



Terms and Conditions of Use of Digitised Theses from Trinity College Library Dublin

Copyright statement

All material supplied by Trinity College Library is protected by copyright (under the Copyright and Related Rights Act, 2000 as amended) and other relevant Intellectual Property Rights. By accessing and using a Digitised Thesis from Trinity College Library you acknowledge that all Intellectual Property Rights in any Works supplied are the sole and exclusive property of the copyright and/or other IPR holder. Specific copyright holders may not be explicitly identified. Use of materials from other sources within a thesis should not be construed as a claim over them.

A non-exclusive, non-transferable licence is hereby granted to those using or reproducing, in whole or in part, the material for valid purposes, providing the copyright owners are acknowledged using the normal conventions. Where specific permission to use material is required, this is identified and such permission must be sought from the copyright holder or agency cited.

Liability statement

By using a Digitised Thesis, I accept that Trinity College Dublin bears no legal responsibility for the accuracy, legality or comprehensiveness of materials contained within the thesis, and that Trinity College Dublin accepts no liability for indirect, consequential, or incidental, damages or losses arising from use of the thesis for whatever reason. Information located in a thesis may be subject to specific use constraints, details of which may not be explicitly described. It is the responsibility of potential and actual users to be aware of such constraints and to abide by them. By making use of material from a digitised thesis, you accept these copyright and disclaimer provisions. Where it is brought to the attention of Trinity College Library that there may be a breach of copyright or other restraint, it is the policy to withdraw or take down access to a thesis while the issue is being resolved.

Access Agreement

By using a Digitised Thesis from Trinity College Library you are bound by the following Terms & Conditions. Please read them carefully.

I have read and I understand the following statement: All material supplied via a Digitised Thesis from Trinity College Library is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, and duplication or sale of all or part of any of a thesis is not permitted, except that material may be duplicated by you for your research use or for educational purposes in electronic or print form providing the copyright owners are acknowledged using the normal conventions. You must obtain permission for any other use. Electronic or print copies may not be offered, whether for sale or otherwise to anyone. This copy has been supplied on the understanding that it is copyright material and that no quotation from the thesis may be published without proper acknowledgement.

The Depiction of Muslims in Contemporary Latin Narratives of the First Crusade

A Dissertation Submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

University of Dublin, Trinity College

By

Yan Bourke

2016

Declaration

I declare that this thesis has not been submitted as an exercise for a degree at this or any other university and it is entirely my own work.

I agree to deposit this thesis in the University's open access institutional repository or allow the Library to do so on my behalf, subject to Irish Copyright Legislation and Trinity College Library conditions of use and acknowledgment.

Signature:

Date:



Thesis 11336

Summary

Although they undoubtedly drew on knowledge that existed in Western Europe, the authors of histories the First Crusade lacked an authoritative source on Islam. As such, in trying to give more complete depictions of Muslims, authors of crusade accounts for the most part were free to create images of their own, picking and choosing between elements of various available models and their own observations. This dissertation is concerned with their attempts to cope with the task of explaining the phenomenon of Islam and the character of Muslims to their audience. Lacking an authority on the nature of Islam on which to rely, and influenced by their different intellectual backgrounds, experiences and their own interpretations of the crusade itself, these attempts to explain Islam varied considerably from author to author. Though there have been a number of works published around the subject of the image of Islam in the West, none has taken the approach of this study. Many have focussed more on the accuracy of the image than on a close analysis of what it meant to contemporaries and how it was derived. Most have also tended to analyse only a few sources deemed representative, over a long period of time. This approach does not give enough attention to the great degree of variation between the First Crusade sources and the individuality of the authors of the accounts in their depictions of Muslims. This thesis will conduct a minute investigation of the language used by the authors to deal with Islam and the culture and manners of Muslims with an emphasis on identifying the ways in which they differed from one another.

The sources analysed in detail in this thesis are the anonymous *Gesta Francorum*, the three revisions of that text by Robert the Monk, Baldric of Bourgueil and Guibert of Nogent, the *Historia Hierosolimitana* of Albert of Aachen and the *Tancredus* of Ralph of Caen. These sources are analysed in detail in seven chapters, and a more comparative approach is used in the conclusion of this thesis. This also allows some works which did not yield enough material to warrant entire chapters to be compared as well; these are introduced in appendices I-IV. The great extent of the variation between these sources in how they depicted Muslims is the central finding of this thesis.

Another important question which arises from this approach to the sources individually is whether any pattern can be detected in the ways they

varied from one another, along geographical or chronological lines. This study shows that authors were for the most part either more or less hostile to or more or less knowledgeable about Muslims according to their own individual tendencies, not to any discernible pattern. There is a weak pattern in that the three Northern French monks who produced their histories by revising the *Gesta Francorum* were somewhat more hostile to Muslims than their source, but even then, it is a stretch to fit the work of Baldric of Bourgueil into this framework.

Other important findings revealed by the comparative approach include the particular variety in the authors' understandings of what Islam was and how the basis from which they constructed this varied as well. Rather than simply all believing that Muslims were a kind of polytheist pagan such as those written of by the church fathers (with the additional information that they worshipped a god named Mohammed), there is a great deal of subtle variation in the degree to which the authors engaged with the reality of Islam on the one hand, and the nature and sources of the inaccurate beliefs they displayed on the other. In particular, the long-held assumption that most people at the time thought Mohammed was a god of the Muslims is not supported by the works examined here (although some did). There was common ground between the authors in that they tended to depict Muslims as savagely violent, and extreme violence against them as justified in turn; most also depicted Muslims by turns as arrogant, cowardly, and overly concerned with the material world, but the extent to which the authors emphasised these varied. The authors also demonstrated some limits to their hostility to Muslims, generally being willing to offer some praise at times and for the most part (but not exclusively) showing no disapproval of peace agreements and even alliances made with Muslim rulers. They also for the most part celebrated conversion of Muslims, demonstrating that the hostility they did display was entirely due to religious rather than ethnic difference (Guibert of Nogent being a possible exception). Arguments that Muslims were marginalised in the accounts of the authors of crusade histories in favour of their more pressing concern with the salvation of the crusaders and other 'eurocentric' issues may help to explain why the authors were not often driven to question their inaccurate beliefs about the nature of Islam. This is more true of some authors than others, however; and in all cases some nuance is needed when considering the 'marginalisation' of Muslims as a subject in these works. The authors must all have reached some limit in

their interest in presenting a full and accurate picture of the enemy of the crusaders, but as this study makes clear, they all displayed some concern with depicting Muslims the 'right' way (as they saw it). It is particularly telling that none of the histories which are known to have used another extant history adopted the depiction of Muslims of their sources without making changes.

Acknowledgments

In the first instance, I would like to thank Trinity College Dublin and the Irish Research Council for their generous funding which facilitated the completion of this research.

The unwavering support and encouragement of my supervisor, Professor Ian S. Robinson has been of incalculable value. Since my days as an undergraduate, he has been generous with his wisdom, advice, and knowledge, and I offer my sincere and very great thanks.

Many other members of staff and faculty at Trinity College Dublin have also provided great and generous assistance over the years; I am particularly grateful to Dr Seán Duffy and Dr Martine Cuypers for their feedback in progress reviews. Many other members of staff and students offered helpful comments on papers presented during the completion of this thesis, many of them facilitated by Dr David Ditchburn. Thanks are also owed to the staff of Trinity's Library, particularly the History Librarian, Seán Hughes, and Research Librarian, Mary Higgins for their generous assistance, especially in the final stages of this work. I would also like to thank all of my colleagues at Trinity College's Medieval History Research Centre for their companionship and advice over the years, particularly Dr Sparky Booker, Dr Caoimhe Whelan, Dr Roman Bleier and Dr Cherie Peters, as well as my fellow students who are submitting our theses this year, Brian Coleman and Christina Wade.

Thanks also to my parents and the rest of my family, who offered a great deal of help and support over the years. The advice and support of my mother, Dr Jackie Bourke, has been especially helpful in the final stretch. Several other friends and members of family generously offered feedback and proofreading on draft chapters; thank you to Niall ó Súilleabháin, Mia de Búrca, Cian Dikker, and Elle Parker (and thanks again to Dr Caoimhe Whelan and my father, Peter O'Kennedy, for this as well) Any mistakes remain, of course, my responsibility.

Finally, I wish to thank my wonderful partner Eileen Deegan, who has helped far more than I think she knows.

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	15
1.1	A Review of the Relevant Literature	16
1.1.1	The Depiction of Muslims in sources predating the First Crusade	26
1.2	Methodology	28
1.3	Sources	31
2	The Anonymous <i>Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolymitanorum</i>	31
2.1.1	Date	32
2.1.2	The Author's Identity	34
2.1.3	Possible Sources of the <i>Gesta Francorum</i>	35
2.1.4	The Style of the <i>Gesta Francorum</i>	37
2.1.5	The <i>Gesta</i> author's Interpretation of the Crusade	38
2.2	Islam in the <i>Gesta Francorum</i>	39
2.2.1	Terminology	39
2.2.2	Muslim Beliefs	41
2.2.3	Violence	48
2.2.4	The structure of Muslim society	53
2.2.5	Dehumanisation and Connections to the Supernatural	58
2.2.6	Arrogance	60
2.2.7	Concern with the Material World	61
2.2.8	Cowardice	63
2.2.9	Muslim destiny	65
2.2.10	Positive views of Muslims	66
2.3	Conclusion	71

2.4	The Historia de Hierosolimitano Itinere of Peter Tudebode	74
2.4.1	Terminology	75
2.4.2	Exaggeration	75
2.4.3	New themes introduced	76
3	The Historia Hierosolimitana of Robert the Monk	80
3.1	Introduction	80
3.1.1	Robert's Identity and the Date of the <i>Historia</i>	81
3.1.2	Robert's Revision of the <i>Gesta Francorum</i>	84
3.2	The Depiction of Muslims in Robert the Monk's <i>Historia Hierosolimitana</i>	89
3.2.1	Terminology	89
3.2.2	Biblical References	94
3.2.3	Animal Imagery	100
3.2.4	Muslim Cowardice and Stupidity	103
3.2.5	Robert's Use of Violence	106
3.2.6	Muslim Wealth and Materialism	109
3.2.7	Muslim Beliefs	112
3.2.8	The Structure of Muslim Society	113
3.2.9	Muslims and the Supernatural	114
3.2.10	Other ways of viewing Muslims	116
3.3	Conclusion	118
4	The Historia Hierosolimitana of Baldric of Bourgueil	122
4.1	Introduction	122
4.1.1	Baldric's Identity	122
4.1.2	Dating	124
4.1.3	Baldric's revision of the <i>Gesta Francorum</i>	125
4.2	The Depiction of Muslims in the Historia Hierosolimitana	126

4.2.1	Terminology	128
4.2.2	Biblical Allusions	128
4.2.3	Muslim Beliefs.....	132
4.2.4	Muslim Society	143
4.2.5	Violence.....	146
4.2.6	Concern with Material Matters	148
4.2.7	Arrogance and Pride	149
4.2.8	Cowardice and Stupidity.....	152
4.2.9	Muslims as Praiseworthy	153
4.3	Conclusion	156
4.4	Manuscript G.....	159
5	The <i>Dei Gesta per Francos</i> of Guibert of Nogent	163
5.1	Introduction.....	163
5.1.1	Guibert's Identity and the date of the <i>Dei Gesta per Francos</i>	164
5.1.2	Guibert's adaptation of the <i>Gesta Francorum</i> ...	166
5.1.3	Guibert's other sources	169
5.2	The Depiction of Muslims in Guibert of Nogent's <i>Dei Gesta Per Francos</i>	172
5.2.1	Terminology	173
5.2.2	Muslim Beliefs.....	179
5.2.3	Violence by Muslims	186
5.2.4	Violence against Muslims.....	188
5.2.5	The Structure of Muslim Society.....	189
5.2.6	Muslim Sexual Immorality	193
5.2.7	Cowardice	197
5.2.8	Concern with the Material World	198
5.2.9	Deceitfulness.....	200

5.2.10	Prediction of the Crusade.....	203
5.2.11	Praise of Muslims and Evidence of More Tolerant Attitudes.	207
5.3	Conclusion.....	212
6	The <i>Historia Ierosolimitana</i> of Albert of Aachen	215
6.1	Introduction	215
6.1.1	Identity and date.....	215
6.1.2	Sources	216
6.1.3	Characteristics.....	218
6.1.4	Attitude towards Muslims.....	220
6.2	Muslims in Albert of Aachen	223
6.2.1	Terminology.....	223
6.2.2	Muslim beliefs.....	224
6.2.3	Violence by Muslims.	228
6.2.4	Sexual Violence	233
6.2.5	Violence against Muslims.....	236
6.2.6	Structure of Society.....	248
6.2.7	Character Traits of Muslims: Arrogance	252
6.2.8	Alliances and Peace Agreements.	254
6.2.9	Conversion	259
6.2.10	Praise and other indications of sympathy	261
6.3	Conclusion.....	264
7	Ralph of Caen, <i>Tancredus</i>	266
7.1	Introduction	266
7.1.1	Ralph's identity and the date of the <i>Tancredus</i> ..	266
7.1.2	Purpose and Characteristics of the <i>Tancredus</i> . ..	269
7.2	The Depiction of Muslims in Ralph of Caen's <i>Tancredus</i> .	273

7.2.1	Muslim beliefs.	274
7.2.2	The Political Structure of Muslim society	281
7.2.3	Violence Against Muslims	282
7.2.4	Violence by Muslims	285
7.2.5	Cowardice	286
7.2.6	Associations with Satan and Antichrist	288
7.2.7	Prophecy	291
7.2.8	Arrogance	292
7.2.9	Alliances and Treaties.....	293
7.3	Conclusion	293
8	Fulcher of Chartres, <i>Historia Hierosolymitana</i>	296
8.1	Introduction.....	296
8.1.1	Identity and Dating	296
8.1.2	Status as Eyewitness and Relationship to Written	
Sources	298	
8.1.3	Characteristics of the <i>Historia</i>	300
8.2	Muslims in Fulcher's <i>Historia</i>	301
8.2.1	Terminology	302
8.2.2	Muslim Beliefs.....	306
8.2.3	Violence.....	308
8.2.4	Violence against Muslims.....	310
8.2.5	Violence by Muslims	313
8.2.6	Structure of Muslim Society	315
8.2.7	Character traits of Muslims	317
8.2.8	Praise and Tolerance of Muslims	319
8.3	Conclusion	321
9	Conclusion.....	324
9.1	Geographical and Chronological Patterns.....	324

9.2	The Depiction of Islam as an Important Motive for the Revisers of the <i>Gesta Francorum</i>	327
9.3	Terminology	328
9.4	Muslim beliefs	335
9.5	Violence by Muslims	341
9.6	Violence against Muslims	343
9.6.1	The Massacre in Jerusalem	345
9.6.2	Cannibalism	348
9.7	Political Structure of Muslim society	350
9.8	Negative Muslim Character Traits	352
9.9	The Association of Muslims with Evil	359
9.10	The Futility of the Muslim Cause	364
9.11	More Tolerant Attitudes to Muslims	365
9.12	Mirroring	372
9.13	Interest in Muslims	373
10	Appendix I: Raymond of Aguilers, <i>Historia Francorum qui Ceperunt Iherusalem</i>	377
11	Appendix II: The Anonymous Continuation of the Chronicle of Frutolf of Michelsberg.	379
12	Bibliography	383
12.1	Primary sources	383
12.2	Secondary sources	386

Abbreviations

Albert of Aachen

Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, ed. and trans. Susan B. Edgington (Oxford, 2007).

Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Iherosolimitana*

Steven Biddlecombe (ed.), *The Historia Ierosolimitana of Baldric of Bourgueil* (Woodbridge, 2014).

Fulcher of Chartres

Fulcher of Chartres, *Historia Hierosolymitana*, ed. Heinrich Hagenmeyer (Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitaetsbuchhandlung, 1913).

Gesta Francorum

Anonymous, *Gesta Francorum et Aliorum Hierosolimitanorum*, ed. and trans. Rosalind Hill (London, 1962).

Guibert of Nogent

Guibert of Nogent, *Dei Gesta per Francos*, ed. R. B. C. Huygens, *Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Medievalis* 127a (Turnhout: Brepols, 1996).

Ralph of Caen

Ralph of Caen, *Gesta Tancredi in Expeditione Hierosolymitana*, RHC: Historiens Occidentaux III (Paris, 1866).

Raymond of Aguilers

John France, *A Critical Edition of the Historia Francorum of Raymond of Aguilers*, University of Nottingham PhD Thesis, 1967.

Robert the Monk

D. Kempf and M. G. Bull (eds), *The Historia Iherosolimitana of Robert the Monk*, (Woodbridge, 2013).

Tudebode

Peter Tudebode, *Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere*, RHC: Historiens Occidentaux III (Paris, 1866).

1106 Continuation

Franz-Josef Schmale and Irene Schmale-Ott (ed. and trans.), *Frutolfi et Ekkehardi Chronica necnon Anonymi Chronica Imperatorum*, (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1972).

1 Introduction

In introducing his passage explaining the identity of Mohammed and the history of the foundation of Islam, Guibert, abbot of Nogent-sous-Coucy included the following remarks:

I do not think that this profane man lived a very long time ago, since I find that none of the church doctors has written against his licentiousness. Since I have learned nothing about his behaviour and life from writings, no one should be surprised if I am willing to tell what I have heard told in public by some skillful speakers.¹

Although recent scholarship has shown that there was more discussion of Muslims in Western Europe in the years before the First Crusade than has sometimes been appreciated, as Guibert's words illustrate this knowledge was not necessarily known to the authors of accounts of the First Crusade. Knowledge of Islam could be quite localised. For example, Nicholas Morton found evidence of a relatively high level of familiarity with the Turks among people who were in contact with the Byzantine Empire, but essentially no references to them by authors who would not have been.² As Bernard Hamilton and B. Z. Kedar have argued, although there was information available in both written and oral forms, there was not sufficient interest for anyone to attempt to coordinate the knowledge.³ Although they

¹ *'Quem prophanum hominem parvae multum antiquitatis existimo, non ob aliud scilicet nisi quia aecclesiasticorum doctorum neminem contra eis spurcitiam scripsisse repperio. Cuius mores vitamque cum nusquam scripta didicerim, quae a quibusdam disertioribus dici vulgo audierim nulli debet esse mirum si dicere velim.'* Guibert of Nogent, *Dei Gesta per Francos*, ed. R. B. C. Huygens, *Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Medievalis* 127a (Turnhout: Brepols, 1996), 94; idem, *The Deeds of God through the Franks: Gesta Dei per Francos*, trans. Robert Levine (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1997), 32.

² Nicholas Morton, 'Encountering the Turks: The First Crusaders' Foreknowledge of their enemy; Some Preliminary Findings' in Simon John and Nicholas Morton (eds), *Crusading and Warfare in the Middle Ages: Realities and Representations. Essays in honour of John France* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014), 47-68. Morton developed this investigation further in the second chapter of his new work on Muslims in First Crusade sources, published in July of this year. See Nicholas Morton, *Encountering Islam on the First Crusade* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016), 97-110.

³ Bernard Hamilton, 'Knowing the Enemy: Western Understanding of Islam at the Time of the Crusades' in *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 7(3) 1997, 373-387, 373; B. Z. Kedar, *Crusade and Mission* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984), 35.

undoubtedly drew on knowledge that existed in Western Europe (as Guibert suggests with his reference to the oral sources he used) the authors of histories the First Crusade lacked an authoritative source on Islam. As John Tolan noted (and as Guibert clearly recognised himself), the works of those viewed as authoritative in the Middle Ages predated the rise of Islam.⁴ As such, in trying to give more complete depictions of Muslims, authors of crusade accounts for the most part were free to create images of their own, picking and choosing between elements of various available models of religious outsiders and their own observations (or the observations of crusaders they spoke to). This dissertation is concerned with their attempts to cope with the task of explaining the phenomenon of Islam and the character of Muslims to their audience. Lacking an authority on the nature of Islam on which to rely, and influenced by their different intellectual backgrounds, experiences and their own interpretations of the crusade itself, these attempts to explain Islam varied considerably from author to author.

1.1 A Review of the Relevant Literature

Though there have been a number of works published around the subject of the image of Islam in the West, none has taken the exact approach which this study proposes. Many have focussed more on the accuracy of the image than on a close analysis of what it meant to contemporaries and how it was derived. Most have also tended to analyse only a few sources deemed representative over a long period of time, and some have given relatively little consideration to crusading sources. The main works are introduced here.

Broadly speaking, the major book-length studies of medieval Western perception of Islam – R. W. Southern's *Western Views of Islam in the Middle Ages*, Norman Daniel's *Islam and the West*, John V. Tolan's *Saracens* and, most recently, Nicholas Morton's *Encountering Islam on the First Crusade* – tended to take similar approaches, leaving the same room for further analysis.⁵ To a greater or lesser extent, the former three tended to

⁴ John V. Tolan, *Saracens: Islam in the Medieval European Imagination* (New York, 2002), 19.

⁵ Norman Daniel, *Islam and the West: The Making of an Image* (Oxford, 1960, reprinted 1993); R. W. Southern, *Western Views of Islam in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, MA, 1962); Tolan, *Saracens*; Morton, *Encountering Islam on the First Crusade*.

take only a few sources as representative of relatively long periods of time and to discuss crusading sources only (if at all) in terms of the First Crusade before moving on to other aspects of Europeans' image of Islam. Morton, while he does focus closely on the First Crusade, also underappreciates the differences between the Latin narratives for the First Crusade.

