortes regis Amalrici*: An Arabic Divinatory Work in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem?,” *Scripta Mediterranea* 19–20 (1998–1999), pp. 229–237.

———. “Antioch as a link between Arabic and Latin culture in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries,” in A. Tihon, I. Draelants, and B. van den Abeele (eds.), *Occident et Proche-Orient: contacts scientifiques au temps des croisades*, (Louvain-la-Neuve, 2000), pp. 1–78. Repr. in *Arabic into Latin in the Middle Ages: The Translators and their Intellectual and Social Context* (Farnham, 2009), no. iv.

———. “Humanism and orientalism in the translations from Arabic into Latin in the Middle Ages,” in A. Speer and L. Wegener (eds.), *Wissen über Grenzen: Arabisches Wissen und lateinisches Mittelalter* (Berlin, 2006), pp. 22–31 (=Burnett 2006a).

———. “Stephen, the disciple of philosophy, and the exchange of medical learning in Antioch,” *Crusades* 5 (2006), pp. 113–129 (=Burnett 2006b).

Busse, H. “Vom Felsendom zum Templum Domini,” in W. Fischer and J. Schneider (eds.), *Das Heilige Land im Mittelalter. Referate des 5. interdisziplinaren Colloquiums des Zentralinstituts für fränkische Landeskunde*. Schriften des Zentralinstituts für Fränkische Landeskunde und Allgemeine Regionalforschung an der Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg 22 (Neustadt an der Aisch, 1982), pp. 19–32.

———. “Die Patriarchengräber in Hebron und der Islam,” *ZDPV* 114:1 (1998), pp. 71–94.

Cabanot, J. “Le trésor des reliques de Saint-Sauveur de Charroux, centre et reflet de la vie spirituelle de l’abbaybe,” *Bulletin de la société des antiquaires de l’Ouest et des musées de Poitiers*, 4th ser., 16 (1981), pp. 103–123.

Cahen, C. “Indigègnes et croisés. Quelques mots à propos d’un médecin d’Amaury et de Saladin,” *Syria* 15 (1934), pp. 351–360.

———. *La Syrie du nord à l'époque des croisades et la principauté franque d'Antioche* (Paris, 1940).

Cantarella, G.M. “La frontiera della crociata: i Normanni del Sud,” in *Il Concilio di Piacenza e le Crociate* (Piacenza, 1996), pp. 225–246.

Carruthers, M. *The book of memory: a study of memory in medieval culture* (Cambridge, 2008).

Castelli, E.A. *Martyrdom and memory: early Christian culture making* (New York, 2004).

Chartrou, J. *L'Anjou de 1109 à 1151: Foulque de Jérusalem et Geoffroi Plantegenêt* (Paris, 1928).

Chenu, M.-D. “Nature and Man—the renaissance of the twelfth century,” in *Nature, Man, and society in the twelfth century*, tr. J. Taylor and L.K. Little (Chicago, 1968).

Ciggaar, K. “Manuscripts as intermediaries. The Crusader States and literary cross-fertilization,” in K. Ciggaar, A. Davids, and H. Teule (eds.), *East and West in the crusader states: context, contacts, confrontations: acta of the congress held at Hernen Castle in May 1993* (Leuven, 1996), pp. 131–151.

———. “Cultural identities in Antioch (969–1268): integration and disintegration—new texts and images,” in M. Borgolte and B. Schneidmüller (eds.), *Hybride Kulturen im mittelalterlichen Europa: Vorträge und Workshops einer internationalen Frühlingsschule* (Berlin, 2010), pp. 105–122.

Classen, P. *Burgundio von Pisa: Richter-Gesandeter-Übersetzer* (Heidelberg, 1974).

———. “*Res gestae*, universal history, apocalypse: visions of past and future,” in R.L. Benson, G. Constable, and C.D. Lanham (eds.), *Renaissance and renewal in the twelfth century* (Oxford, 1982), pp. 387–417.

Claverie, P.-V. “Les difficultés de l’épigraphie franque de Terre sainte aux XIIe et XIIIe siècles,” *Crusades* 12 (2013), pp. 67–89.

Clermont, A., de. *L’Histoire des croisades* (Lyons, 1638).

Cole, P.J. *The preaching of the crusades to the Holy Land, 1095–1270* (Cambridge, MA, 1991).

Crouzet-Pavan, É. *Le mystère des rois de Jérusalem. 1099–1187* (Paris, 2013).

Curtius, E.R. *Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter* (Bern, 1948).

Damian-Grint, P. *The new historians of the twelfth-century Renaissance: inventing vernacular authority* (Woodbridge, 1999).

David, C.W. *Robert Curthose* (Cambridge, Mass., 1920).

Davis, R.H.C. “William of Tyre,” in D. Baker (ed.), *Relations between East and West in the Middle Ages* (Edinburgh, 1973), pp. 64–76.

Dehandschutter, B. “Example and discipleship: some comments on the biblical background of the Early Christian theology of martyrdom,” in J. Den Boeft and M.L. van Poll-van de Lisdonk (eds.), *The impact of scripture in early Christianity* (Leiden, 1999), pp. 20–26.

Derbes, A. “A crusading fresco cycle at the cathedral of Le Puy,” *Art Bulletin* 72 (1991), pp. 561–576.

De Vogüé, M. *Les églises de la Terre Sainte* (Paris, 1860).

Di Cesare, M. *Constructing the image of Muhammad in Europe* (Berlin, 2013).

Dominguez, C. “Lírica y cruzadas en el ámbito hispanomedieval. Una lectura de las cantigas gallego-portuguesas desde la Literatura Comparada,” in J. Casas Rigall and E.M. Díaz

Martínez (eds.), *Iberia Cantat. Estudios sobre poesía hispánica medieval* (Santiago de Compostela, 2002), pp. 153–186.

Donati, M.T. "È ancora verosimile l'attribuzione dell'*Experimentarius* a Bernardo Silvestre?" *Medioevo* 12 (1986), pp. 281–344.

Dondi, C. *The liturgy of the canons regular of the Holy Sepulchre of Jerusalem: a study and a catalogue of the manuscript sources* (Turnhout, 2004).

Douglas, D. "The 'Song of Roland' and the Norman conquest of England," *French Studies* 14:2 (1960), pp. 99–116.

Dunbabin, J. "The Maccabees as exemplars in the tenth and eleventh centuries," in K. Walsh and D. Wood (eds.), *The Bible in the medieval world: essays in memory of Beryl Smalley* (Oxford, 1985), pp. 31–41.

Ebenbauer, A. *Carmen historicum: Untersuchungen zur historischen Dichtung im karolingischen Europa*, vol. 1 (Vienna, 1978).

Eck, T. *Die Kreuzfahrerbistümer Beirut und Sidon im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert auf prosopographischer Grundlage* (Frankfurt am Main, 2000).

Edbury, P.W. "Crusader sources from the Near East (1099-1204)," in M. Whitby (ed.), *Byzantines and crusaders in non-Greek sources, 1025-1204* (Oxford, 2007), pp. 23–38.

———. "The French Translation of William of Tyre's Historia: the Manuscript Tradition," *Crusades* 7 (2007), pp. 61–105.

———. "New Perspectives on the Old French Continuations of William of Tyre," *Crusades* 10 (2010), pp. 107–136.

Edbury, P.W. and Rowe, J.G. "William of Tyre and the Patriarchal Election of 1180," *The English Historical Review* 93:366 (1978), pp. 1–25.

———. *William of Tyre, historian of the Latin East* (Cambridge, 1988).

Edgington, S.B. "Albert of Aachen and the *chansons de geste*," in J. France and J.G. Zajac (eds.), *The crusades and their sources: essays presented to Bernard Hamilton* (Aldershot, 1998), pp. 23–37.

———. "Fulcher of Chartres," in *CE*, vol. 2, pp. 489–490.

———. "Oriental and occidental medicine in the Crusader States," in C. Kostick (ed.), *The Crusades and the Near East: cultural histories* (London, 2011).

———. "Espionage and military intelligence during the First Crusade, 1095–99," in S. John and N. Morton (eds.), *Crusading and warfare in the Middle Ages: realities and representations. Essays in honour of John France* (Farnham, 2014), pp. 75–85.

Elm, K. “La liturgia della Chiesa latina di Gerusalemme nella epoca delle crociate,” in M. Rey-Delqué (ed.), *Le Crociate. L’Oriente e l’Occidente da Urbano II a San Luigi 1096–1270* (Rome, 1997), pp. 243–245.

———. “Nec minori celebritate a catholicis cultoribus observatur et colitur. Zwei Berichte über die 1119/20 erfolgte Auffindung und Erhebung der Gebeine der Patriarchen Abraham, Isaak und Jakob,” *Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte* 94:4 (1997), pp. 318–344.

———. “Die Eroberung Jerusalems im Jahre 1099. Ihre Darstellung, Beurteilung und Deutung in den Quellen zur Geschichte des Ersten Kreuzzugs,” in D. Bauer, K. Herbers, N. Jaspert (eds.), *Jerusalem im Hoch- und Spätmittelalter: Konflikte und Konfliktbewältigung--Vorstellungen und Vergegenwärtigungen* (Frankfurt am Main 2001), pp. 31–54.