Norman Daniel's *Islam and the West: The Making of an Image* is a masterful and impressive work of scholarship, tracing the formation of Western views of Islam through the Middle Ages through a variety of thematic approaches: including western understanding of Islamic beliefs; lives of the Prophet; attitudes to crusade and tolerance; and perception of Muslim morality. Daniel's overall approach was sweeping: although he acknowledged that there had been some variation, he argued that there was a continuous tradition that remained essentially unchanged since the earliest Christian reactions to Islam.⁶ Throughout the work, Daniel was mainly interested in establishing how close to the truth Western writers came, and what sources they relied on and why. He devoted most of his attention to writers who wrote after the period under investigation here, and was more concerned with contrasting the ideas of his authors with what Muslim beliefs were in reality. He rarely referred to Crusade narratives, and then usually only the *Dei Gesta per Francos* of Guibert of Nogent, a source with a highly distinctive understanding of Islam compared to its author's contemporaries. Daniel's approach thus overlooked a great deal of variation and nuance in the sources for the First Crusade, which sometimes contradict the conclusions he drew from a wider range of sources. For example, Daniel dismissed the imputation of idolatry to Muslims as something no educated writer believed.⁷ Although it is not possible to be entirely certain that the authors *believed* what they wrote in this regard, it is certainly not true of the Latin narratives of the First Crusade that only uneducated authors claimed that Muslims worshipped idols, as will be seen in Chapters 3 and 7 and Appendix II.

Southern provides a broad overview of the perception of Islam in Europe throughout the entire medieval period in *Western Views of Islam in the Middle Ages*. The book does not engage in deep analysis of any one period, but makes a case for viewing Western understanding of Islam as falling into three broad phases, the 'Age of Ignorance', the 'Century of

⁶ Daniel, *Islam and the West*, 11.

⁷ Ibid, 338.

Reason and Hope' and the 'Moment of Vision'. The sources for the First Crusade fall more or less between the 'Age of Ignorance' and the 'Century of Reason and Hope,' and as such Southern's analysis of these sources themselves is slight. He argued that the crusade brought a wave of information about Islam, such that by 1120 'everyone in the West had some picture of what Islam meant, and who Mahomet was'. But this picture, in Southern's view, 'was not knowledge, and its details were only accidentally true.'⁸ It was a picture born of triumph, and represented the last part of the 'Age of Ignorance'. Having made this argument, Southern moved on from crusading sources. Southern was the most inclined of these authors to take a select group of sources as representative of a whole period of time, and overlooked a great deal of crusading material entirely.

Tolan presents his investigation in chronological and geographic stages, tracing the development of the European image of Islam from the earliest Eastern Christian responses to the rise of Islam through early Iberian polemic to the First Crusade and on into the thirteenth century, at which point he argues the image of Islam crystallised and was simply recycled by later writers. He describes his aim as being to complement Daniel, who was mainly concerned with the inaccuracy of what he observed and not the reasons why such ideas were believed.⁹ Tolan's analysis of early European and Eastern Christian images of Islam is very thorough, but his analysis of the First Crusade is more limited, and largely repeats his earlier article on the subject.¹⁰ Tolan argued that before the rise of Islam, Christians had established categories for the religious other: Jew, pagan, and heretic. When Christians encountered Muslims, they tried to fit them into one of those categories, "ignoring or distorting" whatever facts did not fit into these pre-established schemata. As such, in contrast to Daniel, the depiction of Muslims as pagans and idolaters is the main focus of his analysis of crusading sources. He relies mostly on Peter Tudebode's *Historia Iherosolymitana* for this discussion. Other crusade sources received considerably less attention. In Tolan's analysis, First Crusade writers made sense of the crusade by interpreting it in terms of 'the age-old struggle between Christianity and paganism.'¹¹ Presenting Muslims as pagans

⁸ Southern, *Western Views of Islam in the Middle Ages*, 28.

⁹ Tolan, *Saracens*, xvii-xviii

¹⁰ John V. Tolan, 'Muslims as Idolaters in Chronicles of the First Crusade' in David R. Blanks and Michael Frassetto (eds.), *Western Views of Islam in Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (Basingstoke and London, 1999), 97-117.

¹¹ *Ibid*, 98.

allowed the crusades to be justified in terms of revenge for the crucifixion.¹² Taking a comparative approach to a wider range of sources, this study has found this interpretation that the approach of the authors to Islam was entirely governed by this model of the struggle between Christians and pagans to be problematic and in need of a great deal of nuance. Tolan discussed Guibert of Nogent's idea of Islam as heresy and Mohammed as heresiarch separately, in a chapter which was mostly focused on non-crusading sources which also subscribed to this interpretation. As mentioned above, Daniel saw this as the learned, if not the 'official' image of Islam. However, as Tolan points out, the picture was not so simple: crusade histories, 'nothing if not "clerical" in outlook', described Muslims as pagans, and Guibert famously attributed his account of Mohammed's life and the foundation of Islam to the *plebeia opinio*.¹³ Tolan discussed crusading texts in much further detail than Daniel and Southern, but he considered only a small number – primarily Tudebode, Guibert of Nogent and the *Chanson d'Antioche*, and to a lesser extent Raymond of Aguilers. Tolan also viewed the ideas he discusses – Islam as idolatry or as heresy – as deliberate propaganda, but this study has found no convincing evidence that the authors did not sincerely believe the information about Islam they provided to be accurate. It is indeed possible that they did not, but essentially unprovable.

Morton covers the First Crusade in far more detail than the authors discussed above, but his approach differs in key respects from this dissertation, and the questions Morton chose to investigate in detail do not entirely overlap with this work. Morton found that the crusaders differentiated considerably between the Turks and the Saracens, and drew their information from Eastern Christians as well as from their own traditions. He also noted, expanding on an article on the same subject, that news of the Turks had reached some areas of Western Europe before the crusade.¹⁴ Morton investigated whether western Christian elites were any more interested in 'Saracens' after the crusade, a discussion which falls outside of the parameters of this thesis. He also argued the process of Islamicisation of the Turks may actually not have been complete, complicating the question of whether the crusaders were always fighting

¹² Ibid, 100, 105, 109.

¹³ Ibid, 135-7; Sini Kangas, 'Inimicus Dei et Sanctae Christianitatis? Saracens and their Prophet in twelfth-century crusade propaganda and western travesties of Mohammed's life', in Conor Kostick (ed.), *The Crusades and the Near East* (Abingdon, 2011), 131-160.

¹⁴ Morton, 'Encountering the Turks', 47-68.

‘Muslims’ (though there is little if any evidence to suggest that the crusaders themselves had any understanding of this, if it was the case).

Morton treated the eyewitness sources and the ‘later’ sources (still primarily those sources of the very early twelfth century that are considered here) separately, but this study has not found compelling evidence of systematic differences in their treatment of Muslims. Like Tolan, Daniel and Southern, he is also inclined to take a small selection of sources as indicative of the rest, not recognising the variation – as a result of which, this study will dispute a number of his findings.¹⁵

Another book-length study of relevance is Léan Ní Chléirigh’s doctoral thesis, *The Crusaders and their Enemies: The Latin Terminology of Group Identity in Chronicles of the First Crusade*. Ní Chléirigh’s thesis laid valuable groundwork for this study. As the title implies, Muslims are only one of the groups Ní Chléirigh is concerned with, the others being the crusaders themselves and Orthodox and other Eastern Christians. Her primary concern was with the terminology used to refer to Muslims – *saraceni*, *pagani*, *barbarae nationes*, to name just a few – but she also included short analyses of the overall representation of Islam in the number of First Crusade sources which she used.¹⁶ She provides valuable insight into the subtle variations in approach to Muslims taken by these authors. This is a relatively small part of her thesis, which is mainly concerned with terminology and not exclusively terminology applied to Muslims. Nevertheless, her work provides a sound foundation on which to build an investigation into the depiction of Muslims in First Crusade sources more broadly. In particular her analysis of the precise meaning and origins of the terminology used to denote Muslims is extremely valuable.¹⁷

David R. Blanks and Michael Frassetto’s edited volume *Western Views of Islam in Medieval and Early Modern Europe: Perception of Other* contains several articles relevant to this thesis. In their introduction, they

¹⁵ For example, this study disagrees with Morton’s conclusions that most authors thought Mohammed was a god of the Muslims, that they literally believed the Turks were descended from the Parthians, and that the authors generally distinguished the Turks and Saracens on ethnic as well as religious grounds. See Conclusion.

¹⁶ The sources Ní Chléirigh examined in detail were the *Gesta Francorum*, the *Historia Ierosolimitana* of Baldric of Bourgueil, the *Historia Francorum qui Ceperunt Iherusalem* of Raymond of Aguilers, the *Historia Iherosolimitana* of Albert of Aachen and the *Chronicon* attributed to Ekkehard of Aura. She did not examine the accounts of Guibert of Nogent, Robert the Monk or Fulcher of Chartres.

¹⁷ Léan Ní Chléirigh, *The Crusaders and their Enemies: The Latin Terminology of Group Identity in Chronicles of the First Crusade* (Unpublished PhD Thesis, Trinity College Dublin, 2010).

argue that the encounter with the Muslim Other 'was elemental to the shaping of the Western world views.' The production of an image of Muslims as 'cowardly, duplicitous, lustful, self-indulgent pagans who worshipped idols and a trinity of false gods' allowed Western Christians to define themselves: 'Indeed, the Muslim became, in a sense, a photographic negative of the self-perception of an ideal Christian self-image.'¹⁸ The most relevant articles in the book are by Blanks and Jo Ann Hoepfner Moran Cruz (Tolan also has a chapter, but it is superseded by his more extensive treatment of the same subject in his monograph discussed above). Blanks's and Moran Cruz's articles show that modern scholars have a tendency to assume too much uniformity with regard to medieval images of Islam. Blanks emphasizes the idea that pre-modern perceptions of Islam were more varied and complex than generally held.¹⁹ Moran Cruz's analysis confirms that this also applies to popular vernacular literature, though that will not be a central consideration for this thesis.²⁰ Blanks's central contention is the variety of medieval ideas, something he accuses Daniel and Southern of ignoring in an attempt to 'account for everything by forcing viewpoints into preestablished categories.'²¹ He criticises Daniel particularly harshly for failing to analyse medieval ideas on their own terms, instead judging medieval authors for their failure to engage honestly with Islam.²² He calls for a better theoretical framework to recover past attitudes, recognising how texts are produced by the confluence of the author's individuality and the uniqueness of events described, and how stereotypes are used to make sense of the unfamiliar and should not be viewed as mere prejudices.²³ As outlined below, this thesis will give full consideration to the individualities of authors and the events they described, and the nature and sources of the stereotypes and images of Islam they constructed and adopted, in an attempt to understand them on their own terms.

¹⁸ David R. Blanks and Michael Frassetto (eds.), *Western Views of Islam in Medieval and Early Modern Europe: Perception of Other* (Basingstoke and London, 1999), 1-10.

¹⁹ ¹⁹ David R. Blanks, 'Western Views of Islam in the Premodern Period: A Brief History of Past Approaches', in David R. Blanks and Michael Frassetto (eds.), *Western Views of Islam in Medieval and Early Modern Europe: Perception of Other* (Basingstoke and London, 1999), 11-54, 19.

²⁰ Blanks and Frassetto, *Western Views of Islam in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, p. 4; Joe Ann Hoepfner Moran Cruz, 'Popular Attitudes towards Islam in Medieval Europe', in David R. Blanks and Michael Frassetto (eds.), *Western Views of Islam in Medieval and Early Modern Europe: Perception of Other* (Basingstoke and London, 1999), 55-82.

²¹ Blanks, 'Western Views of Islam in the Premodern Period', 13-14.

²² *Ibid.*, 2,

²³ *Ibid.*, 39-40.

There have also been a number of other works over the years offering either briefer overviews or more detailed analyses of specific aspects of the image of Islam in the West. One of the earliest was Dana Carleton Munro's presidential address to the Medieval Academy of America on Western attitudes to Muslims throughout the crusading period, later published in *Speculum*. Munro provides a broad overview of the development of Western attitudes to Islam from the First Crusade to the end of the thirteenth century. Though he points out many of the ways in which Muslims were represented as Other, his analysis is largely descriptive. Munro's main aim was to make a case for the evolution of ideas over time: he saw the crusades as a major turning point in the Western attitude to Islam. What little thought Muslims were given before was largely positive, he argued. In response to the crusades, a great deal of propaganda against Muslims began to be produced, but increased contact between Muslims and Christians in the crusader states led to many prejudices being dispelled.²⁴

Munro's contention that hatred of Muslims gradually lessened due to increased contact has more recently been contested in an article by Norman Housley.²⁵ Housley argues that settlers pragmatically adopted a '*modus vivendi*' with their Muslim neighbours, but their underlying worldview was not dissimilar to the crusaders'. Rather than increased contact lessening hatred of Muslims, the crusades exerted a major and continual force for viewing Muslims as inherently alien enemies. This aspect of his argument is less relevant to the subject at hand, but Housley also argued that this malignant effect of the crusades occurred despite their having been essentially 'Eurocentric' in nature. By this Housley meant that the crusades were not inherently anti-Islamic, but were ventures primarily concerned with the personal salvation of the participants and the physical locations and relics of the Holy Land. This left the Muslim enemy comparatively marginalised in accounts of the crusades, and explains why their authors were content with so much imprecision and contradiction.²⁶ A similar argument was advanced by Morton, though the true extent to which the authors lacked interest in Muslims will be questioned in the conclusion of this thesis.²⁷ Housley argued that the the assumption in the sources that Muslims were polytheistic,

²⁴ Munro, 'The Western Attitude toward Islam during the Period of the Crusades', 335-9, 330-34.

²⁵ Norman Housley, 'The Crusades and Islam' in *Medieval Encounters* 13 (2007), 189-208.

²⁶ Ibid, 191-4, 196.

²⁷ Morton, *Encountering Islam on the First Crusade*, 270-3.

idolatrous pagans was rooted in their association of Islam with the pagans faced by the early church, which they chose because it was, 'by far the easiest model to apply'.²⁸ This thesis will question this argument, similar to Tolan's, that the sources adhered closely to Patristic or classical depictions of paganism as models for Islam. It will also show that, while interest in Islam might fairly be described as limited, the authors considered here all gave some attention – sometimes quite a lot – to their depiction of Islam. Indeed, in cases where the authors are known to have used another surviving source, they always altered its depiction of Islam. It is clear that they were concerned at least with presenting what they saw as the correct portrayal of Islam, if not always with investigating thoroughly enough to correct their mistakes and present a complete and accurate depiction.

The *Gesta Francorum*'s most recent editor and translator, Rosalind Hill, drew mostly on that source for an article on the Christian view of Muslims at the time of the First Crusade.²⁹ Though the article is largely descriptive, she provides a fair summary of much of the image of Islam presented in accounts of the First Crusade. She describes the general assumption of polytheism, the imputation of idolatry, associations with astrology and magic, and Guibert's interpretation of Islam as heresy.³⁰ She is somewhat over-inclined to view the First Crusaders' image of Islam positively, however, concluding that although religious toleration in a modern sense was impossible, 'there was always, I think, a certain amount of mutual respect.'³¹ This is a problematic analysis; though the more positive representations she cites (and others) do exist, her interpretation ignores a vast amount of far harsher depictions, and a casual attitude to, even a delight in, the deaths of Muslims in many sources.

Susannah Throop's analysis of the interpretation of crusading as an act of vengeance by contemporary authors is relevant insofar as this interpretation affected the depiction of Muslims, especially by Robert the Monk. Contrary to previous arguments that this was mostly a factor in the works of the earliest authors, Throop found that it was barely to be found at all in the works of the eyewitness authors, and was far more prominent in the

²⁸ Housley, 'The Crusades and Islam,' 197.

²⁹ Rosalind Hill, 'The Christian view of the Muslims at the time of the First Crusade' in P. M. Holt (ed.) *The Eastern Mediterranean Lands in the Period of the Crusades* (Warminster, 1977), 1-8.

³⁰ Ibid, 3-6.

³¹ Ibid, 2-3, 6-7.

works of non-participant authors and authors later than those considered here.³² Throop found that this was not the predominant theme in their works, of which there were many, such as martyrdom, pilgrimage and the imitation of Christ, but they emphasised the point more than the participants. The justification of violence against Muslims as vengeance for their previous mistreatment of Christians is found to some extent in all of the non-eyewitness accounts (to a minor extent in the work of Ralph of Caen, but ‘clearly’ set out in the works of Albert of Aachen, Baldric of Bourgueil and Raymond of Aguilers).³³ The more specific idea of the crusade itself as punishment of Muslims by God enacted through the crusaders is also found in the works of the *Gesta* revisers, as Throop noted.³⁴ As will be shown, however, it is a considerably more prominent theme in the work of Robert the Monk than Throop recognised, and deeply affected his depiction of Muslims. The idea of crusading as vengeance in the other accounts where it is to be found is also important context for their depiction of Muslims, as it justified – often explicitly – the often extreme violence committed by crusaders against them.

Over the years there have also been many articles focused more closely on specific issues which are relevant to this work. Bernard Hamilton was primarily concerned with the discovery and spread of accurate ideas about Islam. He argues that despite the ‘inauspicious’ beginnings of the wild inaccuracies found in many crusade sources, ultimately the increased contact which the crusades caused gradually led to greater information on Islam being available and a more accurate picture to be developed.³⁵ Sini Kangas analysed Guibert of Nogent’s account of the life of Mohammed and the foundation of Islam in the *Dei Gesta per Francos* in the context of three other near-contemporary travesties of the life of the prophet: Embrico of Mainz’s *Vita Mahumeti* (c.1100), Gautier of Compiegne’s *Otia de Machomete* (1137-55) and Adelphus’s *Vita Machometi* (c. 1150). These texts deliberately mocked Mohammed, intended not to inform but to attack the basis of Muslim belief and encourage participation in the crusades. But Kangas’s main interest was in detecting a level of genuine engagement with

³² Susanna Throop, *Crusading as an act of Vengeance*, 1095-1216 (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011), 46-9.

³³ *Ibid.*, 196.

³⁴ Throop, *Crusading as an act of Vengeance*, 51, 55, 173.

³⁵ Bernard Hamilton, ‘Knowing the Enemy: Western Understanding of Islam at the Time of the Crusades’ in *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 7(3) 1997, 373-387, 374.

the ideas of Islam in the polemics of these scholars. As she argued, it has been assumed because of the absurdity of their accusations that the writers of accounts like these were unfamiliar with the tenets of Islam, but in fact they display certain surprisingly accurate details. The *Vitae* were polemical, but they were clearly based on Muslim tradition (such as Mohammed's first marriage to a wealthy widow and his association with Bahira, a Christian monk), 'however blasphemous their interpretation would have seemed to any Muslim'.³⁶ Kangas also noted that many of the themes expressed in the *vitae* are also characteristic of the image of the heretic analysed in R. I. Moore's *Formation of a Persecuting Society*, a work which examined the development of images of heretics, Jews and lepers as 'other' roughly simultaneously with the development of the image of Muslims.³⁷

Joshua C. Birk provided a detailed analysis of the role of conversion of Muslims in the siege of Antioch as treated by the *Gesta* and its revisors. Although the approach Birk takes is similar to the approach of this thesis, the analysis presented here disagrees strongly with his conclusion that the authors were uncomfortable with the idea of the conversion of Muslims to Christianity.³⁸ In a broader chronological analysis, Adam Knobler demonstrated a trope which appears again and again throughout later sources: potential Muslim allies against those in control of the Holy Land were presented as having either converted, considered conversion or as having Christian ancestry.³⁹ Although this trope can be detected in the sources of the First Crusade, as will be shown it had by no means come to be seen as essential for rendering accounts of alliances acceptable. In a number of articles, Svetlana Luchitskaya has discussed the terminology used by the crusade authors to distinguish the various *nationes* of Muslims, as well as their depiction of the political structures of Muslims.⁴⁰ Alan V. Murray examined the use of the place-name *Coroscane* in the *chansons* and the

³⁶ Kangas, 'Saracens and their Prophet', 135.

³⁷ Ibid, p. 149; R. I. Moore, *The Formation of a Persecuting Society: Authority and Deviance in Western Europe 950-1250* (Second edition: Oxford, 2007 (originally published: 1987)).

³⁸ Joshua C. Birk, 'The Betrayal of Antioch: Narratives of Conversion and Conquest during the First Crusade' in *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 41 (3) (2011), 463-487.

³⁹ Adam Knobler, 'Pseudo-Conversions and Patchwork Pedigrees: The Christianisation of Muslim Princes and the Diplomacy of Holy War', in *Journal of World History* 7(2) 1996, 181-197.

⁴⁰ Svetlana Luchitskaya, 'Barbarae Nationes: Les peuples musulmans dans les chroniques de la Première Croisade' in Michel Balard (ed) *Autour de la Première Croisade* (Paris, 1996), 99-107; idem, 'The Muslim Political World as Mirrored in the First Crusade Chronicles', in Adrian J. Boas (ed), *The Crusader World* (Oxford: Routledge, 2016) [ebook], 1411.0 - 1451.8.

histories, showing that while it was based on the real region of Khorosan, it was given greater prominence in the works of western Christian authors because of the association of the similarly-named Biblical town of Chorazin with apocalyptic tradition.⁴¹ Jay Rubenstein has written on the subject of the cannibalism that was widely reported to have taken place at Ma'arrat an-Nu'man in 1098, an incident which 'resisted any attempt at integration' into a celebratory narrative of the crusade.⁴² Rubenstein concluded that cannibalism occurred as a response to famine on several occasions (most of the others only being mentioned in vernacular or Greek sources), but by the time of the siege of Ma'arrat an-Nu'man the utility of the act as psychological warfare to terrify Muslims was recognised, and so this incident was the most public and memorable. Rubenstein also argued that cannibalising Muslims was justifiable to the crusaders as an element of Holy War, though this assertion will be disputed in the conclusion of this thesis.⁴³

1.1.1 The Depiction of Muslims in sources predating the First Crusade

As mentioned above, recent scholarship has given attention to the depiction of Muslims in eleventh-century sources predating the First Crusade that is long overdue. As part of a dissertation on the roots of crusading ideology in the eleventh century, Axel Kelly demonstrated that a number of ideas about Muslims found in the First Crusade sources can also be found in eleventh-century sources, especially those concerning the Mahdia campaign of 1087 and the conquest of Sicily (1061-1091). Kelly found that there was no single consistent portrayal of Muslims in these earlier sources (as indeed there was not in the crusade sources), but certain terminology and ideas do occur in both the crusade sources and these earlier writings. Muslims were referred to as pagans in the *Historia Francorum* of Adémar of Chabannes (989-1034); in accounts of the Great German Pilgrimage of 1064-5; in the accounts concerning Sicily of Amatus of Montecassino and Geoffrey of Malaterra; and even in the letters of Gregory VII.⁴⁴ Kelly does not discuss

⁴¹ Alan V. Murray, 'Coroscan: Homeland of the Saracens in the *Chanson de geste* and The Historiography of the Crusades', in Hans van Dijk and Willem Noomen (eds) *Aspects de l'Épopée Romane: Mentalité, Idéologies, Intertextualités* (Groningen, 1995), 177-184.

⁴² Jay Rubenstein, 'Cannibals and Crusaders', *French Historical Studies* 31 (4) 2008, 525-52, 526.

⁴³ Rubenstein, 'Cannibals and Crusaders', 550-1.

⁴⁴ Axel James Johnston Kelly, *Charting the Development of Crusading Ideology: An examination of proto-crusade primary sources*, (Unpublished PhD Thesis, Trinity College Dublin, 2015), 199-202

the precise meaning of this term in these contexts in depth, but does note that like Guibert of Nogent, sources such as the *Carmen in Victoriam Pisanorum* (concerning the Mahdia campaign) and Amatus of Montecassino's *Ystoire de li Normants* referred to Muslims as both pagans and heretics. Kelly also found that the association of Muslims with diabolic forces was common in these earlier sources, as was the comparison of Muslims to the enemies of the Children of Israel in the Old Testament.⁴⁵ Kelly also found elements of the parallel tradition of Islam as a monotheist heresy (of which Guibert of Nogent's crusade history is a part) in eleventh-century sources, such as the works of Radulf Glaber (†1047), Amatus of Montecassino and the *Carmen in Victoriam Pisanorum*.⁴⁶

Similarly, as mentioned above, Morton has investigated the degree to which information about the Turks had spread to the West before the crusade. He found little evidence to suggest that there was widespread knowledge, but that there would have been a degree of understanding of who the Turks were in some circles: some Italian monasteries whose members had travelled to the East, some Italian Norman chroniclers whose informants had served as mercenaries for the Byzantine Empire, and the family of Count Robert I of Flanders, who had made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem and met the Byzantine Emperor on his way home via Constantinople and was prevailed upon to provide some military assistance for the empire.⁴⁷ It does not seem likely that the authors discussed here borrowed directly from any of the works used by Kelly, and although Morton's conclusion suggests that the *Gesta Francorum* author is likely to have had some knowledge of the Turks before setting out on crusade, this does not apply to the other authors. A close comparison of these sources to the crusade histories is beyond the scope of the present work, and a future work of synthesis would be of immense value. Nevertheless it can be observed here on the basis of the above that at least some of the ideas found in the early Latin prose narratives of the First Crusade were circulating in Europe before the crusade, and may thus have influenced the perceptions of the authors.

⁴⁵ Ibid, 209-214, 218-19.

⁴⁶ Ibid, 226-7.

⁴⁷ Morton, 'Encountering the Turks', *passim*; idem, *Encountering Islam on the First Crusade*, 97-110.

1.2 Methodology

As indicated, although there has been work done around the subject of the representation of Islam in medieval writing, where such work has dealt with crusade sources at all it has tended to treat the sources as a single corpus. This approach does not give enough attention to the great degree of variation between the First Crusade sources and the individuality of the authors of the accounts in their depictions of Muslims, as observed by Blanks in the article discussed above. In her chapter on the depiction of Islam for *Palgrave Advances in the Crusades*, Margaret Jubb similarly noted that, prompted by postmodernism, scholars have begun to reject ‘universalizing’ tendencies: ‘They have thus replaced the erroneous idea that the crusaders’ perceptions of their opponents were uniform and static, and predominantly negative, with more nuanced views.’⁴⁸ This thesis will contribute to this discussion by conducting a minute investigation of the language used by the authors to deal with Islam and the culture and manners of Muslims with an emphasis on identifying the ways in which they differed from one another. The great extent of this variation is the central finding of this thesis.

This study will make use of the techniques of *Begriffsgeschichte*, a branch of the history of ideas concerned with the history of concepts, to investigate the meanings of the words used to describe Muslims and the ways in which the authors conceptualised the crusaders’ enemies.⁴⁹ This kind of study lends itself well to the technique of detailed textual analysis of a wide range of primary sources. The purpose is to identify and analyse the language and ideas used to characterise Muslims as alien, while simultaneously searching out the earlier history of the terminology, to determine the extent to which authors were drawing from their own education and in particular whether they were finding methods of interpreting Islam in Christian tradition previously used for non-Christian groups and applying them to Muslims. This study will conduct a textual analysis on the original Latin used, in order to compare the content of the references to discover what they reveal about how the author’s attitudes to and understanding of Islam varied from one another. In studying the Latin

⁴⁸ Margaret Jubb, ‘The Crusaders’ perceptions of their opponents’ in Helen J. Nicholson (ed.) *Palgrave Advances in the Crusades* (Basingstoke and New York, 2005), 225-244, 226.

⁴⁹ See Melvin Richter, ‘*Begriffsgeschichte* and the History of Ideas’, *Journal of the History of Ideas* 48 (2) 1987, 247-263.

terminology and the imagery used by authors of Crusade accounts, one is also inevitably drawn into an investigation into their reading (both secular and religious) and how this influenced them. This too varied from author to author, with no one kind of source of information predominating. In order to develop a full understanding, a close reading of the texts will be required to identify the literary traditions and intellectual framework on which they rely. An important aspect of this will be the identification of key terms and concepts, and an investigation into how they were used, how fixed they were, and if they can be traced to biblical or classical roots – or, indeed, if some new ideas find expression in the context of the Crusades.

The nature of the inquiry will also determine the kinds of sources which are suitable. Shorter chronicles, letters and charters are less suitable for this research than the longer histories of the Crusade, as the intellectual framework of their authors is all-but impossible to reconstruct, except in cases where a significant body of other work by the author survives. On the other hand, while later or reworked sources can be of questionable utility to other historians, lacking the credibility and accuracy of eyewitnesses, they will prove highly useful for this study. In the case of reworked accounts, they show how the original was understood by the editor. As indicated, this study has not found strong patterns of difference between earlier and later accounts, or accounts by participants and those who had remained in Europe. The attitudes of the authors have proved to be more individual than this, but nevertheless it was an important question to investigate and demanded the use of all such sources. Much later sources dealing with the First Crusade (such as, for example, the Chronicle of William of Tyre) would be a valuable area for future study, providing insight into the evolution of attitudes over the twelfth century, but this is beyond the scope of a single dissertation.

This thesis will examine the treatment of Muslims in accounts of the First Crusade because these accounts created a distinct context for references to Islam which needs to be investigated in its own right. They were based to a great extent on actual contact with Islam, in the context of war, and needed to represent Muslims as an enemy to their audience. This thesis will focus exclusively on Latin narrative accounts. Although there is overlap as discussed below, Latin chronicles form a distinct corpus of literature separate to the vernacular accounts of the crusades. They require investigation in their own right before comparison with the vernacular literature can effectively be made. It would not be possible to give sufficient

analysis to both types of source in one doctoral thesis. Similarly, although there would be great value in comparing the crusading material to roughly contemporary sources dealing with Spain and Sicily, there is such a wealth of sources relating to the First Crusade that to deal with it adequately does not leave room for a detailed comparison with these other centres of contact with Muslims.

An important question which arises from this approach to the sources individually is whether any pattern can be detected in the ways they varied from one another. Authors who wrote later might be expected to have different views and understanding regarding Muslims than authors who wrote earlier, as more information might have become available or as passions inflamed by the crusade cooled. Likewise authors who wrote in Europe might be expected to have had less access to information than authors who participated in the crusade personally, or to have had different attitudes – whether their distance from the conflict might have made them more impartial or their lack of personal contact with Muslims made them seem all the more alien. As will be shown, however, such patterns do not exist. Authors were for the most part either more or less hostile to or more or less knowledgeable about Muslims according to their own individual tendencies, not to any discernible pattern. There is a weak pattern in that the three Northern French monks who produced their histories by revising the *Gesta Francorum* were somewhat more hostile to Muslims than their *fons formalis*, but even then, it is something of a stretch to fit the *Historia Ierosolimitana* of Baldric of Bourgueil into this framework.

The best structure to maximise the effectiveness of this approach has been to deal with each of the sources used individually within dedicated chapters, to better allow for a close examination of their depiction of Islam. This is followed by a detailed conclusion which functions as a comparative section, providing an analysis of how the treatment of a range of different themes identified in the chapters differed from author to author, for a variety of reasons. The conclusion also provides an opportunity to highlight tendencies which appear strongly only in one or two works but are detectable to a lesser degree in others, as well as to discuss more overarching questions such as geographical and chronological patterns in the depiction of Muslims by different authors (or the lack thereof).

1.3 Sources

In drawing the parameters for this dissertation, some works had to be excluded. This dissertation is concerned only with the first generation of histories of the First Crusade, all of which were begun by the end of the first decade of the twelfth century, although the authors of some of the accounts did not finish working on them until later. The narrative sources used here are the *Gesta Francorum*, Robert the Monk's *Historia Iherosolimitana*, Guibert of Nogent's *Dei Gesta per Francos*, Baldric of Bourgueil's *Historia Ierosolimitana*, Albert of Aachen's *Historia Ierosolimitana* and Ralph of Caen's *Tancredus* and Fulcher of Chartres' *Historia Hierosolymitana*. Several accounts consulted during research for this thesis are not treated in detail here: these are the *Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere* by Peter Tudebode, the *Historia Francorum qui Ceperunt Iherusalem* by Raymond of Aguilers, and the anonymous continuation of the chonicle of Frutolf of Michelsberg formerly attributed to Ekkehard of Aura.⁵⁰ These sources were all limited in their treatment of the subject-matter, or in Tudebode's case, adhered so closely to his source (the *Gesta Francorum*) that only a few changes are relevant – though they are important. There are a small number of statements or longer vignettes each of these authors included that are used in the conclusion, but nothing on the scale of the authors treated in full in Chapters 1-8.

2 The Anonymous *Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolymitanorum*

The *Gesta Francorum* is now usually agreed to be the earliest surviving record of the First Crusade, completed soon after the capture of Jerusalem and with earlier sections possibly even written as the crusade progressed. The chronicle is also generally accepted to have been used – to a greater or lesser extent – by most other contemporary historians of the First Crusade, even other eyewitnesses. The *Gesta Francorum* was the principal source of information for Robert the Monk, Baldric of Dol and Guibert of Nogent, three erudite northern French churchmen who revised the account to

⁵⁰ On the complicated question of the authorship of the various continuators of Frutolf, see Appendix II.

improve its rhetoric, add sophistication to its theological message, and, as will be seen, to alter its depiction of Muslims. Raymond of Aguilers, though writing on the basis of his own observations, is also believed to have consulted the *Gesta*, and Fulcher of Chartres relied on it for extended parts of the crusade which he did not personally witness, having joined Baldwin of Boulogne's expedition to Edessa. Of the authors considered in this thesis, only Albert of Aachen and Ralph of Caen seem to have been completely free of the *Gesta*'s influence.

Often formerly thought of as the extremely basic work of an uneducated knight, in recent years more and more sophistication has been attributed to the *Gesta Francorum* – although it does remain perhaps the simplest of these contemporary First Crusade histories. The debate about the author's clerical or lay status shows no sign of abating, but is not of great importance to this thesis – even if he was a knight, we have no other knightly perspective with which to compare the *Gesta*, and so even where the author differs from his contemporaries we would have no way of telling general trends in lay opinion from his own idiosyncrasies. The *Gesta Francorum*'s depiction of Muslims does not conform to an overall plan advanced by the author, frequently being beholden more to narrative concerns than to a coherent message about the enemy faced by the crusaders. The depiction is hostile and othering, but not unremittingly so.

2.1.1 Date

According to the *Gesta*'s most recent editor, Rosalind Hill, the first nine books of the account were written before the author left Antioch in 1098, and the final, longest book at Jerusalem before 1101, probably not long after the Battle of Ascalon. Whether or not Hill is correct about this two-stage writing process, 1101 is generally accepted as the latest possible date of completion for the *Gesta Francorum*. One of the pieces of evidence given for this date is quite problematic. In 1101 the author of the work attributed to Ekkehard, later abbot of Aura, saw 'a little book' which described the conquest while on pilgrimage to Jerusalem; Hagenmeyer believed that this book must have been the *Gesta Francorum*.⁵¹ However, as

⁵¹ Hagenmeyer, *Gesta Francorum*, 1. Hagenmeyer was referring to the following statement in the chronicle which was at the time attributed to Ekkehard: '*Legimus Iherosolime libellum a loco presenti totam huius historie seriem diligentissime...*' *Frutolfi et Ekkehardi Chronica necnon Anonymi Chronica Imperatorum*, ed. and trans. Franz-Josef Schmale and Irene Schmale-Ott (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1972), 148. On the possibility that Ekkehard was not in fact the

John France points out, Ekkehard did not actually use the *Gesta Francorum* for the account of the First Crusade in his chronicle, and so we have no evidence with which to judge whether that *libellus* was truly the *Gesta*. France has criticised the early dating of the *Gesta Francorum* by Hagenmeyer as being based in part on the supposedly primitive style of the *Gesta*.⁵² But while the *Gesta*'s reputation as a primitive work has been steadily chipped away by recent scholarship, as discussed below, there are other reasons for believing it was completed early. It betrays no foreknowledge of later events: in particular, the *Gesta* mentions the election of Godfrey of Bouillon to rule Jerusalem in 1099, but not his death and the succession of his brother Baldwin I in 1100.⁵³ Likewise, the author mentions the election of Arnulf of Chocques as patriarch of Jerusalem at the same point in the narrative, but not his displacement in favour of Daimbert of Pisa at the end of 1099, suggesting a date of completion very soon after the last events depicted (the battle of Ascalon in August 1099). Arnulf is described as 'a most wise and honourable man (*sapientissimum et honorabilem*)'; there is no hint of the controversy that would arise surrounding his election.⁵⁴ It is possible the author was a partisan of Arnulf's and so chose not to mention his later displacement, but there is no such potential explanation for the absence of any information about Godfrey's death, and so an early date of completion remains likely. Furthermore, there are convincing internal reasons for believing that Fulcher of Chartres began writing his account between 1101 and 1102. While Ekkehard did not use the *Gesta*, Fulcher did, so it is very likely to have been completed by 1101, if not earlier, as suggested by the apparent lack of foreknowledge about Godfrey and Arnulf (in either case it was certainly completed before the first redaction of Fulcher's work began to circulate in 1106).⁵⁵

original author of this statement, see Thomas J. H. McCarthy, *Chronicles of the Investiture Contest: Frutolf of Micklesberg and his continuators* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2014), 44-8; and see also appendix II.

⁵² 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 of the First Crusade' in John France and William G. Zajac (eds), *The Crusades and their Sources: Essays presented to Bernard Hamilton* (Farnham: Ashgate, 1998), 29-70, 41.

⁵³ *Gesta Francorum*, 92.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵⁵ On the dating of Fulcher's account, see 8.1.1..

2.1.2 The Author's Identity

The identity of the *Gesta Francorum*'s author has been the source of an enduring controversy. His nationality is uncontroversial; the text abounds with evidence that he was a southern Italian Norman in the service of Bohemond of Taranto, probably later joining the retinue of Raymond of Toulouse when Bohemond remained at Antioch. He called Bohemond *dominus* and lavished him with laudatory epithets (*prudens*, *sapiens*); he knew the names of minor figures in Bohemond's army but sometimes made errors with the names of even the noblest northern leaders; he knew little of Godfrey of Bouillon and Raymond of Toulouse's journeys to the Holy Land.⁵⁶ Far more controversial is the author's social status: was he a cleric or a knight?⁵⁷ To an extent, the belief that the *Gesta* author was a knight is based on now-outdated assumptions about the degree of sophistication of his writing. Not only was he relatively uneducated, in the view of earlier historians, the standpoint of the *Gesta* was clearly that of someone who was (at least on occasion) in the thick of the action. Both of these assumptions have been challenged more recently. While he is not on the level of a Guibert of Nogent, the *Gesta* author displays considerably more sophistication in his writing than previously recognised. Léan Ní Chléirigh has also recently shown how his use of words like *nos* when describing battles was more likely a rhetorical device intended to convey the unity of the crusaders to the reader; indeed, he writes in these terms even for events at which he could not have been present personally. His usage of these terms was also usually preserved by Peter Tudebode, a self-identified cleric who relied closely on the *Gesta Francorum* to produce his account.⁵⁸ Authors like Conor Kostick still support the idea that the author might have been a knight, albeit an educated one – perhaps someone who had received some clerical training before being recalled to secular life by the needs of his family, as

⁵⁶ Hill, *Gesta Francorum*, xi-xii.

⁵⁷ For discussion of this see Hill, *Gesta Francorum*, xi-xvi; Emily Albu, 'Probing the Passions of a Norman Crusader: The *Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum*,' in *Anglo-Norman Studies 27: Proceedings of the Battle Conference 2004*, ed. John Gillingham (Woodbridge, Suffolk, 2005), 2-14; idem, *The Normans in their Histories: Propaganda, Myth and Subversion* (Woodbridge, 2001), 149-150; Conor Kostick, 'A further discussion on the authorship of the *Gesta Francorum*,' in *Reading Medieval Studies* 35 (2009), 1-14, *passim*; Colin Morris, 'The *Gesta Francorum* as Narrative History,' in *Reading Medieval Studies* 19 (1993), 55-71, 64-66; Jean Flori, *Chroniqueurs et Propagandistes: Introduction critique aux sources de la première croisade* (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 2010), 72.

⁵⁸ Ní Chléirigh, *The Crusaders and their Enemies*, 34-5.

was indeed the case with Baldwin of Boulogne.⁵⁹ Kostick further argued that the prejudices of a member of the knightly class are evident throughout the *Gesta*. Albu in fact argued the opposite, but either way, this does not necessarily prove the author was actually a knight.⁶⁰ As Guibert of Nogent is known for demonstrating, joining the clergy did not necessarily make one immune to the prejudices of one's family background.⁶¹ The question remains unresolved.

2.1.3 Possible Sources of the *Gesta Francorum*.

While the general consensus is that the *Gesta* was written on the basis of what the author witnessed (albeit, it is safe to assume, with at least some descriptions of events he did not personally see from fellow crusaders), there have been other interpretations. It was originally believed that the *Gesta Francorum* was based on Peter Tudebode's account rather than vice versa; it is presented in the *Receuil des Historiens des Croisades* with the alternate title '*Tudebodus Abbreviatus*'.⁶² Since the works of Hagenmeyer and Bréhier, however, this view has found little favour. More recently, it was suggested by Tudebode's translators, John and Laurita Hill, that a now lost source was used by the *Gesta Francorum* author and Tudebode, Raymond of Aguilers and Daimbert of Pisa independently – possibly, they thought, the *libellus* described by Ekkehard of Aura. Selective use of this source explains the differences and similarities between the authors.⁶³ John France made a persuasive case against this, and it is certainly unlikely that Raymond shared a common source with the other two authors; but the argument that the *Gesta* and Tudebode may have shared a common source was recently defended by Flori.⁶⁴ A recently discovered manuscript, bearing the title *Peregrinatio Antiochie ad Urbanum Papam Facta*, has complicated the question of the interrelationship of the *Gesta Francorum* and Tudebode's *Historia*

⁵⁹ Hill, *Gesta Francorum*, xiv. Albert of Aachen described Baldwin as a *vir litteris eruditus*, Albert of Aachen, 572. See also Kostick, 'A further discussion on the authorship of the *Gesta Francorum*', 2-3.

⁶⁰ Albu, 'Probing the Passions of a Norman Crusader', 2-14; Kostick, 'A further discussion on the authorship of the *Gesta Francorum*', 5-10.

⁶¹ See below, 5.1.

⁶² Anonymous, *Gesta Francorum et Aliorum Hierosolymitanorum, seu Tudebodus Abbreviatus*, *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades: Historiens Occidentaux*, 4 vols. (Paris: Académie royale des inscriptions et des belles-lettres, 1866), III.

⁶³ Peter Tudebode, *Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere*, trans. John Hugh Hill and Laurita L. Hill, (Philadelphia, 1974), 9-10.

⁶⁴ France, 'An Analysis of the Textual Relationship between Primary Sources of the First Crusade', 54; Flori, *Chroniqueurs et Propagandistes*, 72, 98.

considerably.⁶⁵ In their analysis of the manuscript, both Samu Niskanen and Marcus Bull have concluded that it displays linguistic features and content in common with both the *Gesta* and Tudebode, but is a distinct version of the narrative in its own right. Could it actually be the supposed lost source? According to Bull it is probably in fact an intermediate form, with a process of multiple stages of editing of the *Gesta Francorum* by different writers having produced first the *Peregrinatio* and then Tudebode's version. Niskanen, while he does not reject this, argues that it is also possible that the *Peregrinatio* is the original from which the *Gesta* author and Tudebode both copied.⁶⁶ Complicating the question still further, Jesse Keskiaho claims to have shown that a now lost version of the same basic history underlies all three extant versions (*Gesta*, *Peregrinatio* and *Historia*). This lost manuscript may have most closely resembled the *Peregrinatio Antiochie*, but Keskiaho does not claim certainty on this point. Keskiaho argues for this on the basis of a very thorough comparison of the *Descriptio sanctorum locorum Hierusalem*, a pilgrim's guide appended to both the *Gesta* and Tudebode's *Historia* which he argues was already an integral part of their common archetype; and a 'control group' made up of a segment of text describing an incident common to all manuscripts of the three extant versions. Curiously, while Niskanen and Bull agree on Tudebode's use of the *Peregrinatio Antiochie*, Keskiaho's work indicates no direct relationship between the two, with the similarities therefore arising from a common source. In the absence of the availability of the *Peregrinatio* for study, this dissertation cannot draw any conclusions about the differing treatment of Muslims in all three texts; as such the precise interrelationship is of only peripheral interest and should not detain us further. It is to be hoped that the completion of Bull's forthcoming new edition of the *Gesta Francorum* and

⁶⁵ The text appears in ff 48r-90v of the MS known as St Catherine's College, Cambridge, 3; with the above title in a rubric. The text was identified as a *Gesta Francorum* manuscript by M. R. James in a 1925 catalogue of the St Catherine's collection, but it has recently been recognised as 'something subtly but significantly different': Marcus Bull, 'The Relationship between the "*Gesta Francorum*" and Peter Tudebode's "*Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere*": The Evidence of a Hitherto Unexamined Manuscript (St. Catherine's College, Cambridge, 3)', *Crusades* 11 (2012), 1 – 17, 5.