———. “‘O beatas idus ac prae ceteris gloriosas!’ Darstelling und Deutung der Eroberung Jerusalems 1099 in den *Gesta Tancredi* des Raoul von Caen,” in G. Thome and J. Holzhausen (eds.), *Es hat sich viel ereignet, Gutes wie Böses: lateinische Geschichtsschreibung der Spät- und Nachantike* (Munich, 2001), pp. 152–178.

Ellspermann, G.L. *The attitude of the early Christian Latin writers toward pagan literature and learning* (PhD diss., Catholic University of America, 1949).

Epp, V. “Die Entstehung eines ‘Nationalbewußtseins’ in den Kreuzfahrerstaaten,” *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 45 (1989), pp. 596–604.

———. *Fulcher von Chartres: Studien zur Geschichtsschreibung des ersten Kreuzzuges* (Düsseldorf, 1990).

———. “‘Miles’ und ‘militia’ bei Fulcher von Chartres,” in *‘Militia Christi’ e crociata nei secoli XI-XIII: atti della undecima Settimana internazionale di studio: Mendola, 28 agosto-1 settembre 1989* (Milan, 1992), pp. 769–784.

———. “Sicht der Antike und Gegenwartsbewußtsein in der mittellateinischen Dichtung des 11./12. Jahrhunderts,” in H.-W. Goetz (ed.), *Hochmittelalterliches Geschichtsbewusstsein im Spiegel nichthistorischer Quellen* (Berlin, 1998), pp. 295–316.

Erdmann, C. “Leonitas,” in *Corona quernea, Festgabe Karl Strecker zum 80. Geburtstage dargebracht* (Leipzig, 1941), pp. 15–28.

Feldbusch, M. *Der Brief Alexanders an Aristoteles über die Wunder Indiens* (Meisenheim am Glan, 1976).

Ferrier, L. “La Couronne refuseé de Godefroy de Bouillon: eschatologie et humiliation de la majesté aux premier temps du royaume latin de Jérusalem,” *Le concile de Clermont de 1095 et l’appel à la Croisade: actes du Colloque universitaire international de Clermont-Ferrand 23–25 juin 1995* (Rome 1997), pp. 245–265.

Fischer, M. “The Books of the Maccabees and the Teutonic Order,” *Crusades* 4 (2005), pp. 59–71.

Fleckenstein, J. “Rittertum zwischen Krieg und Frieden,” in J. Fried (ed.), *Träger und Instrumentarien des Friedens im hohen und späten Mittelalter* (Sigmaringen, 1996), pp. 151–168.

Flori, J. *La guerre sainte: La formation de l’idée de croisade dans l’Occident chrétien* (Paris, 2001).

———. “De l’anonyme normand à Tudebode et aux Gesta Francorum: l’impact de la propagande de Bohémond sur la critique textuelle des sources de la première croisade,” *Revue de l’histoire ecclésiastique* 102 (2007), pp. 717–746.

———. *Chroniqueurs et propagandistes: introduction critique aux sources de la première croisade* (Geneva, 2010).

Fohlen, J. “Un nouveau manuscrit de l’Eglise de Sidon à la Bibliothèque Vaticane (Vat. lat. 2220),” *Scriptorium* 38 (1984), pp. 302–304.

Folda, J. *Crusader manuscript illumination at Saint-Jean d’Acre, 1275–1291* (Princeton, 1976).

———. “Crusader art in the twelfth century: reflections on Christian multiculturalism in the Levant,” *Mediterranean historical review* 10 (1995), pp. 80–91.

———. *The art of the crusaders in the Holy Land, 1098–1187* (New York, 1995).

———. “Commemorating the Fall of Jerusalem: remembering the First Crusade in text, liturgy, and image,” in N. Paul and S. Yeager (eds.), *Remembering the crusades: myth, image, and identity* (Baltimore, MD, 2012), pp. 125–45.

———. “Melisende of Jerusalem: queen and patron of art and architecture in the Crusader Kingdom,” in T. Martin (ed.), *Reassessing the roles of women as ’makers’ of medieval art and architecture* (Leiden, 2012), vol. 1, pp. 429–477.

Foreville, R. “L’école de Caen au XIe siècle et les origines normandes de l’Université d’Oxford,” in *Études médiévales offertes à M. le doyen Augustin Fliche* (Paris, 1952), pp. 81–100.

———. “Un chef de la première croisade: Arnoul Malecouronne,” *Bulletin philologique et historique du Comité des Travaux Historiques et Scientifiques* (1957), pp. 357–374.

Fox, R.L. *Travelling heroes: Greeks and their myths in the epic age of Homer* (London, 2008).

France, J. “An unknown account of the Capture of Jerusalem,” *The English historical review* 87:345 (1972), pp. 771–783.

———. “The election and title of Godfrey of Bouillon,” *Canadian journal of history* 18 (1983), pp. 321–329.

———. “The text of the account of the Capture of Jerusalem in the Ripoll manuscript, Bibliothèque Nationale (Latin) 5132,” *The English historical review* 103:408 (1988), pp. 640–657.

———. “The anonymous ‘Gesta Francorum’ and the ‘Historia Francorum qui ceperunt Iherusalem’ of Raymond of Aguilers and the ‘Historia de Hierosolymitano itinere’ of Peter Tudebode: an analysis of the textual relationship between primary sources for the First Crusade,” in J. France and W.G. Zajac (eds.), *The crusades and their sources. Essays presented to Bernard Hamilton* (Aldershot, 1998), pp. 39–69.

———. “The use of the anonymous *Gesta Francorum* in the early twelfth-century sources for the First Crusade,” in A.V. Murry (ed.), *From Clermont to Jerusalem. The crusades and crusader societies 1095–1500* (Turnhout, 1998), pp. 29–42.

———. “*Gesta Francorum*,” in *EC*, vol. 3, pp. 529–530.

Friedman, Y. “Miracle, meaning, and narrative in the Latin East,” *Studies in church history* 41 (2005), pp. 123–134.

Frolow, A. *La relique de la Vraie Croix: recherches sur le développement d’un culte* (Paris, 1961).

Gabriele, M. “The provenance of the *Descriptio qualiter Karolus Magnus*: remembering the Carolingians in the entourage of King Philip I (1060–1108) before the First Crusade,” *Viator* 39:2 (2008), pp. 93–118.

———. *An empire of memory: the legend of Charlemagne, the Franks, and Jerusalem before the First Crusade* (Oxford, 2011).

Gabriele M., and Stuckey, J. (eds.), *The legend of Charlemagne in the Middle Ages: Power, faith, and crusade* (New York, 2008).

Gaposchkin, M.C. “Louis IX, crusade and the promise of Joshua in the Holy Land,” *Journal of medieval history* 34 (2008), pp. 245–274.

Garrison, M. “The Franks as the New Israel? Education for an identity from Pippin to Charlemagne,” in Y. Hen and M. Innes (eds.), *The uses of the past in the early Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 114–161.

Geary, P. *Furta sacra: thefts of relics in the central Middle Ages* (Princeton, NJ, 1978).

Gerish, D. “The True Cross and the kings of Jerusalem,” *The Haskins Society journal* 8 (1996), pp. 137–155.

———. “Ancestors and predecessors: royal continuity and identity in the first kingdom of Jerusalem,” *Anglo-Norman Studies* 20 (1997), pp. 127–150.

———. *Shaping the crown of gold: constructions of royal identity in the first kingdom of Jerusalem* (PhD diss., University of California, Santa Barbara, 1999).

———. “Remembering kings in Jerusalem: the Second Crusade, the *Historia Nicaena vel Antiochena*, and royal identity,” in J.T. Roche and J.M. Jensen (eds.), *The Second Crusade: holy war on the periphery of Latin Christendom* (forthcoming, May 2015).

Ghellinck, J. de, *L’essor de la littérature latine au XIIe siècle* (Brussels, 1946).

Giese, W. “Stadt- und Herrscherbeschreibungen bei Wilhelm von Tyrus,” *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 34 (1978), pp. 381–409.

———. “Untersuchungen zur Historia Hierosolymitana des Fulcher von Chartres,” *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 69 (1987), pp. 62–115.

Glaesener, H. “Raoul de Caen, historien et écrivain,” *Revue Historique Écclesiastique* 46 (1951), pp. 1–21.

Glauche, G. *Schullektüre im Mittelalter. Entstehung und Wandlungen des Lektürekanons bis 1200 nach den Quellen dargestellt* (Munich, 1970).

Goetz, H.-W. *Geschichtsschreibung und Geschichtsbewusstsein im hohen Mittelalter* (Berlin, 1999).

Goez, W. *Translatio imperii. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Geschichtsdenkens und der politischen Theorien im Mittelalter und in der frühen Neuzeit* (Tübingen, 1958).