⁶⁶ Bull, 'The Relationship between the "*Gesta Francorum*" and Peter Tudebode's "*Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere*"', 8; Samu Niskanen, 'The Origins of the "*Gesta Francorum*" and Two Related Texts: Their Textual and Literary Character', *Sacris Erudiri* 51 (2012), 287 – 316, 292.

Niskanen's edition of the *Peregrinatio Antiochie* will finally settle this question.⁶⁷

2.1.4 The Style of the *Gesta Francorum*

The supposed simplicity of the *Gesta Francorum*, once taken for granted, has been increasingly called into question in recent years. The three non-eyewitness authors who used it most extensively - Guibert of Nogent, Robert the Monk and Baldric of Dol - all criticised the *Gesta Francorum*'s style. Guibert claimed that the language used was unfitting to the glorious deeds described, Robert said that his abbot had asked him to revise it because of its poor style, and Baldric called it a 'rustic little book' which even those with the simplest tastes would find unappealing.⁶⁸ Modern historians used to follow these medieval critics in their analysis of the style of the *Gesta Francorum*, and tended to attribute this lack of style to the limitations of the author. Hill described the *Gesta* as written in 'an extremely terse, simple and unadorned style.' Hill was certain that the author was a relatively uneducated knight, describing the work as 'the story told by a devout, observant and intelligent layman with no pretension to learning and no literary background except the Bible.'⁶⁹ Albu also described the style of the *Gesta Francorum* as simple, though she praised 'the virtue of this voice, its authenticity unobscured by layers of literary conceits.'⁷⁰ Flori argues, moreover, that the anonymous author simply did not have the same aim or the same highly literate audience in mind as his revisers: Flori believes his account was addressed to laymen, and as such written in a style that was '*sobre, simple et généralement facile à lire (ou à entendre lire)*'.⁷¹

Additionally, as Flori himself noted, while the style of the *Gesta* is relatively simple compared to its revisers, more and more sophistication has begun to be detected in the way the author constructed his narrative and used the Bible.⁷² In France's words, 'the apparently artless narrative of the *Gesta*, with its lack of cross-reference, is in fact much more contrived and literary

⁶⁷ Niskanen is preparing his edition for the *Corpus Christiani Continuatio Medievalis* series; Bull for Oxford Medieval Texts.

⁶⁸ Guibert of Nogent, 78; Robert the Monk, 3; '*libellum rusticana*', Baldric of Bourgueil, 4.

⁶⁹ Hill, *Gesta Francorum*, xiv, xvi.

⁷⁰ Albu, *The Normans in their Histories*, 149.

⁷¹ Flori, *Chroniqueurs et Propagandistes*, 74.

⁷² *Ibid.*, 75-6.

in form and ideological in inspiration.⁷³ Colin Morris, Hans Oehler and Jay Rubenstein have all detected more sophistication in the *Gesta Francorum*.⁷⁴ Morris suggested more caution was needed in portraying the author as a simple knight, and Oehler and Rubenstein argued that there was simply too much scriptural knowledge displayed for the author not to be a cleric. Morris and Oehler argued that the *Gesta* had its own complexity and style of a different tradition to its contemporary clerical critics, and should be judged on its own merits.

2.1.5 The *Gesta* author's Interpretation of the Crusade

The author of the *Gesta Francorum* frequently emphasised that the success of the crusade was due to God's assistance. This was a central message of the *Gesta Francorum*, reinforced constantly. While it is not central to the depiction of Muslims, it does have some impact on the depiction of Muslims, and so it is worth mentioning some particularly notable passages where this message is reinforced. A certain priest (named as Stephen of Valence in other sources) receives a vision of Christ while the crusaders are trapped in Antioch: in the vision Christ explains that He had been aiding them but has stopped because of their immoral behaviour. He is persuaded to resume his help by the intercession of St Peter and the Virgin Mary.⁷⁵ The fact that the author presented this vision in such detail is a strong indicator that he approved of its message. Earlier in the *Gesta*, the author presented a dialogue on the same subject in the exchange between Kerbogha and his mother: Kerbogha is confident he will defeat the Franks because of his superior numbers, but she warns him that God will assist them.⁷⁶ Similarly, in a passage praising the Turks as warriors, the *Gesta* author says that if only they had remained Christian (an apparent misunderstanding on his part), there would be no better warriors, 'and yet by God's grace they were beaten by our men.'⁷⁷ It will be argued below that several aspects of the *Gesta*'s depiction of Muslims fit into this authorial framework that the crusaders succeeded primarily because of God's intervention on their behalf.

⁷³ France, 'An Analysis of the Textual Relationship between Primary Sources of the First Crusade', 41.

⁷⁴ Hans Oehler, 'Studien zu den *Gesta Francorum*', *Mittelaltersches Jahrbuch* 6 (1970), 58-97, 61-2; Jay Rubenstein, 'What was the *Gesta Francorum* and who was Peter Tudebode?', *Revue Mabillon* 16 (2005), 157-204, 187; Morris, 'The *Gesta Francorum* as Narrative History', *passim*.

⁷⁵ *Gesta Francorum*, 58.

⁷⁶ *Gesta Francorum*, 53-4.

⁷⁷ 'Et tamen gratia Dei uicti sunt a nostris.' *Gesta Francorum*, 21.

2.2 Islam in the *Gesta Francorum*

As we shall see in detail in this chapter, the author used almost every device at his disposal to portray Muslims as Other. No single specific image of Muslims was presented in the *Gesta*, but in different instances they were shown in many different ways to be alien or even inhuman and diabolical. At times, indeed, his depiction of Muslims seems to have been subservient to narrative needs, presenting them as formidable and terrifying when he wished to emphasise the danger faced by the crusaders and as cowardly and prone to panic when he wished to emphasise the totality of a crusader victory. The *Gesta* presented a very vague depiction of Islam as a religion. The most noticeable feature of his understanding of Islam is obviously incorrect: the *Gesta* author was apparently convinced of Muslim polytheism. To what extent – if at all – this was based on using the author’s knowledge of classical paganism as a model is uncertain; Muslims as he portrayed them displayed some ‘pagan’ features, but he also included some genuine details – most notably his references to Mohammed, although it is not clear who exactly he thought Mohammed was. The *Gesta*’s portrayal of Muslims was usually quite negative; Muslims were arrogant and materialistic; brutal given the opportunity but cowardly in defeat; and their polytheism was itself a mark of extreme otherness. Nevertheless, the author had no qualms about depicting peace agreements made with Muslims, or the suborning of a Muslim officer to gain access to Antioch, and, famously, he included a passage in which he praised the Turks’ qualities as warriors highly.

2.2.1 Terminology

The *Gesta Francorum*’s terminology for Muslims (as well as the words it used for Christians, both Latin and Eastern) have been examined in detail by Léan Ní Chléirigh in her doctoral thesis. Some of the terms used are not especially important for the present investigation, but others contributed to the *Gesta*’s particular depiction of Muslims.

An immediately striking finding of Ní Chléirigh’s is that the *Gesta* usually used the term *Turci* for the Seljuk Turks and *Saraceni* for the

inhabitants of Syria and Palestine under Fatimid rule.⁷⁸ *Turci* was occasionally used more broadly – as a collective term for large conglomerate forces whose constituent parts were also listed, and on one occasion as a synonym for ‘Muslim’ as a religious identity⁷⁹ – but the use of the term declined after the departure of the crusade from Antioch and its entry into lands under the control of the Fatimid Caliphate. The *Gesta*’s use of *Saraceni* correspondingly increases. This implies some awareness of the ethnic and political divisions between the Seljuks and the Fatimids – if not the religious Sunni/Shia divide, of which there is no mention. This awareness of the division between the Turks and the ‘Saracens’ is also indicated by many of the details of the structure of Muslim society of which he displays knowledge, as discussed below. Other national terms used in the *Gesta Francorum* – *Arabae*, *Persae*, *Curti*, *Azimiti* and *Agulani* – are less important to this discussion.

The *Gesta Francorum* also used a number of what Ní Chléirigh classified as ‘theological’ terms for Muslims.⁸⁰ Several of these carried implications which created an image of Muslims as an inherent, permanent enemy of Christianity itself, not just temporary rivals for control of Jerusalem. The most frequent term used collectively of Muslims as a whole was *pagani*. What exactly the *Gesta* author meant by referring to Muslims as pagans is discussed further below and in the conclusion to this thesis.⁸¹ It is important to note here the implicit connection to the Roman persecutors of the early Church, contributing to the depiction of Muslims as the enemies of all Christianity. The term also carried negative associations within the *Gesta*. As Ní Chléirigh notes, it was frequently used as the clear opposite of *Christiani*: Bohemond first heard of the crusade as *innumerabilem gentem Christianorum* who had arrived *paratam ad prelium contra gentem paganorum*; the clergy at Ma’arrat-an-Nu’man stood beside a siege tower beseeching God that *Christianitatem exalteret, ac paganismum deponeret*.⁸² The *Gesta* author also occasionally used the Old Testament terms *gentiles* and *nationes*. These terms indicated those outside the faith and created

⁷⁸ Ní Chléirigh, *The Crusaders and their Enemies*, 53-6.

⁷⁹ See *Gesta Francorum* 19, 20, 49-71 for uses of the term to refer collectively to forces also referred to as made up of constituent parts of many nationalities; 67 for Kerbogha’s offer of generous peace terms if the crusaders would ‘become Turks (*effici Turci*)’.

⁸⁰ Ní Chléirigh, *The Crusaders and their Enemies*, 62.

⁸¹ See below, 9.3, 9.4.

⁸² Ní Chléirigh, *The Crusaders and their Enemies* 63-4; *Gesta Francorum*, 7 (147-51); 78 (405).

associations – sometimes explicit – with the enemies of the Children of Israel. For example, the *Gesta*'s second use of *nationes* was in the phrase *hostium nostrorum, Turcorum, Publicanorum... et aliarum plurimarum nationum*. *Plurimarum nationum* is identified by Ní Chléirigh as a reference to Deuteronomy 15:6, when the Israelites are told they will rule over *plurime nationes*.⁸³

A final term used by the *Gesta* which warrants particular notice is *inimici Dei*. Even by itself, it is easy to see how the phrase 'enemies of God' depicts Muslims as Other. In context this becomes even clearer. *Inimici Dei* was used very frequently by the *Gesta* author as a counterpart to the phrase *milites Christi*, soldiers of Christ, which they often used to describe the crusaders themselves – at the battle of Ascalon, for example, the 'enemies of God' stood around stupefied, unable to see the 'soldiers of Christ' thanks to God's intervention.⁸⁴ The longer phrase *inimici Dei et sanctae Christianitatis* was perhaps the baldest possible expression of the idea that Muslims were an inherent enemy of all Christians; the enemies of God and Christianity itself, not just the enemies of the crusade.⁸⁵ This reflects efforts by authors of crusade accounts to depict the crusaders as united and the crusade itself as an undertaking of Christendom as a whole. Muslims were presented in the *Gesta Francorum* as not just an enemy because of the circumstances, but an inherent enemy of Christianity itself. According to Ní Chléirigh, this served one of the main themes the author sought to emphasise: the role of God in the victory of the crusade. This can be seen in his attributions of victories in battle to divine intervention, and was emphasised by references to the crusaders as *milites Christi* and *milites Dei*.⁸⁶

2.2.2 Muslim Beliefs

Providing a full, coherent explanation of what Muslims believed was less of a priority for the *Gesta* author than for some of the other authors of First Crusade accounts. Nevertheless, the author did include some details

⁸³ *Gesta Francorum*, 44-5 (296-8); Ní Chléirigh, *The Crusaders and their Enemies*, 65.

⁸⁴ 'Stabant autem inimici Dei excecati et stupefacti, ac uidentes Christi milites apertis oculis nil videbant', *Gesta Francorum*, 96 (496).

⁸⁵ *Gesta Francorum*, 40 (282).

⁸⁶ Ní Chléirigh, *The Crusaders and their Enemies*, 66. Morton disagrees with this analysis and argues that *inimicus Dei* is merely a stock phrase, but even a stock phrase can have meaning in context. Morton, *Encountering Islam on the First Crusade*, 170-2.

about the religious beliefs of the enemy he described. A central issue in interpreting the *Gesta*'s depiction of Muslims is the question of whether or not this was shaped by his application of a classical pagan model. Norman Housley argued that authors of First Crusade accounts, the *Gesta* author among them, were primarily interested in questions surrounding salvation and the crusaders themselves. As such, they simply assumed Muslims were polytheists like the Roman pagans confronted by the early Church. This was, he argued, adhered to 'in blatant disregard of evidence to the contrary', simply because it was the easiest model to apply.⁸⁷ In the specific case of the *Gesta Francorum*, the depiction of Muslims is not detailed enough to say for certain if a Patristic model was being applied by the author: the only strong indications that the anonymous author may have applied a classical pagan model to Muslims are his use of the term *pagani* itself and his depiction of Muslims as polytheists.

The latter of these is the most striking feature of the *Gesta*'s depiction of Muslim beliefs: the author was apparently convinced of Muslim polytheism. He twice depicted Muslim characters in passages of direct speech invoking or swearing to their gods. In a supposed letter to the Sultan, the Caliph and the Turkish people, the author had Kerbogha swear '*per omnia deorum nomina*' that he would capture Antioch, '*ad deorum honorem*' and for the honour of the Caliph and all other Turks.⁸⁸ Later, in the lament the author attributed to the defeated Muslim commander al-Afdal in the aftermath of the battle at Ascalon, al-Afdal invokes the 'spirits of the gods', and swears by Mohammed and the glory of all the gods that he will never raise another army.⁸⁹ Kerbogha also expressed his confusion at one point, supposedly believing that Bohemond and Tancred were the gods of the Christians – while this must have been intended as humorous flattery of the Italo-Norman leaders, it does further indicate the polytheistic framework within which the author thought Muslims viewed the world.⁹⁰ On a less facetious note, earlier in the same passage the author had Kerbogha's mother explain to him that although they could never stand against him and his

⁸⁷ Norman Housley, 'The Crusades and Islam' *Medieval Encounters* 13(2) (2007), 189 – 208, 197.

⁸⁸ *Gesta Francorum*, 52-3.

⁸⁹ '*O deorum spiritus, quis unquam uidit uel audiuit talia? ...Iuro per Machumet et per omnia deorum numina, quod ulterius non retinebo milites conuentione aliqua, quia expulsus sum a gente aduena.*' Anonymous, *Gesta Francorum*, 96 – 7. See also 52, 53.

⁹⁰ '*Mater karissime, dic michi omnia quae in corde meo sunt incredula... non sunt igitur Boamundus et Tancredus Francorum dii...?*' *Gesta Francorum*, 55.

forces alone, the Christians would surely defeat him because ‘their’ god fought on their side.⁹¹ The use of the term *deus eorum*, as opposed to simply *deus* is significant: in spite of the fact that he is largely using Kerbogha’s mother here as a mouthpiece for some of his ideas about the nature of the crusade itself (as mentioned above), the author still presents this from what he assumes is her point of view. Kerbogha’s mother’s mention of ‘their god’ indicates a tribal form of polytheism, in which, to her, the Christian god was real but was not the only god and was not *her* god (or gods). This idea was also suggested in Baldric of Bourgueil’s account, as will be seen.⁹²

It is surprising that the author, a man who not only spent years in the Holy Land but apparently came from southern Italy – where there would not only have been veterans of the conquest of Sicily from its Muslim rulers but also Muslim mercenaries themselves fighting alongside Christians – would have made such a fundamental mistake about the nature of Muslim beliefs. The possibility that it was simply polemic, that the author knew it was untrue but chose to defame Muslims, cannot be discounted, but neither can it be proved: if the author knew better, he did not let slip any indication. Hill suggests that ‘It may be that some Franks heard their enemies calling, with perfect orthodoxy, upon Allah by some of his ninety-nine “most beautiful names”, and assumed these to be the names of many different gods’, but while this *might* have had some influence on the author’s thinking, there is no actual evidence to support it – we don’t see any crudely Latinised versions of these names in the *Gesta*, or indeed in any other contemporary crusade histories.⁹³ Likewise, it is also possible that in this particular aspect of his depiction of Muslims, the author was influenced by knowledge of classical Roman pantheists, even perhaps vague and confused knowledge. He may also simply have been aware of the polytheism of some non-Christians and assumed it applied to all. Unfortunately, the *Gesta* ultimately simply does not give enough detail to be certain why or even if the author really did think Muslims were polytheists.

The anonymous author did frequently refer to Muslims as ‘pagans (*pagani*)’.⁹⁴ This term implicitly connected Muslims to the Roman persecutors of the early Church, reinforcing the idea that Muslims were the enemies of all Christians – one of the central messages of the *Gesta*. How

⁹¹ ‘...sed deus eorum pro ipsis cotidie pugnat...’, *Gesta Francorum*, 53.

⁹² See below, 4.2.6.

⁹³ Hill, ‘The Christian view of Muslims at the time of the First Crusade’, 5.

⁹⁴ See, for example, *Gesta Francorum*, 20, 49, 53, 55, 77, 82-5, 89, 95.

literal this connection was intended to be is less certain, however. What exactly was understood by the term *pagani* seems to vary from author to author; this will be discussed in detail in the conclusion to this dissertation. The fact that the term was retained by Guibert of Nogent, an author who was extremely careful in his use of terminology and whose depiction of Muslim beliefs was influenced by an entirely separate tradition from classical pagan models, strongly suggests that the term 'pagan' itself could refer to non-Christians generally, without necessarily carrying classicizing implications.⁹⁵ The use of the term itself does not help establish the degree to which the *Gesta* author was influenced by applying a classical model.

Even if a classical model was used, it was not consistently applied by the *Gesta* author. The primary contra-indication to the theory that the author thought of Muslims as broadly the same as the pagans of the Roman world is his knowledge of Mohammed. The *Gesta* mentioned the prophet twice: in the above oaths, in which Muslims swore to their multiple Gods, they also swore to Mohammed, '*per Machomet et omnia deorum nomina/numina*'.⁹⁶ It has been assumed in some of the secondary literature that the author believed that Mohammed was simply one of the gods of the Muslims, presumably the only one whose name he knew.⁹⁷ Swearing to Mohammed was commonly attributed to Muslims in both Latin and Old French sources, as Matthew Bennett has noted. While Bennett acknowledged that Mohammed is not always definitely being regarded as a god in these contexts, he argued that it 'seems likely' that this is implied.⁹⁸ However, while some authors of crusade sources definitely did think of Mohammed as a god, and others may have implied it, comparison with Peter Tudebode's account shows that neither of these possibilities are likely to be an accurate reading of the *Gesta*. The construction 'Mohammed and the names/glory of all the gods' is perhaps somewhat ambiguous, but it contrasts quite sharply with the clarity of Tudebode's phrasing in the same parts of the narrative: '*Malphumet et nostris aliis diis*' – 'Mohammed and our *other* gods'.⁹⁹ This

⁹⁵ A similar conclusion was reached by Morton, *Encountering Islam on the First Crusade*, 81-2. See also below, 5.2.1-2.

⁹⁶ '*Amodo iuro uobis per Machomet et per omnia deorum nomina...*', *Gesta Francorum*, 52; '*Iuro per Machomet et per omnia deorum numina...*' Ibid, 96.

⁹⁷ Dana Carleton Munro, 'The Western Attitude toward Islam during the Period of the Crusades', *Speculum* 6 (3) 1931, 329 – 343, 332; Tolan, 'Muslims as Pagan Idolaters', 99.

⁹⁸ Bennett, 'First Crusaders' Images of Muslims', 109.

⁹⁹ Peter Tudebode, *Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere*, Recueil des Historiens des Croisades: Historiens Occidentaux, 4 vols. (Paris: Académie royale des inscriptions

throws the *Gesta*'s phrasing into sharp relief; the anonymous author does not refer to Mohammed as a god. Although it is possible that Tudebode's version was a clarification of what the *Gesta* author meant, there is nothing in the *Gesta* itself to directly suggest that the author believed Mohammed was a god. Unfortunately, there is also no indication of who the author *did* think Mohammed was; only that he was an important enough figure to be mentioned alongside the gods. Even so, this recognition of Mohammed indicates some level of engagement with the reality of Muslim beliefs rather than a simple application of the model of Roman paganism.

There are two further points which might seem at first glance to tip the scales, but neither can be considered conclusive on closer examination. These are the *Gesta*'s mentions of Turks being buried with grave goods, and of a book which has been interpreted to be the Koran.

After one of the battles with the defenders of Antioch (6 March 1098), the crusaders witnessed the hasty burial of the Muslim dead beside a mosque outside the walls of the city. They despoiled some of these graves, finding the bodies buried with cloaks and coins in a very Roman manner, as well as with weapons and other implements.¹⁰⁰ That this is an accurate report of the burials has often been considered quite unlikely: this was not part of proper Islamic practice, and Hagenmeyer doubted the veracity of the account, pointing to the dark (the burials took place before dawn) and the riskiness of close observation to suggest that the author could not have seen clearly what happened.¹⁰¹ If the author fabricated them, then the application of a classical pagan model to Muslims would be the most likely inspiration for the claim. Hill disagreed, believing that despite not describing usual Muslim practice, the *Gesta* author had no reason to invent the story.¹⁰² Indeed, Nicholas Morton has made a very persuasive case for the possibility that these Turks really were buried in furnished graves. The process of conversion of the Seljuk Turks to Sunni Islam may have been more gradual than has often been thought, due to reliance on sources sympathetic or beholden to the Seljuk leadership. On the basis of this argument and comparison with a remarkably similar description of pre-Islamic Turkish

et des belles-lettres, 1866), III.51. Cf Anonymous, *Gesta Francorum* 52, 96; as quoted above.