Gouguenheim, S. “Les Maccabées, modèles dese guerriers chrétiens des origines au XIIe siècle,” *Cahiers de civilisation médievale. Xe au XIIe siècles* 54 (2011), pp. 3–20.

Graboïs, A. “Charlemagne, Rome and Jerusalem,” *Revue belge de philologie et d’histoire* 59:4 (1981), pp. 792–809.

———. “Anselme, l’Ancien Testament et l’idée de Croisade,” in R. Foreville (ed.), *Les mutations socio-culturelles au tournant des XIe–XIIe siècles. Études Anselmiennes (IVe session)* (Paris, 1984), pp. 163–173.

———. “La fondation de l’abbaye du *Templum Domini* et la légende du Temple de Jérusalem au XIIe siècle,” in M. Balard (ed.), *Autour de la première croisade: actes du Colloque de la Society for the Study of the Crusades and the Latin East, Clermont-Ferrand, 22–25 juin 1995* (Paris, 1996), pp. 231–237.

———. *Le pèlerin occidental en Terre sainte au Moyen Âge* (Paris, 1998).

Green, D.H. *The Millstätter Exodus: a crusading epic* (Cambridge, 1966).

Green, R.P.H. “The genesis of a medieval textbook: the models and sources of the ‘Ecloga Theoduli,’” *Viator* 13 (1982), pp. 49–106.

Grégoire, R. “Esegesi biblica e ‘militia Christi,’” in *Militia Christi’ e crociata nei secoli XI-XIII: atti della undecima Settimana internazionale di studio: Mendola, 28 agosto-1 settembre 1989* (Milan, 1992), pp. 21–45.

Grousset, R. *Histoire des croisades et du royaume latin de Jérusalem*, 3 vols. (Paris, 1934–1936).

Guthe, H. “Die Untersuchung des Patriarchengrabes in Hebron im Jahre 1119,” *ZDPV* 17 (1894), pp. 236–248.

Hahn, J. “The veneration of the Maccabean brothers in fourth century Antioch: religious competition, martyrdom, and innovation,” in Signori 2012, pp. 79–104.

Halbwachs, M. *La topographie légendaire des Évangiles* (Paris, 1941).

Hamilton, B. “Women in the Crusader States: the queens of Jerusalem (1100–1190),” in D. Baker (ed.), *Medieval women: dedicated and presented to Professor Rosalind M. T. Hill on the occasion of her seventieth birthday* (Oxford, 1978), pp. 143–173.

———. *The Latin church in the Crusader States: the secular church* (London, 1980).

———. “Prester John and the Three Kings of Cologne,” in H. Mayr-Harting and R.I. Moore (eds.), *Studies in medieval history presesnted to R.H.C. Davis* (London, 1985), pp. 177–191 (repr. in Beckingham and Hamilton 1996, no. vii).

———. “The Latin church in the Crusader States,” in K. Ciggaar, A. Davids, and H. Teule (eds.), *East and West in the Crusader States Context - Contacts - Confrontations. Acta of the Congress held at Hernen Castle in May 1993* (Leuven, 1996), pp. 1–20.

Hanetseder, E. “Der angebliche Brief Alexanders an Aristoteles über die Wunder Indiens: eine sprachliche Untersuchung der Fassung in der bamberger Handschrift,” *Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi* 52 (1994), pp. 167–200.

Hartl, I. *Das Feindbild der Kreuzzugslyrik: das Aufeinandertreffen von Christen und Muslimen* (Bern, 2009).

Harvey, P.D.A. *Medieval maps of the Holy Land* (London, 2012).

Haskins, C.H. *Studies in the history of mediaeval science* (Cambridge, Mass., 1927).

———. *The renaissance of the twelfth century* (Cambridge, Mass., 1927).

Hebron, M. *The Medieval Siege* (Oxford, 1997).

Heffernan, T.J. *Sacred biography: saints and their biographers in the Middle Ages* (New York and Oxford, 1988, repr. 1992).

Heinzelmann, M. *Translationsberichte und andere Quellen des Reliquienkultes* (Turnhout, 1979).

Heitzmann, C. and Carmassi, P. *Der Liber floridus in Wolfenbüttel: eine Prachthandschrift über Himmel und Erde* (Darmstadt, 2013).

Herren, M.W. "Bavius and Maevius: 'Duo Pessimi Poetae Sui Temporis,'" in S. Echard and G.R. Wieland (eds.), *Anglo-Latin and its Heritage: Essays in Honour of A.G. Rigg on his 64th Birthday* (Turnhout, 2004), pp. 3–15.

Hiestand, R. "Zum Leben und zur Laufbahn Wilhelms von Tyrus," *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 34 (1978), pp. 345–380.

———. "'*Plange, Syon et Iudea*' — Historische Aussage und Verfassersfrage," *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch* 23 (1988), pp. 126–142.

———. "Un centre intellectuel en Syrie du Nord? Notes sur la personnalité d'Aimeri d'Antioche, Albert de Tarse et *Rorgo Fretellus*," *Le Moyen Âge* 101 (1994), pp. 7–36.

———. "*Nam qui fuimus Occidentales, nunc facti sumus Orientales*: Siedlung und Siedleridentität in den Kreuzfahrerstaaten," in C. Dipper and R. Hiestand (eds.), *Siedler-Identität. Neun Fallstudien von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart* (Frankfurt am Main, 1995), pp. 61–80.

———. "Der lateinische Klerus der Kreuzfahrerstaaten: geographische Herkunft und politische Rolle," in H.E. Mayer and Elisabeth Müller-Luckner (eds.), *Die Kreuzfahrerstaaten als multikulturelle Gesellschaft: Einwanderer und Minderheiten im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert* (Munich, 1997), pp. 43–68.

———. "Ein unbekanntes Privileg Fürst Bohemunds II. von Antiochia für das Hospital vom März 1127 und die Frühgeschichte der antiochenischen Fürstenkanzlei," *Archiv für Diplomatik* 43 (1997), pp. 27–46.

———. "Ein Zimmer mit Blick auf das Meer," in K. Ciggaar and H. Teule (eds.), *East and West in the Crusader States: Context – Contacts – Confrontations* (Leuven, 2003), vol. 3, pp. 139–164.

———. "Gaufridus abbas Templi Domini: an underestimated figure in the early history of the kingdom of Jerusalem," in P. Edbury and J. Phillips (eds.), *The experience of crusading*, vol. 1 (Cambridge, 2003), pp. 48–59.

Hirschfeld, Y. "The monasteries of Palestine in the Byzantine period," in O. Limor and G.G. Stroumsa (eds.), *Christians and Christianity in the Holy Land* (Turnhout, 2006), pp. 401–419.

Hodgson, N.R. "Reinventing Normans as crusaders? Ralph of Caen's Gesta Tancredi," in *Anglo-Norman studies* 30 (2007), pp. 117–132 (=Hodgson 2007a).

———. *Women, crusading and the Holy Land in historical narrative* (Woodbridge, 2007) (=Hodgson 2007b).

———. "Lions, tigers, and bears: encounters with wild animals and bestial imagery in the context of crusading to the Latin East," *Viator* 44:1 (2013), pp. 65–94.

Hotzelt, W. "Die Chorherren vom Heiligen Grabe in Jerusalem," *Das Heilige Land in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart: gesammelte Beiträge und Berichte zur Palästinaforschung* (Cologne, 1940), vol. 2, pp. 107–136.

Hunt, R.W. "Stephen of Antioch," *Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies* 2 (1950), pp. 172–173.

Huygens, R.B.C. "Guillaume de Tyr étudiant. Un chapitre (XIX, 12) de son 'Histoire' retrouvé," *Latomus* 21 (1962), pp. 811–829.

———. *Latijn in Outremer: Een blik op de Latijnse letterkunde der kruisvaarderstaten in het Nabije Oosten* (Leiden, 1964).

———. "Le tradition manuscrite de Guillaume de Tyr," *Studi medievali* 5 (3rd Series, 1964), pp. 281–371.

———. "Editing William of Tyre," *Sacris Erudiri* 27 (1984), pp. 461–473.

Iafrate, A. "'Si sequeris casum, casus frangit tibi nasum': la raccolta delle sorti del ms Ashmole 304," *Aevum* 85 (2011), pp. 457–488.

———. "The workshop of Fortune: St Albans and the *sortes* manuscripts," *Scriptorium* 66 (2012), pp. 55–87.

———. "Of stars and men: Matthew Paris and the illustrations of MS Ashmole 30," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 76 (2013), pp. 139–177.

Issa, M. "l'Épique dans le Chronicon de Guillaume de Tyr," in J.-C. Herbin and M.-G. Grossel (eds.), *Croisades?: approches littéraires, historiques et philologiques* (Valenciennes, 2009), pp. 71–84.

Jacobsen, P.C. "Die Eroberung von Jerusalem in der mittellateinischen Dichtung," in D. Bauer, K. Herbers, N. Jaspert (eds.), *Jerusalem im Hoch- und Spätmittelalter: Konflikte und Konfliktbewältigung—Vorstellungen und Vergegenwärtigungen* (Frankfurt am Main, 2001), pp. 335–365.