¹⁰⁰ '...sepelierunt ad machumariam quae est ultra pontem ante portam urbis, simulque illis consepelierunt pallia, bisanteos aureos, arcus, sagittas, et alia plurima instrumenta, quae nominare nequimus.' Ibid, 42 (258).

¹⁰¹ *Gesta Francorum*, ed. Hagenmeyer, 258 n. 61.

¹⁰² Hill, 'The Christian View of Muslims at the time of the First Crusade', 5.

burial practices witnessed by the Arab traveller and writer Ibn Fadlan on the steppes c.922, Morton argued that the *Gesta* had unwittingly provided evidence of Seljuk society in transition: these graves were placed near a mosque, but furnished with grave goods, indicating an affinity for both traditions.¹⁰³ It seems that this particular aspect of the *Gesta*'s depiction of the Turks may actually have been rooted in fact. Ibn Fadlan's description was almost identical, albeit that he also mentioned burial with horses, but it is not implausible that this sacrificial practice might have died out before the others. It is far beyond the scope of this thesis to conclusively establish the burial practices of Seljuk Turks at the end of the eleventh century, however. It remains possible that the author fabricated this passage or misinterpreted something that was really witnessed on the basis of a classical model, but Morton at least offers a plausible basis for the possibility that the *Gesta* author recorded what the crusaders really found. The author does seem to have been unaware that this practice would have distinguished the late eleventh-century Seljuk Turks from other Muslims, however, and so the *Gesta* tacitly implies that this is a universal Muslim practice. To this extent, his depiction of Muslims is distorted and inaccurate, exoticising them and emphasising their otherness from Christianity. However, the strong possibility that it was based on an accurate observation about one Muslim group does make it difficult to justify a claim that the author was depicting Muslims on the basis of a classical model.

In Hill's translation of the *Gesta* there would seem to be a stronger indication that Muslims were *not* depicted using a classical pagan model: the author mentions the Koran twice. However, this translation probably pushes the text too far, leading to a stronger impression of understanding of Islam than it can really support. The first such occasion is indeed a mention of Muslim literature by Kerbogha's mother, making the translation 'Koran' plausible, but by no means certain. She explains how both 'our pages (*nostra pagina*)', and the books of the Christians predict their victory in the crusade. The phrase *nostra pagina* is probably intended as an echo of *Sacra Pagina*, a phrase frequently used of scripture. This is supported by the author's mention of the *gentilium voluminibus*; the books of the Christians:¹⁰⁴ since

¹⁰³ Nicholas Morton, 'The Saljuk Turks' Conversion to Islam: The Crusading Sources', *Al-Masaq* 27(2) 2015, 109-118, 109-12.

¹⁰⁴ The author here demonstrated a degree of imagination and flexibility of thought with which he is rarely credited, appreciating that from the point of view of his character, it was the Christians who were the gentiles.

Kerbogha's mother went on to quote from it in support of her claims, it is fairly clear that the author had the Bible in mind here. This makes it likely that he was using a mirroring *topos* here, and simply assumed the existence of some equivalent sacred text belonging to the Turks. While Hagenmeyer also agrees in a footnote to his edition that the Koran was being referred to here, it does not at all follow that the author was specifically aware of the Koran itself.¹⁰⁵ He clearly did not know it by name, and it was no great leap of imagination for him to presume that Muslims had a sacred text – or, indeed, if he had been using Roman pagans as a model, he would have been thinking of a highly literate culture that had many sacred books. Mirroring remains the most likely reason, given the author's propensity elsewhere to assume Muslim institutions are identical to Christian ones and to present their norms and behaviour as the exact opposite of those of Christianity. The second occasion on which the Koran appears in Hill's translation is even less likely to reflect what the author actually had in mind: in her translation, the garrison of a castle on the way to Jerusalem surrendered, 'and swore on the Koran that they would do no harm to the pilgrims'. The original text actually refers to the 'laws' of the Muslim garrison: *iuraverunt sua lege*.¹⁰⁶ Granted, those laws are codified in the Koran, but there is no indication that this is what the author is referring to. That the author had some awareness of the Koran is a possibility, but the text does not offer conclusive evidence.

The inclusion of Mohammed's name, unfortunately with little indication as to the author's understanding of his identity, complicates Housley's suggestion that a Roman pagan model was applied by authors of crusade accounts. However, it may still be the case that the author produced some hybrid of his own observations with a classical pagan model – if he even thought about it as systematically as that implies. His depiction of Muslim beliefs is ultimately quite vague. Nevertheless there are some details: the author believed they were polytheists who practiced burial with grave goods, but he also knew of a figure important to them named Mohammed, who was not a god. His mention of something which corresponds to the Koran is more likely an accurate assumption than based in any real knowledge.

Other details are simply not given by the author. In particular, while the *Gesta* author showed some awareness of the political divisions between

¹⁰⁵ *Gesta Francorum*, ed. Hagenmeyer, 328 n. 34.

¹⁰⁶ *Gesta Francorum* 81 (415).

the Turks and the Fatimids, as discussed elsewhere in this chapter, he does not show any awareness of the religious element of this division. The Sunni/Shia schism seems to have entirely escaped the anonymous author – indeed, almost no contemporary authors of First Crusade histories seem to have been aware of it. If he did not recognise their denominational differences, to what extent did the author recognise their shared Muslim identity? To what extent did the *Gesta* author understand that *Turci* and *Saraceni* he wrote of shared a common identity, and what was the nature of that identity? Although he never makes any explicit statement or provides any explanation, it is clear from the terminology he used and the information he imparted incidentally while making other points that the author did think both the *Turci* and the *Saraceni* shared the same beliefs. As noted above, both Kerbogha and al-Afdal swore oaths to plural gods and to Mohammed. The distinction the author made between *Turci* and *Saraceni* thus seems to be entirely ethnic and political in nature.¹⁰⁷

2.2.3 Violence

Both violence by and against Muslims was used by the author of the *Gesta Francorum* in ways which demonstrated their alterity: Muslims in the *Gesta* were both perpetrators of and fair targets for extreme violence. Violence by Muslims was used to depict them as savage and cruel; it justified (sometimes explicitly) the violence the crusaders committed against them. At the same time, the graphic depiction of extreme violence against Muslims by the crusaders also emphasised their otherness. The crusaders being the almost unimpeachable heroes of the narratives, this violence must then have been acceptable; Muslims were thus dehumanised by the very acceptability of the acts committed against them.

From the very beginning, the *Gesta* included accounts of terrible violence perpetrated by Muslims. The so-called ‘People’s Crusade’, the more loosely organised expedition led by Peter the Hermit and Walter the Penniless, was quickly attacked and overwhelmed by the forces of Kilij Arslan, the Sultan of Rum. The German and French contingents split from one another, in the *Gesta*’s version. The German contingent took refuge in a

¹⁰⁷ Morton argued that the crusaders were generally aware of religious differences between the Turks and Saracens; the *Gesta Francorum* does not support such a conclusion. Morton, *Encountering Islam on the First Crusade*, 140-142.

castle called *Xerogordo*, but were betrayed by one of their commanders. In the ensuing defeat:

...those who would not renounce God were killed; others, whom the Turks captured alive, were divided among their captors like sheep, some were put up as targets and shot with arrows, others sold and given away as if they were brute beasts.¹⁰⁸

The French contingent itself was also attacked in its camp. There, the Turks indiscriminately slaughtered the sleeping and the unprepared: 'some they found asleep, others naked, and all these they slaughtered. Among the rest they found a priest saying mass, and they martyred him at once upon the altar'. This killing of a priest on an altar (perhaps intended to be reminiscent of Christ's sacrifice as symbolised in the mass, adding an extra layer of pathos) was an act of extreme blasphemy, to which the author gives as much prominence as the slaughter of unarmed pilgrims.¹⁰⁹

Later in the *Gesta*, Bohemond reprimanded some fleeing crusaders:

'If our enemies find you rushing all over the place they will kill you, for they are on watch day and night to catch you without a leader or alone, and they are always trying to kill you or lead you into captivity.'¹¹⁰

Muslims, in the *Gesta* author's view, were thus a relentless and constantly threatening enemy, always on the lookout for opportunities to harm the crusaders.

A notable feature of the *Gesta Francorum*'s treatment of violence is that the graphic nature of the violence depicted becomes somewhat more one-sided after its account of the fate of the People's Crusade, with Muslims more often the victims of graphically-described violence than the perpetrators. The author does include accounts in which Muslims are

¹⁰⁸ *'Illi autem qui Deum negare noluerunt, capitalem sententiam susceperunt. Alios quos ceperunt vivos adinuicem diuiserunt quasi oues. Alios miserunt ad signum et sagittabant eos; alios uendebant et donabant quasi animalia.'* *Gesta Francorum*, 4.

¹⁰⁹ *'Irruentes uero Turci super eos occiderunt multos ex eis; alios inuenerunt dormientes, alios nudos, quos omnes necauerunt, cum quibus quemdam sacerdotum inuenerunt missam celebrantem, quem statim super altare martirizauerunt.'* *Gesta Francorum*, 4.

¹¹⁰ *'Si autem inimici nostri inuenerint uos errantes, occident uos, quia die noctuque uigilant, ut uos sine ductore segregatos siue solos inueniant, uosque cotidie occidere et in captiuitate ducere laborant.'* Anonymous, *Gesta Francorum*, 33.

effective, including vivid descriptions of the frightening effect of Turkish battle tactics which made very effective use of the rhetorical colour '*similiter cadens*'. On one such occasion, a Muslim attack on a group of Christians travelling from the port of St Symeon to Antioch, they 'began to gnash their teeth and gabble and howl with very loud cries, wheeling round our men, throwing darts and shooting arrows, wounding and slaughtering them most brutally.'¹¹¹ But while, especially in Latin, this intense and rhythmic passage does convey the terror inflicted on the crusaders, it does not compare to the graphic nature of the accounts of violence against the People's Crusade, or the graphic violence against Muslims discussed below. Guibert also displays this tendency, and it is even more pronounced in Robert the Monk, both of whom also added more 'historical' violence in the form of their versions of the sermon at Clermont but emphasised the crushing success of the 'official' crusaders.¹¹²

At the same time, the *Gesta* also included vivid descriptions of violence *against* Muslims. Such violence against Muslims in the *Gesta* was, as alluded to, often extreme. The *Gesta* author wrote that so much Muslim blood was shed outside Tripoli that 'even the stream which flowed into the city ran red and stained the water in the citizens' tanks';¹¹³ and earlier in his account the Orontes river also 'appeared to be running all red with the blood of Turks' at one of the battles against the Turkish defenders of Antioch.¹¹⁴ The populations of both Albara and Ma'arrat-an-Nu'man were massacred. In the latter case, '...when it was dawn they killed everyone, man or woman, whom they met in any place whatsoever,' to the extent that no corner of the city was clear of Saracen corpses, and one could scarcely go about the city streets except by treading on the dead bodies of the Saracens.'¹¹⁵ At the end

¹¹¹ '*...coeperunt stridere et garrere ac clamare uehementissimo clamore, circumcingendo undique nostros, iaculando, sagittando, uulnerando, et crudeliter detruncando.*' Anonymous, *Gesta Francorum*, 40. The sequence of verbs ending in -ando is an example of *similiter cadens*.

¹¹² See below, 3.2.5; 5.2.3.

¹¹³ '*Tanta fuit paganorum occisio, et sanguinis effusio, ut etiam aqua quae in ciuitate fluebat, uideretur rubere et fluere in cisternas eorum, unde ualde fuerent tristes alii dolentesque.*' *Gesta Francorum*, 85 (432).

¹¹⁴ '*Unda uero rapidi fluminis undique uidebatur fluere rubea Turcorum sanguine.*' *Gesta Francorum*, 40. This is reminiscent of the Oracle of Delphi's prediction in the *Aeneid*, '*...et Thybrim multo spumantem sanguine cerno* (Vergil, *Aeneid* 6.86-7.)', but the wording is not similar enough to establish a direct borrowing, and it is not implausible that this was simply an accurate description.

¹¹⁵ '*Facto autem die, ubicunque quemquam illorum siue masculum siue feminam, occidebant. Nullus angulus ciuitatis deerat uacuuus Saracenorum cadaueribus uixque poterat aliquis per uiuas ire ciuitatis, nisi calculando super Sarracenorum cadauera.*' *Gesta Francorum*, 79-80.

of the *Gesta*, the author described the battle of Ascalon, in which, he asserted, God stupefied and blinded the Muslim army. They were slaughtered indiscriminately; whether standing stupefied, attempting to hide up trees, or lying on the ground in terror. Raymond of St Gilles killed them ‘without number’, and many tried to flee into the sea.¹¹⁶ There are also many other, slightly less vivid examples of extreme violence being used by the crusaders against Muslims.¹¹⁷ This violence was frequently added to or intensified by the *Gesta*’s revisers, as will be seen. This is particularly true of the *Gesta*’s account of the massacre that took place when Jerusalem was captured. Muslims took shelter in the Temple of Solomon in Jerusalem, but did not escape the slaughter: ‘there was such killing there that our men were wading up to their ankles in their blood’.¹¹⁸ When the crusaders returned later to deal with survivors, ‘their blood flowed through the whole temple’.¹¹⁹ The precise levels of blood shed were frequently increased by authors who used the *Gesta*, eventually giving rise to an enduring myth that the streets of Jerusalem ran with rivers of blood, something which is both biologically unlikely and physically impossible.¹²⁰ The less extreme claims of the *Gesta* have been taken seriously by some historians, but Thomas Madden has attempted a rough mathematical test of the *Gesta*’s claims and found that the number of people who could fit in the al-Aqsa mosque could not actually produce enough blood to fill the mosque to the level of the crusaders’ ankles (and for the streets of Jerusalem to run with blood would have required millions of people to be killed). While one could quibble with some of the assumptions he makes, many of these objections would lead to even less blood being shed (such as the effects of coagulation and drainage), confirming the thrust of his argument: that while the *Gesta*’s description is

¹¹⁶ ‘*Stabant autem inimici Dei excecati et stupefacti, ac uidentes Christi milites apertis oculis nil uidebant, et contra Christianos erigere se non audebant, uirtute Dei tremefacti. Pro nimio timore ascendebant in arbores, in quibus putabant se abscondere; at nostri sagittando et cum lanceis et ensibus occidendo eos ad terram precipitabant. Alii autem iactabant se in terram, non audentes erigere se contra nos. Nostri igitur illos detruncabant, sicut aliquis detruncat animalia ad macellum. Comes Sancti Egidii iuxta mare occidit ex eis sine numero. Alii uero se precipitabant in mare...*’ *Gesta Francorum*, 96, (496).

¹¹⁷ These incidents, described in less vivid detail, nonetheless mention extreme violence: captured Turks are beheaded before Antioch to dampen the defenders’ morale (*Gesta Francorum*, 29); all the *Turci et Saraceni* in Antioch are killed except those who escape to the citadel (47); the inhabitants of Tell-Manas (*Talamanian*) are all massacred by Raymond Pilet except for those who agree to convert (73); likewise the inhabitants of al-Bara are all massacred by Raymond of St-Gilles, men, women and children (75).

¹¹⁸ ‘*Ibique talis occisio fuit, ut nostri in sanguine illorum pedes usque ad cauillas mitterent.*’ Anonymous, *Gesta Francorum*, 90-1.

¹¹⁹ ‘*...sanguis illorum per totum templum flueret...*’ *Gesta Francorum*, 91.

¹²⁰ See below, 3.2.5; 4.1.8; 5.2.4

exaggerated (and many other authors' more so) the sight of so many people massacred in an enclosed space would have made a deep and lasting impression on any observers: 'In the trauma of the event, with its mayhem and mass killing, it is no wonder that a few centimetres or even a few hundred centimetres were added to the level of blood that flowed through the mosque al-Aqsa on that horrible day in July 1099.'¹²¹ The *Gesta* author also vividly described the aftermath of the massacre, when the stench from the bodies became so great that the Christian leadership forced captured Muslims to carry them out of the city walls where they 'piled them up in mounds as big as houses' and burned them 'on pyres like pyramids'.¹²²

The vividness of the *Gesta*'s depictions of violence – with rivers flowing red with blood, if not streets – suggests that the author may have chosen to depict violence with such detail for a reason. This is definitely the case with Robert the Monk's depiction of violence, as will be seen.¹²³ In the *Gesta* the possibility remains that the vivid details were intended to make the work more entertaining, although it is difficult to be certain of this in the absence of any strong indications of whom the intended audience was. However, regardless of the author's expectations, the *Gesta*'s depictions of violence had certain implications for how Muslims appeared in the work – something which may still have been the author's intention. Both violence by and against Muslims was used by the author of the *Gesta Francorum* in ways which demonstrated their apartness. Violence by Muslims suggests that they are barbarians, ferocious and uncivilised; and it implicitly justified the use of violence against them. At the same time, the graphic depiction of extreme violence against Muslims by the crusaders also emphasised their otherness. The crusaders being the almost unimpeachable heroes of the narratives, this violence must then have been acceptable; Muslims were thus dehumanised by the very acceptability of the acts committed against them; the callous attitude implies that they are beneath sympathy. This seems contradictory – if the crusaders commit the same kind of violence as the Muslims, is there really any difference? In Robert the Monk's work, as will be argued, the apparent contradiction is resolved by explicitly depicting the

¹²¹ Thomas F. Madden, 'Rivers of Blood: An Analysis of One Aspect of the Crusader Conquest of Jerusalem in 1099,' *Revista Chilena de Estudios Medievales* 1 (2012), 25-37, 35-6.

¹²² 'Et uiui Saraceni trahebant mortuos ante portarum exitus, et ordinabant montes ex eis, quasi essent domos. Tales occisiones de paganorum gente nullus umquam audiuit nec uidit; quoniam pyrae erant ordinatae ex eis sicut metae...' *Gesta Francorum*, 92.

¹²³ See below, 3.2.5.

violence of the crusaders – indeed, the entire crusade – as an act of vengeance for the past treatment of Christians by Muslims.¹²⁴ There is no trace of this argument in the *Gesta*. Rather, it is most likely that there was simply no consistent message intended, with the author using any available polemic tool without regard for contradiction.

2.2.4 The structure of Muslim society

The *Gesta* author frequently wrote of a place called *Corosanum* as if it were the capital of the Turkish Empire.¹²⁵ *Corosanum* is probably the author's interpretation of Khorasan. Greater Khorasan is a historic region in the northeast of Persia, encompassing the administrative provinces of North, South and Razavi Khorasan Province in modern Iran and stretching much further. It was neither the original homeland of the Seljuk Turks nor the site of their current capital (Baghdad), but it was from there that they launched their empire and it remained culturally significant.¹²⁶ It seems an understandable misinterpretation for the *Gesta* author to have made, if such is what it was. John Tolan interpreted *Corosanum* as being instead a reference to the Biblical town of Corozain in the Vulgate.¹²⁷ Corozain was cursed by Christ in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke for having heard His teachings but failed to take heed of them.¹²⁸ In eschatological tradition derived from pseudo-Methodius the town also came to be seen as the future birthplace of the Antichrist. But the *Gesta* does not make any explicit reference to *Corosanum* as being associated with the Antichrist, nor even to the curse laid on Corozain in the Gospels. Contrast this with an account of the martyrdom of Archbishop Thiemo of Salzburg (1090-1101): during the crusade of 1101 the archbishop was captured by three brothers from *Corozain*, a place '*a Domino maledicta, ubi sedes est Satanae*'. Clearly this author had the Biblical town in mind, and in describing the town as *ubi sedes est Satanae* he was probably also referring to the pseudo-Methodius eschatological tradition.¹²⁹ None of the revisers of the *Gesta Francorum*, including the highly erudite Guibert of Nogent and Baldric of Dol, who

¹²⁴ See below, 3.1.2, 3.2.5. See also Throop, *Crusading as an act of Vengeance*.

¹²⁵ For examples, see *Gesta Francorum*, 4, 15 (181), 52 (322), 66-7 (367).

¹²⁶ 'Khurasan', *The Encyclopedia of Islam*, C. E. Bosworth, E. Van Donzel, B. Lewis and C. H. Pellat (eds), (Leiden, 1979) 55, 58.

¹²⁷ Tolan, 'Muslims as Idolaters in Chronicles of the First Crusade', 101.

¹²⁸ Matthew 11:21, Luke 10:13.

¹²⁹ *Passio Tiemonis Archiepiscopi Iuvanensis*, MGH Scriptores II, 52 ff.

might have noticed a similarity that the *Gesta* author had missed, made any additional comments to suggest an association of *Corosanum* with Corozain. Nor indeed did Fulcher of Chartres, who used the *Gesta* but did not follow it as closely, or Albert of Aachen who was completely independent of any surviving written source.¹³⁰ In an article on the widespread and enduring use of the term *Corosanum*, Alan Murray argues more conservatively that while authors of First Crusade accounts did not confuse Khorosan with Corozain, they may have been consciously or unconsciously inclined to give the region more prominence than it actually warranted due to the association.¹³¹ This seems more likely to be the case, as neither the *Gesta* nor any of its revisers make any more specific allusions to the Biblical town.