Jacoby, D. "La littérature française dans les états latins de la Méditerranée orientale à l'époque des croisades: diffusion et création," in *Essor et fortune de la chanson de geste dans l'Europe et l'Orient latin: actes du IXe Congrès international de la Société Rencesvals pour l'étude des épopées romanes, Padoue-Venise, 29 août-4 septembre 1982* (Modena, 1984), pp. 617–646.

———. “Knightly values and class consciousness in the Crusader States of the Eastern Mediterranean,” *Mediterranean Historical Review* 1 (1986), pp. 158–186.

Jaeger, C.S. *The origins of courtliness — civilizing trends and the formation of courtly ideals — 939–1210* (Philadelphia, 1985).

———. “Pessimism in the twelfth-century ‘renaissance,’” *Speculum* 78:4 (2003), pp. 1151–1183.

Jauss, H.R. “Modernity and literary tradition,” *Critical inquiry* 31:2 (2005), pp. 329–364.

Joslyn-Siemiatkoski, D. *Christian memories of the Maccabean martyrs* (New York, 2009).

Jotischky, A. *The perfection of solitude. Hermits and monks in the Crusader States* (University Park, PA, 1995).

———. “Gerard of Nazareth, Mary Magdalene and Latin relations with the Greek Orthodox in the crusader East in the twelfth century,” *Levant* 29 (1997), pp. 217–226.

———. “The Frankish encounter with the Greek Orthodox in the Crusader States. The case of Gerard of Nazareth and Mary Magdalene,” in M. Gervers and J.M. Powell (eds.), *Tolerance and intolerance. Social conflict in the age of the crusades* (Syracuse, NY, 2001), pp. 100–114.

———. “Ethnographic attitudes in the Crusader States: The Franks and the indigenous Orthodox people,” in K. Ciggaar, A. Davids, and H. Teule (eds.), *East and West in the Crusader States: context - contacts - confrontations 3: Acta of the Congress held at Hernen Castle in September 2000* (Leuven, 2003), pp. 1–19.

Katzir, Y. “The conquests of Jerusalem, 1099 and 1187: historical memory and religious typology,” in V.P. Goss (ed.), *The meeting of two worlds: cultural exchange between East and West during the period of the crusades* (Kalamazoo, Mich., 1986), pp. 103–113.

Kedar, B.Z. “Toponymic surnames as evidence of origin: some medieval views,” *Viator* 4 (1973), pp. 123–129.

———. “The Patriarch Eraclius,” in B.Z. Kedar, H.E. Mayer, and R.C. Smail (eds.), *Outremer: studies in the history of the crusading kingdom of Jerusalem presented to Joshua Prawer* (Jerusalem, 1982), pp. 177–204 (repr. in Kedar 1993, no. VIII).

———. “Gerard of Nazareth: A neglected twelfth-century writer in the Latin East: A contribution to the intellectual and monastic history of the Crusader States,” *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 37 (1983), pp. 55–77 (repr. in Kedar 1993, no. IV). [=Kedar 1983a]

———. “Palmarée, abbaye clunisienne au XIIe siècle en Galilée,” *Revue Bénédictine* 93 (1983), pp. 260–269 (repr. in Kedar 1993, no. VI). [=Kedar 1983b]

———. “The subjected Muslims of the Frankish Levant,” in *Muslims under Latin rule, 1100–1300*, ed. J.M. Powell (Princeton, N.J., 1990), pp. 135–174 (repr. in Kedar 1993, no. XVIII).

———. “De Iudeis et Sarracenis,” in R.I. Castillo Lara (ed.), *Studia in honorem eminentissimi cardinalis Alphonsi M. Stickler* (Rome, 1992), pp. 207–213 (repr. in Kedar 2006, no. XIII).

———. (ed.) *The Horns of Ḥaṭṭīn* (Jerusalem, 1992).

———. *The Franks in the Levant, 11th to 14th centuries* (Aldershot, 1993).

———. “Benvenutus Grapheus of Jerusalem, an oculist in the era of the crusades,” *Korot. The Israel Journal of the history of medicine and science* 11 (1995), pp. 14–41 (repr. in Kedar 2006, no. XIV).

———. “A twelfth-century description of the Jerusalem hospital,” in H. Nicholson (ed.), *The Military Orders*, vol. 2 (Aldershot, 1998), pp. 3–26 (repr. in Kedar 2006, no. X).

———. “Intellectual activities in a holy city: Jerusalem in the twelfth century,” in B.Z. Kedar and R.J. Zwi Werblowsky (eds.), *Sacred space: shrine, city, land. Proceedings from the international conference in memory of Joshua Prawer* (London and Jerusalem, 1998), pp. 127–139 (repr. in Kedar 2006, no. IX).

———. “La *via sancti sepulchri* come tramite di cultura araba in Occidente,” in R. Greci (ed.), *Itinerari medievali e identità europea. Atti del Congresso Internazionale di Parma, 27–28 febbraio 1998* (Bologna, 1999), pp. 181–201 (repr. in Kedar 2006, no. VII).

———. “The origins of the earliest laws of Frankish Jerusalem: the Canons of the Council of Nablus, 1120,” *Speculum* 74 (1999), pp. 310–335 (repr. in Kedar 2006, no. I).

———. “The Jerusalem Massacre of July 1099 in the Western historiography of the Crusades,” *Crusades* 3 (2004), pp. 15–75.

———. “Reflections on maps, crusading, and logistics,” in J.H. Pryor (ed.), *Logistics of warfare in the age of the crusades: proceedings of a workshop held at the Centre for Medieval Studies, University of Sydney, 30 September to 4 October 2002* (Aldershot, 2006), pp. 159–183.

———. “On books and hermits in Nazareth’s short twelfth century,” in M. Yazbak and S. Sharif (eds.), *Nazareth: archaeology, history and cultural heritage* (Nazareth, 2012), pp. 43–53.

———. “Emicho of Flonheim and the apocalyptic motif in the 1096 massacres: between Paul Alphandéry and Alphonse Dupront,” in I.J. Yuval and R. Ben-Shalom (eds.), *Conflict and religious conversation in Latin Christendom: studies in honour of Ora Limor* (Turnhout, 2014), pp. 87–97.

———. “Some new light on the composition process of William of Tyre’s *Historia*,” in S.B. Edgington and H.J. Nicholson (eds.), *Deeds done beyond the sea: Essays on William of Tyre, Cyprus and the military orders presented to Peter Edbury* (Farnham, 2014), pp. 3–11.

Kedar, B.Z. and Aslanov, C. “Problems in the study of trans-cultural borrowing in the Frankish Levant,” in M. Borgolte and B. Schneidmüller (eds.), *Hybride Kulturen im mittelalterlichen Europa. Vorträge und Workshops einer internationalen Frühlingsschule* (Berlin, 2010), pp. 277–285.

Kedar, B.Z. and Pringle, D. “1099–1187: The Lord’s Temple (Templum Domini) and Solomon’s Palace (Palatium Salomonis),” in B.Z. Kedar and O. Grabar (eds.), *Where Heaven and Earth Meet: Jerusalem’s Sacred Esplanade* (Jerusalem, 2009), pp. 133–149.

Keller, H. “*Machabaeorum pugnae*. Zum Stellenwert eines biblischen Vorbilds in Widukinds Deutung der ottonischen Königsherrschaft,” in H. Keller and N. Staubach (eds.), *Iconologia sacra: Mythos, Bildkunst und Dichtung in der Religions- und Sozialgeschichte Alteuropas: Festschrift für Karl Hauck zum 75. Geburtstag* (Berlin, 1994), pp. 417–437.

Kenaan-Kedar, N. “Symbolic meaning in crusader architecture: the twelfth-century dome of the Holy Sepulcher Church in Jerusalem.” *Cahiers archéologiques* 34 (1986), pp. 109–17.

Kesler, C. “‘Abd al-Malik’s inscription in the Dome of the Rock: a reconsideration,” *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* 1 (1970), pp. 2–14.

Kienzle, B.M. “The twelfth-century monastic sermon,” in B.M. Kienzle (ed.), *The sermon* (Turnhout, 2000), pp. 271–323.

Kirstein, K.-P. *Die lateinischen Patriarchen von Jerusalem: von der Eroberung der Heiligen Stadt durch die Kreuzfahrer 1099 bis zum Ende der Kreuzfahrerstaaten 1291* (Berlin, 2002).

Kohlberg, E. and Kedar, B.Z. “A Melkite physician in Frankish Jerusalem and Ayyubid Damascus: Muwaffaq al-Din Ya‘qub b. Siqlab,” *Asian and African Studies* 22 (1988), pp. 113–126.

Kohler, C. “Un Rituel et un Bréviaire du Saint-Sepulcre de Jérusalem (XIIe-XIIIe siècle),” *Revue de l’Orient latin* 8 (1900–1901), pp. 389–430.

Kostick, C. “William of Tyre, Livy, and the vocabulary of class,” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 65:3 (2004), pp. 353–368.

———. “A Further Discussion on the Authorship of the ‘Gesta Francorum,’” *Reading Medieval Studies* 35 (2009), pp. 1–14.

Koytcheva, E. “Logistics of the early Crusades in the Balkans on *Via Militaris*,” in K. Holzner-Tobisch (ed.), *Die Vielschichtigkeit der Straße: Kontinuität und Wandel im Mittelalter und der frühen Neuzeit*, Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Realienkunde des

Mittelalters und der Frühen Neuzeit 22, Sitzungsberichte Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse 826 (Vienna, 2012), pp. 209–232.

Krey, A.C. *The first crusade: the accounts of eye-witnesses and participants* (Princeton, 1921).

———. "A neglected passage in the *Gesta*," in L.J. Paetow (ed.), *The Crusades and othe rhistorical essays presented to Dana C. Munro* (New York, 1928), pp. 57–76.

———. "William of Tyre: the making of an historian in the Middle Ages," *Speculum* 16:2 (1941), pp. 149–166.

Kümper, H. "Bartolf of Nangis," in G. Dunphy (ed.), *Encyclopedia of the medieval chronicle* (Leiden, 2010), vol. 1, p. 145.

Kühn, F. *Geschichte der ersten lateinischen patriarchen von Jerusalem* (Leipzig, 1886).

Kühnel, B. "The kingly statement of the bookcovers of Queen Melisende's Psalter," in E. Dassmann and K. Thraede (eds.), *Tesserae: Festschrift für Joseph Engemann*, *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum*, Ergänzungsband 18 (1991), pp. 340–357.

———. *Crusader art of the twelfth century: a geographical, an historical, or an art historical notion?* (Berlin, 1994), p. 122; Folda 1995, pp. 157–158.

Kühnel, G. "Aachen, Byzanz und die frühislamische Architektur im Heiligen Land," in G. Minkenberg, W. Dreßen, A.C. Oellers (eds.), *Ex Oriente. Isaak und der weisse Elefant; Bagdad-Jerusalem-Aachen. Eine Reise durch drei Kulturen um 800 und heute*, vol. 3 (Mainz am Rhein, 2003), pp. 52–67.

Lachmann, R. "Mnemonic and intertextual aspects of literature," in Erll and Nünning 2008, pp. 301–310.

LaMonte, J. "The significance of the Crusaders' States in Medieval history," *Byzantion* 15 (1940–1), pp. 300–315.

———. "The lords of Caesarea in the period of the Crusades," *Speculum* 22:2 (1947), pp. 145–161.

Lapina, E. *"Things done in a foreign land": representations of the First Crusade in the twelfth century* (PhD diss., 2007).

———. "Anti-Jewish rhetoric in Guibert of Nogent's *Dei gesta per Francos*," *Journal of Medieval History* 35 (2009), pp. 239–253.

———. "The Maccabees and the Battle of Antioch," in G. Signori (ed.), *Dying for the faith, killing for the faith. Old-Testament faith-warriors (1 and 2 Maccabees) in historical perspective* (Leiden, 2012), pp. 147–159.

Latowsky, A. “Foreign embassies and Roman universality in Einhard’s Life of Charlemagne,” *Florilegium* 22 (2005), pp. 25–57.

———. “Charlemagne as pilgrim? Requests for relics in the *Descriptio qualiter* and the *Voyage of Charlemagne*,” in Gabriele and Stuckey 2008, pp. 153–167.

———. *Emperor of the world: Charlemagne and the construction of imperial authority, 800–1229* (Ithaca, NY, 2013).

Lehmann, P. “Vom Leben des Lateinischen im Mittelalter,” *Bayerische Blätter für das Gymnasialschulwesen* 65 (1929), pp. 65–82, repr. in *Erforschung des Mittelalters*, vol. 1 (Stuttgart, 1941), pp. 62–81.

———. “Von Nazareth nach Erfurt,” *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen* 50 (1933), pp. 483–4.

———. “Die Institutio oratoria des Quintilianus im Mittelalter,” *Erforschung des Mittelalters*, vol. 2 (Stuttgart, 1959), pp. 1–28.

———. “Mittelalterliche Büchertitel,” in *Erforschung des Mittelalters*, vol. 5 (Stuttgart, 1962), pp. 1–93.

Lehtonen, T.M.S. “By the help of God, because of our sins, and by chance: William of Tyre explains the crusades,” in T.M.S. Lehtonen and K. Villads Jensen (eds.), *Medieval history writing and crusading ideology* (Helsinki, 2005), pp. 71–84.

Lewis, C.S. *The discarded image* (Cambridge, 1964).

Liere, van, F.A. *An introduction to the medieval Bible* (Cambridge, 2014).

Limor, O. “‘Holy journey’: Pilgrimage and Christian sacred landscape,” in O. Limor and G.G. Stroumsa (eds.), *Christians and Christianity in the Holy Land* (Turnhout, 2006), pp. 321–353.

Linder, A. “An unpublished charter of Geoffrey, abbot of the Temple in Jerusalem,” in B.Z. Kedar, H.E. Mayer, and R.C. Smail (eds.), *Outremer: Studies in the History of the Crusading Kingdom of Jerusalem presented to Joshua Prawer* (Jerusalem, 1982), pp. 119–129.

———. “The liturgy of the liberation of Jerusalem,” *Mediaeval Studies* 52 (1990), pp. 110–131.

———. “A new day, new joy: the liberation of Jerusalem on 15 July 1099,” in *L’idea di Gerusalemme nella spiritualità cristiana del Medioevo: atti del Convegno internazionale in collaborazione con l’Istituto della Görres-Gesellschaft di Gerusalemme* (Vatican City, 2003), pp. 46–64.

Loche, G. “Il *Templum Domini* e le sue tradizioni secondo le fonti scritte in epoca crociata,” *Liber Annuus* 59 (2009), pp. 281–299.

Lock, P. *The Routledge companion to the crusades* (New York, 2006).

Louchitsky, S. "'Veoir' et 'oïr,' 'legere' et 'audire': réflexions sur les interactions entre traditions orale et écrite dans les sources relatives à la Premiére croisade," in S. Louchitsky and M.-C. Varol (eds.), *Homo legens. Styles and Practices of Reading. Comparative Analyses of Oral and Written Traditions in the Middle Ages* (Turnhout, 2010), pp. 89–125.

Lützelschwab, R. "Zwischen Heilsvermittlung und Ärgernis—das preputium Domini im Mittelalter," in J.-L. Deuffic (ed.), *Reliques et sainteté dans l'espace médiéval* (Saint-Denis, 2005), pp. 601–628.

MacGregor, J.B. "The First Crusade in late medieval *exempla*," *The Historian* 68 (2006), pp. 29–48.

MacEvitt, C. *The crusades and the Christian world of the East: rough tolerance* (Philadelphia, 2008).

Madelin, L. *L'Expansion française: de la Syrie au Rhin* (Paris, 1918).

Maier, A. "Die Handschriften der Ecclesia Sidonensis," *Manuscripta* 11 (1967), pp. 39–45.

———. "Die Homiliare der 'Ecclesia Sidonensis,'" in *eadem*, *Ausgehendes Mittelalter: gesammelte Aufsätze zur Geistesgeschichte des 14. Jahrhunderts*, 3 vols. (1964–1977), vol. 1, pp. 289–292.

———. "Noch einmal zu den Codices der 'Ecclesia Sidonensis,'" in *eadem*, *Ausgehendes Mittelalter: gesammelte Aufsätze zur Geistesgeschichte des 14. Jahrhunderts*, 3 vols. (1964–1977), pp. 293–294.

Maier, C.T. *Preaching the Crusades: mendicant friars and the Cross in the thirteenth century* (Cambridge, 1994).

Mallet, A. "The 'Other' in the crusading period: Walter the Chancellor's presentation of Najm al-Din Il-Ghazi," *Al-Masāq* 22 (2010), pp. 113–128.

Manselli, R. *Italia e Italiani alla I Crociata* (Rome, 1993).

Mantello, F.A.C. and Rigg, A.G. (eds.) *Medieval Latin: An Introduction and Bibliographical Guide* (Washington, D.C., 1996).

Martin, J. "Classicism and style in Latin literature," in Benson, Constable, and Lanham 1982, pp. 537–568.

Mattelaer, J.J., Schipper, R.A., Das S. "The circumcision of Jesus Christ," *Journal of urology* 178:1 (2007), pp. 31–34.

Mayer, H.E. "Zum Tode Wilhelms von Tyrus," *Archiv für Diplomatik* 5–6 (1959–1960), pp. 182–201.

———. “Das Pontifikale von Tyrus und die Krönung der lateinischen Könige von Jerusalem. Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Forschung über Herrschaftszeichen und Staatssymbolik,” *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 21 (1967), pp. 141–232.

———. “Studies in the history of Queen Melisende of Jerusalem,” *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 26 (1972), pp. 95–182.