The author had slightly better knowledge of the political leadership of the Turks than that of the Fatimid Caliphate. Kerbogha, Atabeg of Mosul, was the central villain of the *Gesta*'s account. After a long siege to capture Antioch, the crusaders' soon found themselves besieged in turn within the city by Kerbogha. The *Gesta* referred to him as *princeps militiae Soldani Persidiis*; the commander of the Persian Sultan's army, and wrote that he has been granted permission to kill Christians by the Caliph, 'their pope' (*illorum apostolico*).¹³² In another passage, the author had Kerbogha dictate a letter home, which he addresses to 'our king, the lord sultan' and to 'the caliph, our pope'.¹³³ The letter demonstrates awareness of who Kerbogha was and whom he served, distinct, as will be seen, from the main Muslim personality in the final part of the *Gesta*, the Fatimid Vizier al-Afdal Shahanshah. It is also fairly accurate; Kerbogha was in command of the Seljuk Sultan Berkyaruk's armies, and if there are quite a number of differences between a sultan and a king, not to mention a pope and a caliph, they are not wildly inaccurate simplifications – though it is likely that Kerbogha's supposed license from the caliph to kill Christians was a deliberate inversion of the crusading indulgence offered by Pope Urban II,

¹³⁰ *Gesta Francorum*, 4, 5, 14-15 39, 52, 66-7; Tudebode, 12, 13, 23, 59, 61-2, 79, 82; Fulcher of Chartres, 261; 261; Albert of Aachen, 34, 248-253. Guibert in fact offered an entirely different explanation. Guibert of Nogent, 82-3, 94; see also Chapter 5. The exception to this tendency is Robert the Monk, who may indeed have thought the *Gesta* author was referring to Corozain; see Chapter 3.

¹³¹ Alan V. Murray, 'Coroscane: Homeland of the Saracens in the *Chanson de geste* and The Historiography of the Crusades', in Hans van Dijk and Willem Noomen (eds) *Aspects de l'Épopée Romane: Mentalité, Idéologies, Intertextualités* (Groningen, 1995), 177-184.

¹³² *Gesta*, 49, 66.

¹³³ '...Caliphae nostro apostolico, ac nostri regi domino Soldano...', *Gesta Francorum*, 52 [321-2]. These were Al-Mustazhir and Abu al-Muzaffar Rukn ud-Dīn Barkyāruq bin Malikshāh, respectively.

rather than being what the author genuinely thought was the role of the Abbasid Caliph. It is likely that this is another case of the *Gesta* author superimposing Christian institutions onto what he knew of Muslims.¹³⁴

The *Gesta* author ceased to mention the Sultan after the crusade moved beyond Seljuk lands. He also ceased to mention a Caliph, apparently unaware that there was another. Indeed, he displayed no real sense of a power behind the enemies the crusaders faced on the road to Jerusalem, until after the city was captured. At this point, the crusaders learned of an army coming to attack them led by the *amiraius Babiloniae*; these were the forces of the Fatimid Caliph al Mustanzhir led by his vizier al-Afdal, marching from Egypt to recover Jerusalem. Neither is named; indeed the author may have conflated the two. His references to the leader present at Ascalon as the *amiraius Babiloniae* clearly indicates that he was thinking of al-Afdal, but it is not at all clear that he was aware of another figure to whom al-Afdal answered (nominally, at least – al Mustanzhir was a minor at the time).¹³⁵ The *Gesta* mistakenly calls him an *emir*, and for reasons that are not entirely clear consistently refers to him as coming from Babylon – though he does also refer to al-Afdal's forces as *gentem Aegyptiacam*.¹³⁶ Al-Afdal laments that he will be ridiculed in all the *terra Babilonica* for his defeat: the *Gesta* was fully aware that he was coming from somewhere different to Kerbogha.¹³⁷ As with Khorasan, there is no evidence that he was clearly aware of where exactly the *terra Babilonica* was, though he probably had some idea. Al-Afdal's assertion that the Egyptians were accustomed to the Christians travelling through their lands in poverty as pilgrims is probably an indication that the author was aware that Jerusalem had been in Fatimid hands at some point before its recent recapture from the Seljuks.¹³⁸

The *Gesta* author thus displays awareness of at least the political division between the Seljuk Turks and the Fatimid Caliphate, both in his terminology, as seen above, and in the information he gives about two

¹³⁴ Morton argues convincingly that such instances were usually simply intended to be informative rather than depicting Muslims as the evil counterparts of Christians, arguing in particular that references to the caliph as their pope were explanatory in nature. Morton, *Encountering Islam on the First Crusade*, 122.

¹³⁵ *Gesta Francorum*, 85-6, 96-7.

¹³⁶ *Gesta Francorum*, 97. The question of the association of the Fatimids with Babylon, made by almost all authors, is discussed in the conclusion to this thesis.

¹³⁷ 'Heu michi, quid amplius dicam? Inhonoratus ero semper in terra Babilonica.' *Gesta Francorum*, 97.

¹³⁸ 'Ipsa modo persequitur gentem Aegyptiacam, quae illi plerumque suas largita est elemosinas, dum olim per omnem nostram patriam mendicarent...' *Gesta Francorum*, 96 (498).

important opponents of the crusade. Beyond these details, the author seems to have tended to assume that Muslim political society was organised on essentially the same lines as Western European feudalism. The political organisation of Muslim society, in as much as it is depicted in the *Gesta Francorum*, is essentially that of Western Europe. Attention has already been drawn in the secondary literature to the passages in which the *Gesta* author had Muslims swear fealty to one another.¹³⁹ Shams ad-Daula, son of the Governor of Antioch Yaghi Siyan, petitioned Kerbogha for help, saying that if the *atabeg* could defeat the Franks, he would surrender the citadel to him, perform homage (*tibique faciam hominium*) and hold the citadel in fealty to him (*in tua fidelitate*) henceforth.¹⁴⁰ Kerbogha refused, demanding that the citadel be surrendered to him immediately, and he placed Ahmad ibn-Marwan (not named in the *Gesta*) in charge, telling the emir to hold the citadel 'in fealty' to him (*in fidelitatem meam*).¹⁴¹ However, Kerbogha's reply to Peter the Hermit's suggestion that he should convert may indicate a view of Turkish society as different to European, albeit still seen through a feudal lens. Part of Kerbogha's response was to offer generous benefices and horses to all the Christians if they would convert instead, so that they would all be knights (*milites*) as the Turks were, instead of *pedites*. The implication that all the Turks had horses and were *milites* seems on the one hand to suggest that Turkish society and military tactics differed from European in that they were even more reliant on horses, but at the same time to assume that ownership of a horse conferred the same level of prestige.¹⁴²

The author included some details, not all accurate, of the history of Islam in the Holy Land. For example, he believed that the Turks had previously been Christians, but had apostatised. In a passage praising the Turks' as warriors (discussed further below), he wrote that 'you could not find stronger or braver or more skilful soldiers' if only they had stayed Christian.¹⁴³ While this was incorrect of the Turks themselves, who had never been Christian, it does demonstrate a general awareness that in its

¹³⁹ Most recently by Morton, *Encountering Islam on the First Crusade*.

¹⁴⁰ '...tibi dabo oppidum tibique faciam hominium, et in tua fidelitate custodiam illud oppidum', Hill, *Gesta Francorum* 50 (316).

¹⁴¹ 'Volo ut intres in fidelitatem meam custodire hoc castrum' *Gesta Francorum*, 51.

¹⁴² '...nos illis hanc et satis plus dabimus de terra, et ciuitates et castella adhuc autem quod nemo uestrorum remanebit pedes, sed erunt omnes milites sicut et nos sumus', *Gesta Francorum*, 67.

¹⁴³ 'Certe si in fide Christi et Christianitate sancta semper firmi fuissent, ..fortiores uel bellorum ingeniosimos nullus inuenire potuisset.' *Gesta Francorum*, 21.

early history, Islam had spread in part by winning converts among the Christian inhabitants of the Middle East.

The author was also apparently aware of some of the more recent history of the wars between the Byzantine Empire and the various Muslim powers. In describing the embassy sent to Kerbogha on the eve of the final battle for Antioch, he recorded Kerbogha's response to Peter the Hermit's mocking suggestion that he had come seeking conversion, in which he explained his real reason for coming:

We have come here because we are scandalised to think that those leaders and commanders whom you name should lay claim to a land which we have conquered from an effeminate people.¹⁴⁴

The *effeminatae gentes* referred to were the Byzantines, from whom the Holy Land and large parts of Asia Minor had been annexed by Muslim forces in the previous half century. The Greeks had already been thought of as an effeminate people by the Western Christians for some time; Hagenmeyer noted that in Bishop Liutprand of Cremona's report of his mission to Byzantium in 968 he referred to them as *effeminati Graecorum populi*.¹⁴⁵ Hill also interprets Kerbogha's remarks on being presented with faulty crusader weapons – 'Are these the people who drove all our forefathers (*parentes*) out of Rûm and from the royal city of Antioch...?'¹⁴⁶ – as a reference to the wars of Nicephoros Phocas and John Tzimiskes against the Arabs in the tenth century. However, this is an unlikely reference for the author to make. These victories were won by the Byzantines whom the author usually distinguished from the crusaders; it suggests considerably more knowledge than he displays elsewhere and the victories mentioned were entirely temporary. It is more likely that *parentes* is to be understood as referring to relations or kinspeople more generally here, and that Kerbogha is therefore referring to the recent victories of the crusaders themselves.¹⁴⁷

¹⁴⁴ 'Huc usque iam uenimus eo quod ualde miramur quamobrem seniors ac maiores quos memoratis, cur terram quam abstulimus effeminates gentibus illi uocant esse suam.' *Gesta Francorum*, 67 (366).

¹⁴⁵ Hagenmeyer, *Gesta Francorum*, 366 n. 23.

¹⁴⁶ '...qui propulerunt omnes parentes nostros a Romania, et Antiochia urbe...?' *Gesta Francorum*, 51; 51 n. 2.

¹⁴⁷ Charlton T. Lewis and Charles Short, *A Latin Dictionary* sv '*parens*'. They refer to the meaning, 'relations, kinsfolk, kindred,' as 'rare' and not found in writings before the time of Augustus, but it is far more likely to be the correct translation here. This sense of the word was known in the Middle Ages; the translation,

This makes considerably more sense in its narrative context as well: it is far more likely for Kerbogha to express surprise that this is the equipment of the people who had defeated Turkish forces in Rûm and Antioch recently rather than in the tenth century.

2.2.5 Dehumanisation and Connections to the Supernatural

If the author's callous attitude to violence against Muslims can be seen as dehumanising, the *Gesta* also found much more explicitly dehumanising ways to represent Muslims. He directly referred to Muslim voices as demonic. The Turkish forces who attacked the crusaders at Dorylaeum were shouting 'some demonic utterance in their language', and Bohemond saw them 'shrieking and howling with demonic voices.'¹⁴⁸ He also referred to a mosque as a 'devil's chapel (*diabolicum atrium*).'¹⁴⁹ The author wrote that the Turkish soldiers killed in one of the battles before Antioch (the 'Bridge battle') 'received eternal burial with the Devil and his angels.'¹⁵⁰ This is probably a deliberate echo of his discussion of Christian soldiers killed in the same battle, 'who, as we believe, ascended to heaven, and received the white *stola* of martyrs.'¹⁵¹ This is another example of the *Gesta*'s occasional tendency to use distorted inversion of Christian topoi to depict Muslims.

Not only does the author explicitly describe their voices as demonic, as above, but two of the specific words he used here and elsewhere to describe their vocalisations, *stridere* and *garrire*, would have carried dark connotations for the author.¹⁵² *Stridere* occurs frequently in the Vulgate in the phrase *stridor dentium*, gnashing of teeth. Many times in the Gospels, people are cast into darkness or fire, where there is weeping and gnashing of teeth (*fletus et stridor dentium*) – into hell, in other words.¹⁵³ *Stridere* can

'relatives, kin' is the one given by Niermeyer, *Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus* (Leiden: Brill, 2002), sv 'parens'.

¹⁴⁸ 'Continuo Turci coeperunt stridere et garrire ac clamare, excelso uoce dicentes diabolicum sonum nescio quomodo in sua lingua. Sapiens uir Boamundus uidens innumerabiles Turcos procul, stridentes et clamantes demoniaca uoce...' *Gesta Francorum*, 18.

¹⁴⁹ *Gesta Francorum*, 42. The similar phrase 'synagogue of Satan', commonly used of Jewish synagogues in this period, was derived from Revelations 2:9 and 3:9. R. I. Moore, *The Formation of a Persecuting Society*, 33.

¹⁵⁰ '...recepunt sempiternum interitum cum diabolo et angelis eius.' *Gesta Francorum*, 41.

¹⁵¹ '...qui ut credimus in caelum ascenderunt, et candidati stolam martyrii receperunt.', *Gesta Francorum*, 40.

¹⁵² *Gesta Francorum*, 18, 40, 41.

¹⁵³ Matthew 8:12, 13:42, 13:50, 24:51, 25:30; Luke 13:28.

also mean shrieking, as in the description of the sorcerers in Isaiah 9:19,¹⁵⁴ which is more likely the meaning that the author had in mind here (there is no mention of teeth, for one). However, given the explicitly diabolical descriptions of the Muslim warriors' war-cries given by the author, it is probably not coincidental that he chose a word which is frequently associated with hell in the Gospels. *Garrire* seems to have been more often used of idle chatter, but its use by Isidore of Seville in his encyclopaedia entry for ghosts demonstrates that it too may have had eerie implications for medieval Latin-speakers: 'Ghosts (*larvae*), they say, are demons made from people who were deserving of evil. It is said that their nature is to frighten small children and chatter (*garrire*) in shadowy corners'.¹⁵⁵ Combined, the connotations of these words and the explicit comparison of the voices of Muslim warriors to demons contributed to a strong tendency to dehumanise Muslims.

Another supernatural aspect the author attributes to Muslim society is a belief in astrology and soothsaying. Kerbogha's mother attributed the prophecy that the Christians would defeat him and dominate the Muslims not only to *nostra pagina* and the *gentilium volumina*, but also to her careful observations of the stars, the planets, and the *duodecim signa*, the twelve signs of the Zodiac.¹⁵⁶ Kerbogha's mother is a complicated figure; as well as this less reputable activity she is depicted as being familiar with the Bible, which makes it difficult to evaluate how she is to be interpreted by the reader. However, the *Gesta* never suggests that she herself is Christian, only that she is convinced they will win – making her a figure equivalent to Pilate's wife in Matthew 27:19, a gentile given insight into God's plans.¹⁵⁷ Her concern with predictions that are not rooted in the Bible is probably intended to reinforce her non-Christian nature. In devoting so much space to this in one of the few passages where the author focuses his attention directly on Muslim actions, the author created the impression that divination was a prominent feature of Muslim society.

¹⁵⁴ '...et cum dixerint advos quaerite a pythonibus et a divinis qui strident in incantationibus suis numquid non populus a Deo suo requerit pro vivis a mortuis...' Isaiah 8:19.

¹⁵⁵ 'Larvas ex hominibus factos daemones aiunt, qui meriti mali fuerint. Quaram natura esse dicitur terrere parvulos, et in angulis garrire tenebrosis', Isidore of Seville, *Sancti Isidori Hispalensis Episcopi Etymologiarum Libri XX*, VIII.xi.101. *Patrologia Latina; The Etymologies of Isidore of Seville*, trans. Stephen A. Barney et al. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 190.

¹⁵⁶ *Gesta Francorum*, 55.

¹⁵⁷ See Ní Chléirigh, *The Crusaders and their Enemies*, 71.

2.2.6 Arrogance

The author frequently depicted the Muslim leadership as arrogant and certain of victory. Kerbogha was singled out as particularly arrogant – a depiction which may have been rooted in the crusaders' actual impression of him, as it is consistent even in independent sources.¹⁵⁸ Kerbogha boasts to his mother that he has more emirs in his army than all of the Christians put together.¹⁵⁹ His reply to the embassy the crusaders sent to him on the eve of the final battle for Antioch was likewise supremely confident of victory: he offered the crusaders the chance to convert to Islam and be richly rewarded, 'otherwise, let them know that they shall all be slain or led in chains to Khorasan, where they shall serve us and our children for all time, in everlasting captivity.'¹⁶⁰ When the crusaders prepared for battle the next day, his arrogance initially continued unabated: seeing the Christian army begin to exit the city to draw up battle lines, instead of attacking them as they were caught in the bottleneck of the city gates, he said 'let them come, so that we have them the more surely in our power.'¹⁶¹ This latter statement is very rapidly undermined, as Kerbogha was very frightened (*ualde timuit*) and makes preparations for a retreat signal as soon as he sees the crusaders' numbers.¹⁶²

Most of these examples centre on Kerbogha, but Antioch dominates the narrative of the *Gesta Francorum* and as such he is the primary representative of Muslims in the work. Nevertheless, he is not alone in being depicted this way in the *Gesta*. Kilij Arslan's soldiers carried ropes into battle at Nicaea, with which they expected to lead away the defeated Christians into slavery: they 'came in high spirits, exulting in their certainty of victory, bringing with them ropes with which to lead us bound into Khorosan.'¹⁶³ This confidence is echoed in the *Gesta*'s description of the Fatimid army at Antioch carrying water bottles with them which they

¹⁵⁸ See below, 6.2.7; 7.2.8.

¹⁵⁹ *Gesta Francorum*, 53.

¹⁶⁰ 'Sin autem, sciant se per omnia capitalem subire sententiam, aut deducti in uinculis Corrozanam in captiuitate perpetua seruient nobis nostrisque infantibus per sempiterna tempora.' *Gesta Francorum*, 67.

¹⁶¹ 'Sinite eos exire, ut melius eos habeamus in potestate nostra.' *Gesta Francorum*, 68.

¹⁶² *Gesta Francorum*, 68.

¹⁶³ 'uenerunt ... gaudentes et exultantes ad certum bellum, trahentes secum funes, quibus nos ligatos ducerent Corosanum.' *Gesta Francorum*, 15.

expected to drink while pursuing the fleeing Franks.¹⁶⁴ This would have served a simple narrative purpose; arrogance and assumptions of victory on the part of the enemy's leaders would have made the eventual success of the crusaders seem all the more satisfying to readers. But it may also have had a deeper significance. Although there are no direct references, the accounts are structurally quite similar to many Old Testament stories of battles against the Children of Israel, such as the fight against Goliath and the Philistines in 1 Samuel.

2.2.7 Concern with the Material World

On a number of occasions the *Gesta* depicted Muslims as highly materialistic, and overly concerned with the physical world in comparison to the crusaders. On one of these occasions, a group of Kerbogha's soldiers presented him with some particularly poor examples of weapons captured from the Christians: 'a very poor sword all covered with rust, a thoroughly bad wooden bow, and a spear which was quite useless,' which had been taken from the poorest of the crusaders.¹⁶⁵ Kerbogha responded with amusement:

Then Kerbogha began to chuckle, and said to all those who were present, "Are these the warlike and splendid weapons which the Christians have brought into Asia against us, and with these do they confidently expect to drive us beyond the furthest boundaries of Khorasan...?"¹⁶⁶

Similarly, in the passage in which his mother attempted to persuade him not to attack the Christians, he ridiculed her concerns, pointing out that he had 'more emirs in my following than the whole of the Christians, both great and small.'¹⁶⁷ Kerbogha's assurance that his superior numbers and weapons will win him the day is probably a deliberate contrast to the author's central message that the crusaders were victorious thanks to God's assistance. This

¹⁶⁴ 'Unusquisque suum habebat uasculum pendens collo, ex quibus poterant persequentes nos; sed illis non licuit, gratia Dei.' *Gesta Francorum*, 95.

¹⁶⁵ '...detulerant ante conspectum Curbarum quemdam uilissimum ensem rubigine tectum, et deterrimum arcum ligneum, et lanceam nimis inutilem, quae abstulerant nuper pauperibus peregrinis...' *Gesta Francorum*, 51.

¹⁶⁶ 'Tunc Curbarum coepit surridere, palam dicens omnibus: "Haec sunt arma bellica et nitida, quae attulerunt Christiani super nos in Asiam, quibus putant nos et confidunt expellere ultra confinia Corrozanae...?"' *Gesta Francorum*, 51.

¹⁶⁷ 'Enimuero mecum habeo plures ammiralios, quam Christiani sint sive maiores sive minores.' *Gesta Francorum*, 53.

is illustrated particularly well by Kerbogha's mother's response to his scepticism: she makes an impassioned attempt to convince him that, although the Christians are indeed 'unworthy to meet [him] in battle' alone, he cannot defeat them because:

their god fights for them every day... and suffers no people to hurt or vex them, and if anyone wishes to fight them, this same god of theirs will smite them, as he says by the mouth of David the prophet: "Scatter the people that delight in war (Psalms 67:31)"...¹⁶⁸

This is the 'correct' view of the world with which the author contrasts the views of Kerbogha and, later, al-Afdal. In the final passages of the *Gesta*, the defeated Fatimid commander is given a speech lamenting his defeat at Ascalon, in which he struggles to understand what has just occurred:

Who has ever seen or heard of such things as these? Such power, such courage, such an army as has never been overcome by anyone, to be defeated by such a wretched little force of Christians! ...I have been beaten by a force of beggars, unarmed and poverty-stricken, who have nothing but a bag and a scrip...¹⁶⁹

An important theological point is made by the author with this last phrase, which uses language very reminiscent of Christ's commands to his Apostles in Luke 10:4.¹⁷⁰ There is a crucial difference in that the Apostles are commanded to go forth and preach without even a bag or a scrip (*nolite portare sacculum neque peram* in Luke's version). The crusaders *did* apparently possess a bag and a scrip (if nothing else). This may be the result of the author misremembering the details of the passages to which he was referring. All the passages forbid staffs except for Mark 6:8 which commands

¹⁶⁸ "...Christiani nequeunt uobiscum bellare, scio namque quod non ualent uobis pugnam inferre, sed deus eorum pro ipsis cotidie pugnat... et non permittit eos laedi nec conturbari ab ulla gente, et quicumque uolunt eis obsistere, idem eorum deus conturbat illos, sicut ait ipse per os David propheta: "Dissipa gentes quae bella uolunt." Et alibi: "Effunde iram tuam in gentes quae te non nouerunt, et in regna quae nomen tuum non inuocauerunt." " *Gesta Francorum*, 53-4 (325-6).

¹⁶⁹ "...quis unquam uidit uel audiuit talia? Tanta potestas, tanta uirtus, tanta militia quae nunquam ab ulla gente fuit superata, modo a tantilla gente Christianorum est deuicta? ...Superatus sum a gente mendica, inermi et pauperrima; quae non habet nisi saccum et peram." *Gesta Francorum*, 96.