———. *Bistümer, Klöster und Stifte im Königreich Jerusalem*, Schriften der MGH 26 (Stuttgart, 1977).

———. *Das Siegelwesen in den Kreuzfahrerstaaten* (Munich, 1978).

———. Review of P.C. Boeren’s edition of Rorgo Fretellus in *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 38 (1982), p. 632.

———. “Guillaume de Tyr à l’école,” *Mémoires de l’Académie des sciences, arts et belles-lettres de Dijon* 117 (1985–86), pp. 257–265.

———. “Die Hofkapelle der Könige von Jerusalem,” *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 44 (1988), pp. 489–509.

———. “Bemerkungen zur Typologie der Urkunden des Kreuzfahrerkönigreichs Jerusalem,” in J. Marques (ed.), *Diplomatique royale du Moyen Age, XIIIe-XIVe siècles: actes du colloque* (Porto, 1996), pp. 115–131.

———. *Die Kanzlei der lateinischen Könige von Jerusalem*, 2 vols. (Hannover, 1996).

———. “Einwanderer in der Kanzlei und am Hof der Kreuzfahrerkönige von Jerusalem,” in H.E. Mayer and Elisabeth Müller-Luckner (eds.), *Die Kreuzfahrerstaaten als multikulturelle Gesellschaft: Einwanderer und Minderheiten im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert* (Munich, 1997), pp. 25–42.

Meister, R. “Mittellatein als Traditionssprache,” in B. Bischoff and S. Brechter (eds.), *Liber floridus. Mittellateinische Studien* (St. Ottilien, 1950), pp. 1–9.

Meyer, W. *Gesammelte Abhandlungen zur mittellateinischen Rythmik* (Berlin, 1905–1936), 3 vols.

Minervini, L. “Tradizioni linguistiche et culturali negli Stati Latini d’Oriente,” in a. Pioletti and F. Rizzo Nervo (eds.), *Medioevo romanzo e orientale. Oralità, scrittura, modelli narrativi* (Messina, 1995), pp. 155–192.

———. “Produzione e circolazione di manoscritti negli stati crociati: biblioteche e ‘scriptoria’ latini,” in A. Pioleti, F. Rizzo Nervo (eds.), *Il viaggio dei testi. Medioevo romanzo e orientale III* (Venice, 1999), pp. 79–96.

———. “Outremer,” in P. Boitani, M. Mancini, A. Varvaro (eds.), *Lo spazio letterario del Medioevo. 2. Il Medioevo volgare*, vol. 1, *La produzione del testo* (Rome, 2001), II, pp. 611–648.

———. “Modelli culturali e attività letteraria nell’Oriente latino,” *Studi medievali* 43:1 (2002), pp. 337–348.

———. “La costruzione dell’identità franca nell’Oriente latino nel *Tractatus de locis et statu terre Sancte* (ca. 1170-1186),” in M. Cassarino (ed.), *Lo sguardo sull’altro, lo sguardo dell’altro. L’alterità in testi medievali* (Soveria Mannelli, 2011), pp. 89–103.

Minnis, A.J. and Scott, A.B. (eds.) *Medieval literary theory and criticism c.1100–c.1375: the commentary tradition*, (Oxford, 1991, rev. ed.).

Mitchell, P.D. *Medicine in the Crusades: warfare, wounds, and the medieval surgeon* (Cambridge, 2004).

Möhring, H. “Zu der Geschichte der orientalischen Herrscher des Wilhelm von Tyrus: Die Frage der Quellenabhangigkeiten,” *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch* 19 (1984), pp. 170–183.

Mohrmann, C. “Le latin médiéval,” *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale* 1:3 (1958), pp. 265–294, repr. in *Études sur le latin des chrétiens*, vol. 2 (Rome, 1961), pp. 181–232.

Molinier, A. *Catalogue des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Mazarine* (Paris, 1885–1892), 4 vols.

Morris, C. “The *Gesta Francorum* as narrative history,” *Reading Medieval Studies* 19 (1993), pp. 55–71.

Morton, N. “The defence of the Holy Land and the memory of the Maccabees,” *Journal of Medieval History* 36 (2010), pp. 275–293.

Müller, U. *Kreuzzugsdichtung*, 2nd ed. (Tübingen, 1979).

Munk Olsen, B. *L’étude des auteurs classiques latins aux XIe et XIIe siècles* (Paris, 1982–1989), 4 vols.

———. *I classici nel canone scolastico altomedievale* (Spoleto, 1991).

———. “La diffusion et l’étude des historiens antiques au XIIe siècle,” in A. Welkenhuysen, H. Braet, W. Verbeke (eds.), *Mediaeval antiquity* (Leuven, 1995), pp. 21–43.

Muratova, X. “Western chronicles of the First Crusade as sources for the history of art in the Holy Land,” in J. Folda (ed.), *Crusader art in the twelfth century* (Jerusalem, 1982), pp. 47–69.

Murray, A.V. “The origins of the Frankish nobility of the kingdom of Jerusalem, 1100–1118,” *Mediterranean Historical Review* 4 (1989), pp. 281–300.

———. “The title of Godfrey of Bouillon as ruler of Jerusalem,” *Collegium medievale: interdisciplinary journal of medieval research* 3 (1990), pp. 163–178.

———. “Ethnic identity in the Crusader States: The Frankish race and the settlement of Outremer,” in S. Forde, L. Johnson, and A.V. Murray (eds.), *Concepts of National Identity in the Middle Ages* (Leeds, 1995), pp. 59–73.

———. “‘Mighty against the enemies of Christ’: the relic of the True Cross in the armies of the kingdom of Jerusalem,” in J. France and W.G. Zajac (eds.), *The crusades and their sources: essays presented to Bernard Hamilton* (Aldershot, 1998), pp. 217–238.

———. *The crusader kingdom of Jerusalem: a dynastic history 1099-1125* (Oxford, 2000).

———. “William of Tyre and the origin of the Turks: observations on possible sources of the Gesta orientalium principum,” in M. Balard, B.Z. Kedar, and J. Riley-Smith (eds.), *Dei gesta per Francos: Etudes sur les croisades dédiées à Jean Richard* (Aldershot, 2001), pp. 217–229.

———. “National identity, language and conflict in the crusades to the Holy Land, 1096–1192,” in C. Kostick (ed.), *The crusades and the Near East* (New York, 2011), pp. 107–130.

———. “Roads, bridges and shipping in the passage of crusade armies by overland routes to the Bosporus 1096–1190,” in K. Holzner-Tobisch (ed.), *Die Vielschichtigkeit der Straße. Kontinuität und Wandel im Mittelalter und der frühen Neuzeit*, Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Realienkunde des Mittelalters und der Frühen Neuzeit 22, Sitzungsberichte Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse 826 (Vienna, 2012), pp. 183–208.

———. “Franks and indigenous communities in Palestine and Syria (1099–1187): a hierarchical model of social interaction in the principalities of Outremer,” in A. Classen (ed.), *East meets West in the Middle Ages and Early Modern times: transcultural experiences in the Premodern world* (Berlin, 2013), pp. 291–309.

———. “Biblical quotations and formulaic language in the chronicle of William of Tyre,” in S.B. Edgington and H.J. Nicholson (eds.), *Deeds done beyond the sea: Essays on William of Tyre, Cyprus and the military orders presented to Peter Edbury* (Farnham, 2014), pp. 25–42.

———. “The siege and capture of Jerusalem in Western narrative sources of the First Crusade,” in S.B. Edgington and L. García-Guijarro (eds.), *Jerusalem the golden: the origins and impact of the First Crusade* (Turnhout, 2014), pp. 191–215.

Nader, M. *Burgesses and burgess law in the Latin Kingdoms of Jerusalem and Cyprus (1099–1325)* (Aldershot, 2006).

Nicholson, H.J. *Templars, Hospitallers, and Teutonic Knights: images of the military orders, 1128–1291* (London, 1995).

Nicholson, R.L. *Tancred: A study of his career and work in their relation to the First Crusade and the establishment of the Latin States in Syria and Palestine* (Chicago, 1938).

Norberg, D.L. *An introduction to the study of medieval Latin versification*, tr. G.C. Roti and J. de La Chapelle Skubly (Washington, DC, 2004).

Norman, J.S. "The life of King David as a Psychomachia allegory: a study of the Melisende Psalter book cover," *University of Ottawa Quarterly* 50 (1980), pp. 193–201.

Novick, P. *That noble dream: the 'objectivity question' and the American historical profession* (Cambridge, 1988).

Oehler, H. "Studien zu den *Gesta Francorum*," *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch* 6 (1970), pp. 58–97.

Oellers, A.C. "Karl und die Christen im Heiligen Land," in Minkenberg, Dreßen, and Oellers 2003, vol. 3, pp. 108–121.

Otter, M. "Renaissances and revivals," in Hexter and Townsend 2012, pp. 535–552.

Pabst, B. *Prosimetrum: Tradition und Wandel einer Literaturform zwischen Spätantike und Spätmittelalter* (Cologne, 1994).