¹⁷⁰ The same terms are repeated in Luke 22:35-6, and similar commands (mentioning a *pera* but not a *saccum*, among other forbidden items) are given in Matthew 10:10, Mark 6:8, and Luke 9:3.

the disciples to bring nothing *nisi virgam, tantum non peram*, using the words *nisi* and *pera* in close proximity, which may have added to the author's confusion. Nevertheless, the general theme of poverty and the particular words used makes the author's intentions clear. The crusaders were acting as purveyors of the Gospel: as their appearance showed, they were true disciples of Christ, dressed in the manner Christ commanded the Apostles to dress. This echoes the opening words of the *Gesta*, which begins with Christ's words telling the disciples that the time has come to take the journey to Jerusalem.¹⁷¹ As well as adding to a consistent motif with regard to the author's portrayal of the crusaders, this reference adds a deep layer of irony to the reader who was aware of its powerful statement on apostolic poverty: something which this non-Christian was incapable of understanding and utterly perplexed by. It is particularly ironic, indeed, that al-Afdal would expect people resembling the Apostles to be easily defeated. The author thus both implicitly and explicitly contrasts the materialistic views of the Muslims with his belief in the divine assistance which the crusaders received. Likewise, in the speech the author attributed to Kerbogha in which he laid out his peace terms, all the rewards he promised for conversion to Islam were worldly, material ones: wealth, land and horses. This offer was, of course, emphatically rejected by Peter the Hermit on behalf of the crusaders.¹⁷²

2.2.8 Cowardice

In contrast with the *Gesta*'s depictions of Muslims as effective and terrifying fighters – and its explicit statement, discussed below, that the Turks in particular were excellent warriors – Muslims were very frequently depicted as cowardly. They were inspired to terrified flight on many occasions.¹⁷³ Alone, these examples might simply have been intended to convey the particular ferocity of the Christian attack, but there are a number of other examples which depict Muslims as distinctly cowardly.

The *Gesta* described Kilij Arslan's flight from the battle of Dorylaeum, a headlong flight lasting four days.¹⁷⁴ The Arab commander he supposedly encountered asked why he was trembling (*tremefactus*); he

¹⁷¹ 'Cum iam appropinquasset ille terminus quem dominus Iesus cotidie suis demonstrat fidelibus. Specialiter in euangelio dicens: "si quis uult post me uenire, abneget semetipsum et tollat crucem suam et sequatur me"...' *Gesta Francorum*, 1.

¹⁷² *Gesta Francorum*, 67.

¹⁷³ *Gesta Francorum*, 20, 31, 70.

¹⁷⁴ 'per quattuor dies et noctes fugientes huc et illuc.' *Gesta Francorum*, 22.

replied that they had seen such huge masses of Franks that they fled from the very sight of them, and were still terrified:

when we saw them we were terribly afraid and took to flight at once, barely escaping from their hands, and that is why we are still terror-stricken.¹⁷⁵

He advises the Arabs to flee as well, and they do. Similarly, Kerbogha, for all his initial confidence, was greatly affected by the sight of the entire crusader army when it advanced out from Antioch: 'after they were all outside the city, and he saw how great was the force of the Franks, he was very much afraid,' and he made preparations for a retreat signal simply at the sight of the crusaders' numbers.¹⁷⁶ Later, a force of only thirty knights led by Raymond Pilet attacked a force of 700 Muslims so fiercely that 'they turned tail, panic-stricken.'¹⁷⁷ Particularly strikingly, the *Gesta* claimed that the Fatimid forces at Ascalon collapsed completely: they stood still in the face of the crusader attack, blinded and stupefied by God's will, before breaking and fleeing, some trying to hide in trees and others throwing themselves prostrate on the ground.¹⁷⁸

At first glance contradictory, viewed in context together the depictions of Muslim cowardice and the martial prowess discussed in other sections give an impression of an immensely powerful foe whom, (with God's help, as frequently emphasised), the crusaders comprehensively defeated. This serves one of the author's over-arching narrative purposes well: readers were given the impression that Muslim society was martial and powerful, but no match for the righteousness of the crusaders' cause.

¹⁷⁵ '...tunc respiciens retro, uidi tam innumerabilem gentem eorum, ut si uos aut aliquis illic adesset, putaret quod omnes montes et colles uallesque et omnia plana loca plena essent illorum multitudine. Nos igitur illos cernentes, statim coepimus capere subitaneum iter, timentes tam mirabiliter, ut uix euaserimus de illorum manibus, unde adhuc in nimio terrore sumus.' *Gesta Francorum*, 22.

¹⁷⁶ 'Postquam uero fuerunt foris de urbe, uiditque Curbaram ingentem Francorum gentem, ualde timuit.' *Gesta Francorum*, 68.

¹⁷⁷ '...timore nimio perterriti, uerterunt scapulas retro.' *Gesta Francorum*, 89. The numbers cannot be trusted at all, but it is clear what the author intended to suggest about Muslims.

¹⁷⁸ 'Stabant autem inimici Dei excecati et stupefacti, ac uidentes Christi milites apertis oculis nil uidebant, et contra Christianos erigere se non audebant, uirtute Dei tremefacti. Pro nimio timore ascendebant in arbores, in quibus putabant se abscondere; at nostri sagittando et cum lanceis et ensibus occidendo eos ad terram precipitabant. Alii autem iactabant se in terram, non audentes erigere se contra nos.' *Gesta Francorum*, 96.

2.2.9 Muslim destiny

There is a minor, but detectable, theme in the *Gesta* of Muslims being doomed both in this world and the next. As referred to above, Muslims – in direct contrast to the martyred crusaders who are welcomed directly into heaven – are condemned to hell after their deaths. The repeated associations with the devil and use of the word *stridere*, as also discussed above, may have contributed to this impression. The author also established the inevitable fate of Muslims in the material world, using Kerbogha's mother as a mouthpiece. In warning her son that God fights on behalf of the Christians, she claims that not only Kerbogha's defeat, but the ultimate victory of the Christians overall has been foretold in prophecy. Both the Christian and Muslim books predicted that 'the Christian people was destined to come upon us and defeat us in every place, and that it should rule over the pagans, and that our people should be subject to these men wherever they are;' although she did not know 'whether these things will come to pass now or in the future' (it is worth noting again here that it is generally agreed that this part of the *Gesta* was completed after Antioch was secured and Kerbogha defeated, but before the crusade moved on to Jerusalem itself, which may explain the uncertainty).¹⁷⁹ Kerbogha's mother's astrological observations confirmed that the Christians would win.¹⁸⁰ Rather than being influenced by eschatological thought, looking ahead to the final victory predicted in the book of Revelation, the author is clearly thinking in terms of Old Testament prophecy here, as such references litter this passage. Having firmly established that Christians are the inheritors of God's relationship with the Children of Israel (not only does he have Kerbogha's mother cite Old Testament examples of God's defence of His people, she also literally refers to them as 'sons of adoption and promise', and 'heirs of Christ'), the author has her quote Deuteronomy 11: 24-5 and Joshua 1:4-5 as the words of 'the prophets' in support of her prediction.¹⁸¹ This indicates a tendency to view the crusade in an Old Testament framework, rather than an eschatological one based on exegesis of the New Testament. The author's certainty of Muslims' fate may have been strongly influenced by the crusaders' triumphs – if not their final triumph in Jerusalem (which both of these passages are

¹⁷⁹ '...quoniam gens Christiana super nos foret uentura, et nos ubique uictura, ac super paganos regnatura; et nostra gens illis ubique erit subdita. Sed ignoro, utrum modo, an in futuro sint haec euentura.' *Gesta Francorum*, 55.

¹⁸⁰ *Ibid.*

¹⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 54-6.

thought to predate), then at least their extremely hard-won conquest of Antioch.

2.2.10 Positive views of Muslims

As a counterpoint to the usual distinctly negative depiction of Muslims in the *Gesta Francorum* it must be noted that in a few places in the text the author demonstrated a more positive view of them, or at least an acceptance that accommodation was possible. The most well-known passage of this kind is also the most positive. The author lavished praise on Turkish military prowess in a passage following the battle of Dorylaeum. Who could dare to describe their skill and prowess, he asked, noting that they had struck terror into the Syrians, Arabs, Saracens, Armenians and Greeks. His purpose is immediately clear; as he put it, the Turks 'thought that' they would similarly terrorise the Franks, but '*si Deo placet nunquam tantum ualebunt, quantum nostri*'.¹⁸² As formidable an enemy as they were, they could not defeat the crusaders: he praises the Muslim enemy in order to praise by proxy the men who faced them and won, and to reassert his fundamental belief that the crusaders were successful because God was on their side. Nevertheless, he creates a positive image of the Muslims here. Surprisingly, he goes even further: he claims that the Turks themselves believe that they and the Franks descend from common ancestors, and that of all races only those two are born to be knights. The author neither confirms nor denies this belief; apparently he is not bothered by the thought. He attributes their defeat to God's grace, saying that if only they had remained Christian (here he apparently confuses the Turks with the original inhabitants of the region, many of whom had been Christian before the Arab conquests), there would be no better soldiers.¹⁸³ This claim that they had formerly been Christian may also have explained their prowess to him, allowing him to fit this into his worldview: they owed their fighting ability to their Christian forebears, and would have been even better soldiers if they had remained Christian. The supposed common ancestry of the Turks and the Franks may also be a part of his attempt to reconcile a positive presentation of the Turks with them

¹⁸² *Gesta Francorum*, 21.

¹⁸³ Matthew Bennet draws attention to a 'stock phrase' used of Noble Saracen characters in the *Chansons de Geste*: 'Deus, quell baron, s'ouist Chrestientét'. The question of the relationship of the *Gesta* to the *Chansons* is a complicated one, but this is at least an example of a similar idea being current in the thought of contemporaries, if not a case of direct influence (whether of the *Chansons* on the *Gesta* or vice versa). Matthew Bennett, 'First Crusaders' Images of Muslims: The Influence of Vernacular Poetry?' in *Forum for Modern Language Studies* 22 (2) 1986, 101-116, 105.

being the enemy, and to explain how they should have similar strength to the Franks.

This statement about common ancestry has been read as acknowledging the truth of the Turks' supposed belief, which would indicate a great deal of sympathy and admiration.¹⁸⁴ Marcus Bull has argued that this statement can be traced back to a misunderstanding of the account of the Trojan origin of the Franks in the seventh-century chronicle of Fredegar.¹⁸⁵ As such, 'even in what seems a moment of campfire rumour-mongering, therefore, the basis of the comment is essentially intertextual, not observational'.¹⁸⁶ However, the author's attribution of the idea to the Turks serves to distance him from the statement: he does not necessarily believe that the Turks and Franks share ancestry, though he emphasises that it is true that they believe it: '*Verum-tamen dicunt se esse de Francorum generatione*'.¹⁸⁷ This, along with the absence of details from the myth, suggests that the author did not learn of it from what he considered an authoritative source, and may only have received a vague impression of it – possibly even a 'campfire rumour' after all. The idea that the Turks and Franks shared the same ancestry on the basis of the myth of the Trojan origin of the Franks does seem to have appeared elsewhere, however. Anna-Dorothee von Den Brincken drew attention to a manuscript (Cod. UB Leipzig 350) which she believed to contain a world-chronicle by Hugh of St-Victor (†1141). In this manuscript, Hugh described the Turks as being related to the Franks, similar to what the *Gesta* says the Turks believed.¹⁸⁸

¹⁸⁴ Morton, *Encountering Islam on the First Crusade*, 99-101.

¹⁸⁵ Bruno Krusch, 'Die Chronikae des Sogenannte Fredegar', *Neues Archiv* 7, 247-351 and 421-516, 474. Bennet also points out that the *Gesta* may have derived this suggestion of a common bloodline from the myth of the Trojan origin of the Franks. Bennett, 'First Crusaders' Images of Muslims, 115.

¹⁸⁶ Marcus Bull, 'The Western narratives of the First Crusade', in David Thomas and Alex Mallett (eds) *Christian-Muslim Relations: A Bibliographical History*, 11 vols (Leiden, 2011), 3.15-25, 23.

¹⁸⁷ *Gesta Francorum*, 21. This impression is reinforced by the *Gesta*'s next assertion, that the Turks would have been matchless warriors if they had remained Christian, which he introduces by saying '*Veritatem dicam quam nemo audebit prohibere...*' The contrast between what 'they say' (*dicunt*) and what 'I say' (*dicam*), which 'nobody can deny' is clear. Although the author claims to speak truly in both cases, the implication in the first instance is only that it is true that the Turks believe this, whereas in the latter a more objective truth is asserted.

¹⁸⁸ Cod. UB Leipzig 350, fol. 114, as cited in Anna-Dorothee von den Brincken, *Studien zur Lateinischen Weltchronistik Bis in das Zeitalter Ottos von Freising* (Duesseldorf: Michael Triltsch Verlag, 1957), 201 n. 103. Von den Brincken disagrees with Georg Waitz and August Potthast, who thought Hugo's authorship of this manuscript to be at best uncertain. She provided evidence for her interpretation on 199-200, followed by a description of the content of the manuscript. More information about Cod. UB Leipzig 350 can be found in von den Brincken, 'Die

He had, in von den Brincken's opinion, and much as Bull suggests of the *Gesta* author himself, 'die bei Fredegar genannten sagenhaften Torqui... mit den Tuerken identifiziert'.¹⁸⁹ Fredegar wrote that the Franks and the *Torqui* were descended from refugees who fled the destruction of Troy. The *Turci* and the *Franci* divided into two groups in Europe, and one of the groups '*Electum a se utique regem nomen Torquoto, per quod gens Turquorum nomen accepit.*' The other group likewise took their name from their king, Francio.¹⁹⁰ Von den Brincken considered it likely that Hugh got this information not from Fredegar directly, but from Haimo of Fleury, who says much the same thing.¹⁹¹ How the idea came to be in Fredegar, and who the *Torqui* actually were, is obscure.¹⁹²

Whatever the origin of this statement, he seems to genuinely admire the Turks in this passage – although too much has perhaps been read into it at the expense of other passages in which he displays no admiration. Hill's assertion that the author regarded the Turks as 'bonny fighters' is clearly influenced strongly by this passage, but it must be weighed against incidents such as the easy defeat of the Turks at Nicaea and Kilij Arslan's humiliating flight from Dorylaeum.¹⁹³ Rather than presenting a coherent view of the Turks as fighters, the author was building them up when he needed to, to make their defeat all the more impressive and dramatically satisfying. However, while in places he does this in ways that emphasise their ferocity or dehumanise them (as discussed above) here he does it through praise, demonstrating that the lens of otherness was not the only way in which he was capable of viewing Muslims. Hill also drew attention to the description

Ausbildung Konventioneller Zeichen und Farbgebungen in der Universalkartographie des Mittelalters', *Archiv fuer Diplomatik, Schriftgeschichte, Siegel- und Wappenkunde* 16(JG) 1970, 325-349.

¹⁸⁹ Von den Brincken, *Studien zur Lateinischen Weltchronistik*, 201.

¹⁹⁰ Fredegar, *Fredegari et Aliorum Chronica. Vitae Sanctorum*. Monumenta Germaniae Historica Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum II.46, 93.

¹⁹¹ Haimo of Fleury, *Historia Francorum*, Patrologia Latina 139, col. 639.

¹⁹² Morton presented a similar analysis to the above, although he was convinced that the *Gesta* author did accept the common ancestry of the Turks and the Franks; as noted above there is reason to believe the author may have remained skeptical. Morton also found late medieval evidence of the Turks actually subscribing to this belief: the Mamluk historian Badr al-Din Mahmud († 1451), drawing on 'far earlier' sources traced the racial origins of mankind back to the time of Noah. He wrote that all of world's peoples descended from Noah's sons Shem, Ham and Japheth. Crucially, he explained that Japheth's eldest son Gomer fathered Riphath (father of the Franks), Ashikiyan (father of the Slavs) and Togarmah (father of the Turks). Morton notes that it had long been believed the Turks descended from Gomer and Japheth, but this was the earliest reference he could find to Franks sharing that ancestry – so it is by no means certain it was current in 1090s, but possible. Morton, *Encountering Islam on the First Crusade*, 99-101, 100 n. 132.

¹⁹³ *Gesta Francorum*, xiv.

of the emir to whom Kerbogha entrusted the citadel of Antioch, Ahmed ibn Marwan, as 'honourable and brave', although she is again inclined to overstate the degree to which Kerbogha is presented positively. It is true that he 'fights fairly, taking no advantage of sorcery', but this is true of all the Muslim commanders; indeed it is true of all Muslims in all the histories of the First Crusade considered in this thesis with the sole exception of two women described by Raymond of Aguilers.¹⁹⁴ Magic comes up only on that occasion; its absence here is thus unlikely to be significant. Hill also points to his offer to enrich and befriend any Christian who will convert and join the Turks, but the intention of this passage is clearly to demonstrate that the crusaders were offered a tempting alternative to their struggle and remained steadfast, rather than any great generosity on Kerbogha's part.¹⁹⁵

Hill observed in her introduction to the *Gesta Francorum* that the crusaders did not understand the willingness of the Byzantines to treat with Muslims as a foreign power on equal terms and saw it as 'rather treacherous'.¹⁹⁶ This does not actually seem true of the *Gesta*, however, which recorded a number of diplomatic engagements with Muslims, with no indication of disapproval. Fatimid ambassadors came to the crusader camp at Antioch, apparently in the hopes that these newcomers could become allies against their Turkish rivals. The *Gesta Francorum* has one of the least detailed accounts of these ambassadors: the author did not record anything about their arrival or departure, let alone the subject of their negotiations, unlike other authors. They simply appear in a passage in which, following Bohemond's defeat of a relief force sent to Antioch, the heads of a hundred of the Turkish dead were brought to their camp at one of the city gates.¹⁹⁷ Later, more severed heads from the bodies of Turks buried hastily after another encounter, whose graves were robbed by the crusaders (as discussed above) were loaded on four horses belonging to the ambassadors and sent to the coast. Whether this was intended as a threat or an indication of shared hostility to the Turks (or both) is not entirely clear, but in light of what the

¹⁹⁴ For further discussion of supernatural matters, see below, 9.9. On Raymond, see Appendix I.

¹⁹⁵ Rosalind Hill, 'The Christian view of the Muslims at the time of the First Crusade' in M. Holt (ed.) *The Eastern Mediterranean Lands in the Period of the Crusades*, (Warminster, 1977), 1-8, 2.

¹⁹⁶ Hill, *Gesta Francorum*, xxiii.

¹⁹⁷ 'Et centum capita mortuorum detulerunt ante portam ciuitatis, ubi legati ammirati Babyloniae castrametati fuerant, qui mittebantur senioribus.' *Gesta Francorum*, 37-8.

author says elsewhere it seems clear that he was untroubled by the use of diplomacy to achieve the goals of the crusade as well as war.

A series of treaties was made with independent Muslim rulers as the crusade made its way south towards Jerusalem. While a number of cities were captured, the crusaders seem to have adopted a new tactic of accommodation with many others. Shaizar and Marakia made treaties with the crusaders; the former as they passed, and the latter admitting them to the city.¹⁹⁸ Godfrey of Bouillon and Robert of Flanders quickly made a treaty with Djibei, a town they were besieging, when Raymond of Toulouse called for their aid. The rulers of Homs and Tripoli had their overtures rebuffed at first, told that they would have to convert to Christianity, but this condition was apparently not always demanded.¹⁹⁹ Indeed in the treaty made when the siege of Tripoli was finally abandoned in favour of finally reaching Jerusalem, the emir of Tripoli²⁰⁰ released Christian prisoners and promised tribute, but conceded only a promise to convert *if* the crusaders defeated the Fatimids (the results of negotiations with Homs were not mentioned by the author).²⁰¹ In all of these cases, the *Gesta*'s author presented the treaties neutrally and without comment. In isolation, the insistence attributed to the crusade leaders that the rulers of Homs and Tripoli must convert to Christianity – and the assertion that the Emir of Tripoli did ultimately agree to – would suggest difficulty with the idea of diplomatic relations with Muslim rulers. Adam Knobler demonstrated a recurring tendency throughout the crusading period to depict potential Muslim allies as having converted or considered conversion; ideas which allowed Christians unaccustomed to seeing Muslims represented as anything other than the enemy to make 'a distinction between bad Muslims and good Muslims'.²⁰² But these examples occurred alongside three examples of treaties where no such condition was even suggested by the author; he does not seem to have shared this difficulty with accepting Muslims as allies. The author does indicate that Pirrus, the tower guard who betrayed Antioch to the Christians, wished to convert to Christianity, but he does not return to this observation. This aligns with Knobler's arguments, but it is not something the *Gesta* author concentrated

¹⁹⁸ *Gesta Francorum*, 81, 84.

¹⁹⁹ *Gesta Francorum*, 82-3.

²⁰⁰ Jalal al-Mulk Abu'l Hasan.

²⁰¹ Hill, *Gesta Francorum*, 85-6 [415-438]

²⁰² Adam Knobler, 'Pseudo-Conversions and Patchwork Pedigrees: The Christianisation of Muslim Princes and the Diplomacy of Holy War', in *Journal of World History* 7(2) 1996, 181-197, 197.

on.²⁰³ The need to distinguish ‘bad Muslims and good Muslims’ in this way does not seem to have yet become as pressing as it may have been later.

The *Gesta* author’s treatment of Muslims could depict them as very alien - describing their voices as inhuman, satanic screeches; referring to them as the enemies of God and Christendom itself – but he did not see them as irreconcilably other. As evidenced by the passages discussed here, he was also capable of viewing Muslims as potential allies, and even of admiring them.