Pahlitzsch, J. *Graeci und Suriani im Palästina der Kreuzfahrerzeit. Beiträge und Quellen zur Geschichte des griechisch-orthodoxen Patriarchats von Jerusalem* (Berlin, 2001).

Palazzo, R.P. "The veneration of the Sacred Foreskin(s) of Baby Jesus—a documented analysis," in J.P. Helfers (ed.), *Multicultural Europe and cultural exchange* (Turnhout, 2005), pp. 155–176.

Paul, N.L. *To follow in their footsteps: the Crusades and family memory in the high Middle Ages* (Ithaca, NY, 2012).

Payen, J.-C. "Une légende épique en gestation: Les *Gesta Tancredi* de Raoul de Caen," *La Chanson de geste et le mythe carolingien: mélanges René Louis / publiés par ses collègues, ses amis et ses élèves à l'occasion de son 75e anniversaire*, vol. 2 (Saint-Père-sous-Vézelay,1982), pp. 1051–1062.

Petit, F. *Spirituality of the Premonstratensians: the twelfth and thirteenth centuries*, tr. V. Szczurek (Trappist, Ky. etc., 2011).

Phillips, J. *The Second Crusade: Extending the Frontiers of Christendom* (New Haven, Conn., 2007).

Prawer, J. "Social classes in the Crusader States," in K. Setton (ed.), *History of the Crusades*, vol. 5, N.P. Zacour and H.W. Hazard (eds.), *The impact of the Crusades on the Near East* (Madison, Wisc., 1985), pp. 119–147.

Pringle, D. *The churches of the Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem: a corpus* (Cambridge, 1993–2009), 4 vols.

———. *Secular buildings in the Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem* (Cambridge, 1997).

Propst, H. *Die geographischen Verhältnisse Syriens und Palästinas nach Wilhelm von Tyrus, Geschichte der Kreuzzüge*, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1927).

Prutz, H. *Kulturgeschichte der Kreuzzüge* (Berlin, 1883).

———. "Studien über Wilhelm von Tyrus," *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde* 8 (1883), pp. 91–132.

Ray, R. "Historiography," in Mantello and Rigg 1996, pp. 639–649.

Reiner, E. "A Jewish response to the Crusades: The dispute over sacred places in the Holy Land," in A. Haverkamp (ed.), *Juden und Christen zur Zeit der Kreuzzüge* (1999), pp. 209–231.

Remensnyder, A.G. *Remembering kings past: monastic foundation legends in medieval southern France* (Ithaca, NY, 1995).

Rey, E. *Les colonies Franques de Syrie aux XIIe et XIIIe siècles* (Genève, 1883).

Rheinheimer, M. *Das Kreuzfahrerfürstentum Galiläa* (Frankfurt, 1990).

Richard, J. *Les récits de voyages et de pèlerinages*, Typologie des sources du Moyen Âge Occidental 38 (Turnhout, 1981).

Riché, P. "La Bible et la vie politique dans le haut Moyen Âge," in P. Riché and G. Lobrichon (eds.), *Le Moyen Âge et la Bible* (Paris, 1984), pp. 385–400.

Richtscheid, R. "Die Kreuzfahrer als 'Novi Machabei': zur Verwendungsweise der Makkabaermetaphorik in chronikalischen Quellen der Rhein- und Masslande zur Zeit der Kreuzzuge," in F.G. Hirschmann and G. Mentgen (eds.), *Campana pulsante convocati: Festschrift anlässlich der Emeritierung von Prof. Dr. Alfred Haverkamp* (Trier, 2005), pp. 473–486.

Riley-Smith, J. *The Knights of St. John in Jerusalem and Cyprus, c. 1050–1310* (London, 1967).

———. "The title of Godfrey of Bouillon," *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 52 (1979), pp. 83–86.

Rödig, T. *Zur politischen Ideenwelt Wilhelms von Tyrus* (Frankfurt am Main, 1990).

Röhricht, R. "Amalrich I., König von Jerusalem (1162–1174)," *Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Instituts für Geschichtsforschung* 12 (1891), pp. 432–493.

———. *Geschichte des ersten Kreuzzuges* (Innsbruck, 1901).

Rousset, P. *Les origines et les caractères de la première croisade* (Neuchâtel, 1945).

Rubenstein, J. "Putting history to use: three crusade chronicles in context," *Viator* 35 (2004), pp. 131–168.

———. "What is the *Gesta Francorum*, and who was Peter Tudebode?" *Revue Mabillon* 16, 2nd series (2005), pp. 179–204.

———. "Cannibals and crusaders," *French Historical Studies* 31:4 (2008), pp. 525–552.

———. "Godfrey of Bouillon versus Raymond of Saint-Gilles: How Carolingian kingship trumped Millenarianism at the end of the First Crusade," in Gabriele and Stuckey 2008, pp. 59–75.

———. *Armies of heaven: the first crusade and the quest for apocalypse* (New York, 2011).

———. "Lambert of Saint-Omer and the apocalyptic First Crusade," in N. Paul and S. Yeager (eds.), *Remembering the Crusades: Myth, image, and identity* (Baltimore, MD, 2012), pp. 69–95.

Runciman, S. "Charlemagne and Palestine," *The English Historical Review* 50:200 (1935), pp. 606–619.

———. *A History of the Crusades*, 3 vols. (Cambridge, 1951–4).

———. "The visit of King Amalric I to Constantinople in 1171," in B.Z. Kedar, H.E. Mayer, and R.C. Smail (eds.), *Outremer: Studies in the History of the Crusading Kingdom of Jerusalem presented to Joshua Prawer* (Jerusalem, 1982), pp. 153–158.

Russo, L. "Tancredi e i Bizantini. Sui Gesta Tancredi in expeditione Hierosolymitana di Rodolfo di Caen," *Medioevo Greco* 3 (2002), pp. 193–230.

———. "Continuité et transformations de la typologie des Maccabées jusqu'aux origines du mouvement des croisades," in M.T. Kretschmer (ed.), *La Typologie biblique comme forme de pensée dans l'historiographie médiévale* (Turnhout, 2014), pp. 53–76.

Sabbadini, R. "Spogli Ambrosiani Latini," *Studi italiani de filologia classica* 11 (1903), pp. 165–388.

Sandler, S. *The iconographic programme of the ivory covers of Queen Melisende's psalter: sources and meaning* (Ph.D. diss., Tel Aviv University 1992).

Sanford, E.M. "The study of ancient history in the Middle Ages," *Journal of the history of ideas* 5:1 (1944), pp. 21–43.

Santinelli-Foltz, E. "'. . . quand le mari quitta son épouse si chérie . . .' (Foucher de Chartres) De celles qui restent pendant la Première Croisade," in J.-C. Herbin and M.-G. Grossel

(eds.), *Croisades?: approches littéraires, historiques et philologiques* (Valenciennes, 2009), pp. 195–211.

Savage-Smith, E. "New evidence for the Frankish study of Arabic medical texts in the Crusader period," *Crusades* 5 (2006), pp. 99–112.

Schatkin, M. "The Maccabean martyrs," *Vigiliae Christianae* 28 (1974), pp. 97–113.

Schein, S. "Between Mount Moriah and the Holy Sepulchre: the changing traditions of the Temple Mount in the central Middle Ages," *Traditio* 40 (1984), pp. 175–195.

———. "The *Miracula* of the Hospital of St. John and the Carmelite Elianic tradition—two medieval myths of foundation?," in M. Goodich, et al. (ed.), *Cross cultural convergences in the crusader period: essays presented to Aryeh Graboïs* (New York, 1995), pp. 288–289.

———. *Gateway to the heavenly city: crusader Jerusalem and the Catholic West (1099-1187)* (Burlington, VT, 2005).

Schmale, F.-J. *Funktion und Formen mittelalterlicher Geschichtsschreibung: eine Einführung* (Darmstadt, 1985).

Schmidt, P.L. "Rezeptionsgeschichte und die Überlieferungsgeschichte der klassischen lateinischen Literatur," in C. Leonardi and B. Munk Olsen (eds.), *The classical tradition in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance* (Spoleto, 1992), pp. 3–21.

Schmieder, F. "Paradise islands in the East and West—tradition and meaning in some cartographical places on the medieval rim of the world," in T. Jørgensen and G. Jaritz (eds.), *Isolated islands in medieval nature, culture and mind* (New York, 2011), pp. 3–22.

Schmuck, A. *Mittellateinische Kreuzlieder: poetische Werbung zum Kreuzzug* (Diss., Universität Würzburg, 1954).

Schönfelder, A. "Die Prozessionen der Lateiner in Jerusalem zur Zeit der Kreuzzüge," *Historisches Jahrbuch* 32 (1911), pp. 578–598.

Schreckenberg, H. *Die Flavius-Josephus-Tradition in Antike und Mittelalter* (Leiden, 1972).

Schreckenberg H., and Schubert, K. *Jewish Historiography and Iconography in Early and Medieval Christianity* (Assen, 1992).

Schum, W. *Beschreibendes Verzeichnis der Amplonianischen Handschriften-Sammlung zu Erfurt* (Berlin, 1887).

Schwering-Illert, G. *Die ehemalige französische Abteikirche Saint-Sauveur in Charroux (Vienne) in 11. und 12. Jh.: Ein Vorschlag zur Rekonstruktion und Deutung der romanischen Bauteile* (Ph.D. Diss., Bonn, 1963).

Schwinges, R.C. *Kreuzzugsideologie und Toleranz: Studien zu Wilhelm von Tyrus* (Stuttgart, 1977).

———. "Regionale Identität und Begegnung der Kulturen der Stadt und 'Kreuzfahrerkönigreich' Jerusalem," in A. Meyer, C. Rendtel, and M. Wittmer-Butsch (eds.), *Päpste, Pilger, Pönitentiarie: Festschrift für Ludwig Schmugge zum 65. Geburtstag* (Tübingen, 2004), pp. 237–251.

Shagrir, I. "The medieval evolution of by-naming: notions from the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem," in I. Shagrir, R. Ellenblum, J. Riley-Smith (eds.), *In Laudem Hierosolymitani: studies in Crusades and medieval culture in honour of Benjamin Z. Kedar* (Aldershot, 2007), pp. 49–59.

———. "The guide of MS Beinecke 481.77 and the intertwining of Christian, Jewish and Muslim traditions in twelfth-century Jerusalem," *Crusades* 10 (2011), pp. 1–22.

Sholod, B. "Charlemagne: Symbolic link between the eigth and eleventh century crusades," in I.A. Langnas and B. Sholod (eds.), *Studies in honor of M.J. Bernardete: Essays in Hispanic and Sephardic culture* (New York, 1965), pp. 33–46.

Short, I. "Part 1: The Oxford version," in J.J. Duggan, et al. (eds.), *La Chanson de Roland = The Song of Roland: the French corpus*, vol. 1 (Turnhout, 2005), pp. I/19–20.

Sibilio, V. "Il meraviglioso nella prima crociata," *Teresianum* 56 (2005), pp. 161–198.

Siedow, von, O. *Tancred. Ein Lebensbild aus der Zeit der Kreuzzüge* (Berlin, 1880).

Smail, R.C. *Crusading warfare (1097–1193). A contribution to medieval military history* (Cambridge, 1956).

Smalley, B. "Sallust in the Middle Ages," in R.R. Bolgar (ed.), *Classical influences on European culture A.D. 500–1500* (Cambridge, 1971), pp. 165–175.

———. *Historians in the Middle Ages* (London, 1974).

Sot, M. "*Gestae*," in *Lexikon des Mittelalters* (Munich, 1980–1999), vol. 4, cols 1404–1406.

Spear, D.S. "The school of Caen revisited," *The Haskins Society Journal* 4 (1992), pp. 55–66.

Spreckelmeyer, G. *Das Kreuzlied des lateinischen Mittelalters* (Munich, 1974).

———. *Mittellateinische Kreuzzugslieder: Texte und Melodien* (Göppingen, 1987).

Steffens, F. *Lateinische Paläographie: 125 Tafeln in Lichtdruck mit gegenüberstehender Transkription nebst Erläuterungen und einer systematishchen Darstellung der Entwicklung der lateinischen Schrift* (Berlin, 1929).

Steger, H. *David: rex et propheta. König David als vorbildliche Verkörperung des Herrschers und Dichters im Mittelalter, nach Bilddarstellungen des achten bis zwölften Jahrhunderts* (Nürnberg, 1961).

Stuckey, J. "Charlemagne as crusader? Memory, propaganda, and the many uses of Charlemagne's legendary expedition to Spain," in Gabriele and Stuckey 2008, pp. 137–152.

Stock, B. "Antiqui and moderni as 'giants' and 'dwarfs': a reflection of popular culture?," *Modern Philology* 76 (1979), pp. 370–374.

Sybel, H., von. *Geschichte des ersten Kreuzzugs* (Düsseldorf, 1841).

Szövérffy, J. *Secular Latin lyrics and minor poetic forms of the Middle Ages: a historical survey and literary repertory from the tenth to the late fifteenth century* (Concord, NH, 1994), 3 vols.

Tessera, M.R. "*Prudentes homines ... qui sensus habebant magis exercitatos*: a preliminary inquiry into William of Tyre's vocabulary of power," *Crusades* 1 (2002), pp. 63–71.

———. "Dalla liturgia del Santo Sepolcro alla Biblioteca di Sidone: note sulla produzione libraria latina di Oltremare nel XII-XIII secolo," *Aevum. Rassegna di scienze storiche, linguistiche e filologiche* 79 (2005), pp. 407–415.

Thomas, R. "Herodotus' *Histories* and the floating gap," in N. Luraghi (ed.), *The historian's craft in the age of Herodotus* (Oxford, 2001), pp. 198–210.

Thomsen, P. "Die lateinischen und griechischen Inschriften der Stadt Jerusalem und ihrer nächsten Umgebung (Fortsetzung)," *ZDPV* 44:1 (1921), pp. 1–61.

Traube, L. *Vorlesungen und Abhandlungen*, 3 vols. (Munich, 1911).

Turner, R.V. "The *miles literatus* in twelfth- and thirteenth-century England: How rare a phenomenon?," *American Historical Review* 83 (1978), pp. 928–945.

Tyerman, C. *God's war: a new history of the crusades* (Cambridge, Mass., 2006).

Verhelst, S. "The liturgy of Jerusalem in the Byzantine period," in O. Limor and G.G. Stroumsa (eds.), *Christians and Christianity in the Holy Land*, Cultural Encounters in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages 5 (Turnhout, 2006), pp. 421–462.

Vessey, M. "William of Tyre and the art of historiography," *Mediaeval Studies* 35 (1973), pp. 433–455.

———. "William of Tyre: apology and apocalypse," in G. Cambier (ed.), *Hommages à André Boutemy* (Brussels, 1976), pp. 390–403.

Vincent, L.H., Mackay, E.J.H., Abel, F.M. *Hébron: le Haram el-Khalîl: sépulture des patriarches* (Paris, 1923), 2 vols.

Wallace-Hadrill, J.M. *The Frankish Church* (Oxford, 1983).

Wentzlaff-Eggebert, F.W. *Kreuzzugsdichtung des Mittelalters: Studien zu ihrer geschichtlichen und dichterischen Wirklichkeit* (Berlin, 1960).

Westra, H.J. "The allegorical interpretation of myth," in in A. Welkenhuysen, H. Braet, W. Verbeke (eds.), *Mediaeval antiquity* (Leuven, 1995), pp. 277–291.

Whalen, B.E. "*The Discovery of the Holy Patriarchs*: Relics, ecclesiastical politics and sacred history in twelfth-century crusader Palestine," *Historical Reflections* 27:1 (2001), pp. 139–176.

Williams, R. *The Sociology of Culture* (Chicago, 1981).

Winkler, A. *Le tropisme de Jérusalem dans la prose et la poésie: (XIIe-XIVe siècle: essai sur la littérature des croisades* (Paris, 2006).

Winterbottom, M. "Quintilian: *Institutio oratoria*," in L.D. Reynolds (ed.), *Texts and transmission: a survey of the Latin classics* (Oxford, 1983), pp. 332–334.

Witke, C. "Rome as 'region of difference' in the poetry of Hildebert of Lavardin," in A.S. Bernardo and S. Levin (eds.), *The classics in the Middle Ages: papers of the Twentieth Annual Conference of the Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies* (Binghamton, N.Y., 1990), pp. 403–411.

Worstbrock, F.J. "Translatio artium," *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 47 (1965), pp. 1–22.

Yeager, S.M. *Jerusalem in Medieval Narrative* (Cambridge, 2008).

Zajac, W.G. "Captured property on the First Crusade," in J. Phillips (ed.), *The First Crusade. Origins and impact* (Manchester, 1997), pp. 153–186.

Zeitler, B. "The distorting mirror: reflections on the Queen Melisende Psalter (London, B.L., Egerton 1139)," in R. Cormack and E. Jeffreys (eds.), *Through the looking glass: Byzantium through British eyes* (Aldershot, 2000), pp. 69–83.

Ziadé, R. *Les martyrs Maccabées. De l'histoire juive au culte chrétien: les homélies de Grégoire de Nazianze et de Jean Chrysostome* (Leiden, 2007).

Ziolkowski, J.M. "Towards a history of medieval Latin literature," in Mantello and Rigg 1996, pp. 505–536.

———. "The prosimetrum in the classical tradition," in J. Harris and K. Reichl (eds.), *Prosimetrum: crosscultural perspectives on narrative in prose and verse* (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 45–65.

———. *Nota bene: reading classics and writing melodies in the early Middle Ages* (Turnhout, 2007).

———. "The Middle Ages," in C.W. Kallendorf *et al.* (ed.), *A companion to the classical tradition* (Malden, MA, etc., 2007), pp. 17–29.