2.3 Conclusion

Overall, the *Gesta* does not offer a single consistent view of Muslims. Much of what the author says springs out of the incident he is recording, sometimes relying on a quite contrived and stereotypical depiction of an enemy in his efforts to describe the heroics of the crusaders. This is most visible in his alternating depictions of Muslims as terrifyingly effective killers, and as easily defeated cowards. In this regard, the depiction of Muslims is subservient to other narrative concerns; namely, conveying the magnitude of what the crusaders achieved with the assistance of God. The *Gesta*’s depiction of Muslims lacks detail in other areas as well. Norman Housley has argued of crusade sources in general that this is due to a tendency for the authors to have viewed the crusade in a firmly Eurocentric frame of mind: they were concerned with the salvation achieved by the crusaders, and not with the enemy.²⁰⁴ Something of this mindset probably did affect most authors of crusade accounts up to a point, though the ‘corrections’ that the *Gesta* revisers all took time to make to its depiction suggest that this can only explain so much. In the *Gesta*’s case, however, it is less clear that the author had any great interest in creating a specific depiction of Muslims. It may even be the case that he assumed his readers were already familiar with them.

A more consistent thread which unites much of what the author says about Muslims is his insistence that Muslims were the inherent enemies of all Christianity and of God Himself, not just temporary rivals for control of physical territory. This is perhaps not an unexpected attitude, but nor was it

²⁰³ *Gesta Francorum*, 44-7.

²⁰⁴ Housley, ‘The Crusades and Islam,’ 197, 207-8.

an inevitable one. The author reinforced this message through language – quite literally referring to them as *inimici Dei*, using terminology reminiscent of the enemies of the Children of Israel in the Old Testament, and possibly even invoking the Roman persecutors of the early Church by referring to them as polytheistic pagans (though in this case there is no evidence to suggest that he did not also genuinely think this is what they were). He also reinforced it by dehumanising and ‘othering’ Muslims – in his depiction, they were ferocious killers, demonic in appearance and connected to Satan and the supernatural. They were also both the perpetrators of, and the justified targets of, extreme violence.

In spite of the relative consistency with which the author attempted to portray Muslims as inherently inimical to all Christians, even this was not a programme to which he adhered to the exclusion of all other ways of thinking about them. He famously included a passage in praise of the Turks’ abilities as warriors, which does seem to indicate some sympathy in spite of their non-Christian beliefs, and he at least appears to take seriously the idea that the Turks and the Franks might share common ancestry, albeit with some skepticism. Contrary to what has been argued, the *Gesta* author was comfortable with the idea of Muslims converting, indicating that all hostility was purely religiously-based. Despite his emphasis on the hostile character of Muslims, when he reached the point in the narrative at which he had to record alliances and treaties made with Muslim rulers, he made no attempt to conceal or excuse these pragmatic arrangements – the demands of the narrative once more outweighing any other program which the author may have had in mind.

Another central theme of the *Gesta* is the inevitability of the success of the crusade due to the crusaders’ assistance by God. This theme is reflected in the depiction of Muslims in several ways. The *Gesta*’s graphic descriptions of violence become increasingly one-sided as the narrative proceeded from the People’s Crusade: having established that Muslims were both savage barbarians and a great threat for the crusaders to overcome, the author then gave the impression that the crusaders (who were assisted by God) were far more effective. The author’s depiction of Muslims contributed to this narrative in other, more subtle ways as well. His frequent depictions of Muslims, in particular Kerbogha, as arrogant and supremely confident that they would be victorious, ironically underscored their total defeat. They were also presented as materialistic: not only driven by wealth, which was

all they had to offer the crusaders when Kerbogha tried to convince them to convert, but also convinced that their numbers and military strength were all they needed to triumph: a clear unspoken contrast with the divinely-assisted crusaders. Muslim defeat and crusader victory is often presented as inevitable and as having been foretold, whether by scripture or by more supernatural means of fortune-telling.

The *Gesta Francorum* offered little detail about what Muslims believed; as far as can be determined the anonymous author thought only that they were polytheists and that a figure named Mohammed was important to them, but not necessarily one of their gods. Though he believed Muslims to be polytheists, in light of this lack of detail and his apparent knowledge of Mohammed – as well as Guibert's usage – it is likely that he only called them 'pagans' as a generic term for all non-Christians.

The *Gesta* author displayed some level of understanding of the structure of Muslim society. He recognised the political distinction between the Seljuk Turks and their subjects on the one hand, and the Fatimid Caliphate and its subjects on the other, consistently referring to them as *Turci* and *Sarraceni*, respectively. He understood the political leadership of the Turks somewhat better, referring to the Sultan and Caliph relatively accurately as the equivalent of their king and pope, though he did not seem to be aware of the recent fracturing of the empire which meant that not all of the Turkish leaders encountered by the crusade were fully (or at all) recognising the Sultan Berkyaruk's authority. The seat of power of the *Turci* was located in Khorosan (*Corrozanum*), a region highly significant to the Seljuks but not the actual site of their capital. This may have been simply a minor error on the author's part or he may have been influenced by the similarity of the place-name Khorosan to the Biblical town of Corozain, though it is unlikely that his use of *Corrozanum* was first and foremost a Biblical reference. The Fatimid leadership was depicted with less accuracy, with the Vizier al-Afdal, given the title *ammiralius Babiloniae*, apparently assumed to be the outright ruler of the Caliphate (with no recognition of the existence of a second caliph or of the theocratic nature of the state). Other aspects of Muslim society were usually clearly modelled on Western Europe, with the author assuming Muslims used the same feudal institutions as the mechanism of their government – as well as his interpretation of the Sultan and Caliph as equivalent to a king and a pope, as mentioned.

2.4 The *Historia de Hierosolimitano Itinere* of Peter Tudebode

The French priest Peter Tudebode's *Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere* is essentially the closest revision of the *Gesta*, though he was also an eyewitness. Tudebode exaggerated and added to the *Gesta* in ways which are important and need to be taken into account in the conclusion of this thesis. While important in character, these changes are not great enough in number to require an entire chapter devoted to Tudebode's *Historia*. Instead, it is presented here as an appendix to this chapter.

Relatively little is known about Tudebode, but internal evidence in the text at least gives us his name, including a toponym – *Sivracensis* – believed to refer to the town of Civray, near Poitiers.²⁰⁵ Tudebode was a priest who was himself present on the crusade, and contributed some important information which is not found in the *Gesta Francorum* or in Raymond of Aguilers, to whose work he also had access. His narrative covers exactly the same period as the *Gesta Francorum*, so it is difficult to assign an exact date to it, but the authenticity of the information unique to his work does suggest a date of composition not long after the end of the crusade.²⁰⁶ Tudebode's version generally tends to elaborate the *Gesta*'s prose and adds a number of details and longer passages, at least some of which were from his own experience. Some of these concern Muslims, and Tudebode alters and exaggerates the image of Islam presented by the *Gesta*. Although the modern consensus is that the *Gesta* was the original and Tudebode's version the copy, the exact relationship between the two remains unsettled. As discussed in the *Gesta Francorum* chapter, a recently discovered manuscript bearing the title *Peregrinatio Antiochie ad Urbanum Papam Facta* and displaying linguistic features and content in common with both the *Gesta* and Tudebode has complicated the question.²⁰⁷ It has not

²⁰⁵ Peter Tudebode, *Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere*, RHC Historiens Occidentaux III (Paris, 1866) (hereafter 'Tudebode').

²⁰⁶ 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 Crusade' in John France and William G. Zajac (eds) *The Crusades and their Sources: Essays Presented to Bernard Hamilton*, (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998) 39 – 70, 43.

²⁰⁷ The text appears in ff 48r-90v of the MS known as St Catherine's College, Cambridge, 3; with the above title in a rubric. The text was identified as a *Gesta Francorum* manuscript by M. R. James in a 1925 catalogue of the St Catherine's collection, but it has recently been recognised as 'something subtly but significantly different': Marcus Bull, 'The Relationship between the "*Gesta Francorum*" and

been suggested that Tudebode was the original, however, so the *Gesta Francorum* is treated in more detail in this thesis.

Although there is not enough material to warrant a full chapter, Tudebode's additions and alterations to the depiction of Muslims found in the *Gesta* are necessary to consider. He added some ideas about Muslims to the *Gesta* which provide important points of comparison to the anonymous account and to others. Tudebode's version is also important to analyse as an example of how even the closest-related authors differed in their depiction of Muslims. As such, this material is presented here as an appendix.

2.4.1 Terminology

For the most part, Tudebode adhered to the *Gesta Francorum*'s terminology for Muslims. This seems to have been a conscious choice to adopt the *Gesta*'s phrasing: he maintained the *Gesta*'s usages even in passages which were added to the text.²⁰⁸

2.4.2 Exaggeration

In producing such a close revision of the *Gesta Francorum*, Tudebode inevitably reproduced the same themes. However, in a number of ways, he often exaggerated the impression given by the *Gesta*. This ranged from simply adding derogatory descriptors to some of the *Gesta*'s phrases (For example, in reproducing the passage in which Bohemond learns of the purpose of the Crusade, Tudebode stated it in starker terms (to snatch the road to the Holy Sepulchre from the hands of the pagans, rather than simply going prepared to fight against them) and added the epithet *pessimorum* to the Anonymous's *gentem paganorum*) to entire incidents which added to the *Gesta*'s depictions of violence and the arrogance of the Muslims.²⁰⁹ These incidents included the martyrdom of Rainald Porchet, alluded to above, and the fate of a spy captured investigating the siege engines brought to bear against Jerusalem during the siege. When Rainald rejected his offer of conversion to Islam, 'Cassianus', the emir of Antioch (Yaghi-Siyhan) was enraged and ordered him to be

Peter Tudebode's "*Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere*": The Evidence of a Hitherto Unexamined Manuscript (St. Catherine's College, Cambridge, 3)', *Crusades* 11 (2012), 1 – 17, 5.

²⁰⁸ For examples, see Tudebode, 16, 36, 52, 72, 105.

²⁰⁹ Tudebode (15): 'At bellipotens vir Boamundus, qui erat in obsessione Malfi, scilicet Scaphardi pontis, audiens venisse innumerabilem gentem Francorum quatinus Sancti Sepulchri viam de manu eriperet pessimorum paganorum...' *Gesta Francorum* (7): 'At bellipotens Boamundus qui erat in obsidione Malfi, Scafardi Pontis, audiens uenisse innumerabilem gentem Christianorum de Francis, ituram ad Domini Sepulchrum, et paratam ad prelium contra gentem paganorum...'

beheaded and all his fellow captives to be bound together naked and burned at the stake.²¹⁰ The spy's fate allowed Tudebode (or, not impossibly, his captors) to indulge in dramatic irony: he was bound and placed in a catapult, then hurled at the walls, against which he was crushed.²¹¹ Tudebode also intensified some of the descriptions of violence that were in the *Gesta*, such as the defeat of Al-Afdal's forces at Ascalon. Where the *Gesta* recorded that fleeing Fatimid soldiers tried to hide in trees, but were killed with arrows and spears, Tudebode added that they fell from the trees 'like birds', and once on the ground they were dismembered with swords.²¹²

Tudebode also added to the *Gesta*'s theme of the arrogance and materialism of the Muslim enemy. He described a sortie by four 'emirs' who came out from the citadel of Antioch to intimidate the Christians besieged within the city proper, dressed entirely in gold armour, with their horses similarly armoured down to their knees. Similarly, he added to Kerbogha's letter to the Caliph, Sultan and knights of Khorosan; having Kerbogha contrast the shoddy Christian weapons that had been displayed before him with those of his army, which were made of steel treated to be as pure as gold or silver.²¹³ These additions strengthen the *Gesta*'s depiction of Muslims as arrogant and contrast strongly with the Christian military ideal of trusting in God rather than strength of arms to win battles.

2.4.3 New themes introduced.

In his narration of the martyrdom of Rainald Porchet, Tudebode revealed that he thought Mohammed was the name of one of the gods of the Muslims: Rainald's captor demanded that he renounce Christianity and

²¹⁰ *'Quod audiens amiralius, nimis iratus fuit. Illico jussit eum decollari, et Turci cum magno gaudio... Statim jussit ad se omnes peregrinos adduci qui erant in civitate, ligatis post tergum manibus. Quumque ante eum venissent, imperavit ut nudi exspoliarentur omnes. Quum vero exspoliati fuissent, fecit eos stricte congregari in unum, et cum fune ligare omnes in gyrum. Et fecit sica ligna et paleam et foenum circa eos ordinare, ac deinde, sicuti inimicus Dei, ignem jussit mittere... Et sic martyrizati fuerunt omnes...'* Tudebode, 52.

²¹¹ *'Quem Christiani apprehendentes, interrogaverunt per drogomundum, scilicet per interpretem, ad quid venerat. qui respondens ait: "Sarraceni me huc miserunt, volentes scire cujusmodi essent ingenia vestra." Cui respondendet, Christiani dixerunt bonum esse, atque eum acceptum, ligatis manibus ac pedibus, posuerunt eum in funda cujusdam ingenii, quod petrera vocatur, atque cum omnibus viribus suis cogitantes eum projicere infra civitatem, nequiverunt. Nam cum tanto impetu venit, quod, ruptis vinculis, antequam ad murum pervenisset civitatis, dilaceratus est.'* Tudebode, 107.

²¹² *'At nostri illum sagittando et cum lanceis occidendo more avium ex arboribus praecipitabant. Postea cum ensibus et aliis gladiis frustratim detruncabant.'* Tudebode, 115. Cf *Gesta Francorum*, 96.

²¹³ *'...bis aut ter sive quater collata atque purgata ceu argentum aut aurum purissimum...'* Tudebode, 62.

worship 'Mohammed and our other gods.'²¹⁴ Ultimately the image of Muslims as polytheistic pagans is maintained without much change, but this difference – whether one of perception or merely one of emphasis – is a detail worth noting, especially considering the tendency for modern scholars to assume that the *Gesta* author and others in general did think of Mohammed as one of the Muslim gods.

Tudebode also introduced brief examples of two other themes which are more prominent in the work of other authors, although the first of these is only one possible interpretation, and may not be what he actually intended. He provided a uniquely full account of the procession around Jerusalem which the crusaders undertook before launching the final assault. This procession was subject to the ridicule of the Muslim defenders of Jerusalem, who followed it along the walls of the city, '*Machomet in quadam hasta deferentes uno panno coopertum*'. J. H. Hill and L. L. Hill translate this as 'bearing insignia of Mohammed on a standard and pennon', but there is no word which corresponds to insignia; what Tudebode said is closer to 'bearing Mohammed on a spear covered with cloth'. The Hills seem to assume that the events occurred as Tudebode described them (they call his account 'by far the best')²¹⁵, and may have chosen to translate this phrase in a way that makes it sound more plausible given the strict Muslim prohibition of images of Mohammed. It is far more likely that such an image or statue is what Tudebode meant. His actual words are somewhat allusive (assuming, as seems safe, that he did not mean that the defenders of Jerusalem bore Mohammed himself on a spear), but to translate this as 'insignia' is to add an extra layer of abstraction that leaves his phrasing making considerably less sense. Rather than an accurate report, then, what we probably have here is either an invention or Tudebode's misinterpretation of something that he saw. The detail that *Machomet* was *uno panno coopertum* – covered with a cloth, with the adjective *coopertus* suggesting something that was covered completely, may indicate that a representation of Mohammed having been present was simply an assumption rather than a complete fabrication, though just what it is Tudebode would then be describing remains mysterious.²¹⁶ Whatever he is describing, and whether or not it was based on something he

²¹⁴ '*Abnega Deum tuum quem colis et credis, et credi Malphumet et nostris aliis diis.*' Tudebode, 51.

²¹⁵ Hill and Hill, *Historia Hierosolymitana*, 115 n. 15.

²¹⁶ Charlton T. Lewis and Charles Short, 'Coopertus' in *A Latin Dictionary*, (Oxford: Clarendon, 1879, rpr. 1987).

actually saw, this mention of Mohammed being borne on a spear indicates that Tudebode may have believed, along with Ralph of Caen, Fulcher of Chartres and possibly Robert the Monk, that Muslims worshipped idols of Mohammed. His phrasing does not conclusively establish that that is what he believed this to be: he may simply have assumed it was a depiction of Mohammed that was not an object of worship. However, the appearance of this possible idol in close proximity to a Christian procession in which priests bore crosses in their hands suggests a deliberate inversion of the crusaders' activity, and a supposed depiction of Mohammed that is the inverse of a cross can surely fairly be described as an idol. This direct correspondence of the Muslim behaviour as a direct inversion of that of the crusaders strongly suggests that Tudebode did in fact invent this incident, although it is also possible that he genuinely misinterpreted something he saw as a result of assuming he could accurately apply a distorted Christian model. In any case, this addition by Tudebode to the narrative found in the *Gesta* should probably read as placing his *Historia* alongside several other First Crusade histories that share a tradition of believing that Muslims worshipped idols which would endure for a considerable length of time.

The second additional theme is one of the earliest instances in the Crusade literature of the representation of Muslims as Other based on their sexual morality. This is something only Guibert of Nogent and Albert of Aachen gave much space to among First Crusade authors, but which would become a more common theme in later crusade accounts – and, indeed, throughout the following centuries.²¹⁷ In the account of Rainald's martyrdom, Yaghi Siyhan offers him gold, horses, mules, other goods, and wives and inheritances if he will convert to Islam.²¹⁸ This is thematically similar to Kerbogha's offer to enrich all of the crusaders if they would convert to Islam, as mentioned above. Conspicuously absent from Kerbogha's offer to the crusaders in the *Gesta Francorum* compared to Yaghi Siyan's offer here, however, is the mention of wives. Tudebode also added wives to Kerbogha's offer, placing conjugal pleasures among the worldly goods which were, implicitly, the only attractions the Muslim religion has to offer.²¹⁹ This implicit contrast between the temporary,

²¹⁷ Rana Kabbani, *Europe's Myths of Orient: Devise and Rule* (London, 1988).

²¹⁸ 'Quod si feceris [i.e. if he converts], dabimus tibi omnia quae petieris, videlicet aurum et argentum, equos et mulas, et alia plurima ornamenta quae volueris, et uxores et haereditates, et maximo honore ditabimus te', Tudebode, 51.

²¹⁹ 'Revertimini quantocius, et dicite vestris senioribus quod si per omnia cupiunt effici Turci, et Deum vestrum quem vos inclini colitis abnegare voluerint, nos illis

worldly and carnal things which are presented as the rewards of Islam and the eternal salvation offered by Christianity in return for the material poverty, suffering and celibacy of the crusaders depicts those who would choose Islam as foolish, materialistic and sexually lax. That sexual morality is relevant here is made clearer by the phrasing of Yaghi Siyan's offer; while Kerbogha offers plural wives to plural crusaders, allowing some ambiguity, Yaghi Siyan offers multiple wives to Rainald Porchet himself. The (often misunderstood and exaggerated) Muslim practice of polygamy was not something of which the *Gesta* author demonstrated awareness, but it is used here by Tudebode to develop an image of Islam and its followers as vain, materialistic and lascivious, in stark contrast to the crusaders who immediately reject these temptations.

3 The *Historia Iherosolimitana* of Robert the Monk

3.1 Introduction.

In the early twelfth century, three northern French Benedictine monks acquired the *Gesta Francorum* (possibly through Bohemond's propaganda campaign to recruit for his expedition against the Byzantine Empire)²²⁰ and, apparently independently, all three decided that the work was inadequate and needed revision. Of the three – of any account of the First Crusade – Robert the Monk's *Historia Iherosolimitana* was by far the most prevalent, leaving over eighty surviving manuscripts.²²¹ Robert wrote that the *Gesta* required revision because of having omitted to describe the council of Clermont, and having been written in a way that 'did not make the best of the sequence of wonderful events' because of its 'uncertain and unsophisticated' composition and style.²²² Fixing these deficiencies were the only changes he acknowledged in his *apologeticus sermo*.²²³ As shall be seen, however, these were not the only changes he made. Robert reframed the crusade as an act of divine vengeance wrought by God through the crusaders; avenging the persecution of Christians by Muslims, both historical and recent. As a result of this, and possibly also as a result of unspoken efforts to make the *Gesta*'s treatment of Muslims more consistent,

²²⁰ Bohemond travelled to northern France in 1106, seeking recruits for an expedition to secure his principality of Antioch against Byzantium. A. C. Krey suggested that an edited form of the *Gesta* was prepared, which showed Bohemond in a more flattering light and condemned the Byzantine Emperor Alexios I more harshly, and distributed in advance of his journey. As mentioned in the *Gesta* chapter, the idea of its having been edited is not universally accepted, but the suggestion that many copies of the *Gesta* were made in connection with this tour does fit some known facts: the *Gesta*'s revisions all apparently appeared soon after 1106, and most surviving *Gesta* manuscripts are from France. See A. C. Krey, 'A neglected passage in the *Gesta* and its bearings on the literature of the First Crusade,' in *The Crusades and other historical essays presented to Dana C. Munro*, ed. L. J. Paetow (New York, 1928), 57-78.

²²¹ Damien Kempf and Marcus Bull (eds), *The Historia Iherosolimitana of Robert the Monk*, (Woodbridge, 2013), x.

²²² '...partim quia initium suum, quod in Clari Montis concilio constitutum fuit, non habebat, partim quia series tam pulcre materie inculca iacebat, et litteralium compositio dictionum inculca vacillabat.' D. Kempf and M. G. Bull (eds), *The Historia Iherosolimitana of Robert the Monk* (Woodbridge, 2013), 3; Robert the Monk, *Historia Iherosolimitana*, *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades: Historiens Occidentaux* (Paris, 1866), (6 vols) III.721. Henceforth Kempf and Bull's edition will be cited as 'Robert the Monk', with the *RHC* pagination in parentheses as a guide for those to whom it may still be more readily available. In cases where the *RHC* edition is cited in its own right, usually to make use of its fuller critical apparatus, it will be referred to as 'Robert the Monk, *RHC*.'

²²³ Robert the Monk, 3 (721).

Robert takes a much harder line in his representation of Muslims as Other. He omitted the *Gesta*'s passage in praise of the Turks entirely, representing Muslims during the crusade as more consistently cowardly and stupid than the *Gesta*; including frequent comparisons to timid prey animals. He significantly intensified the level of violence against Muslims as part of his theme of revenge, but with the additional effect of utterly dehumanising them. He emphasised Muslim wealth and materialism, and their connection to the supernatural. In fact, Robert's changes to the representation of Muslims – and to the overall conception of the crusade, as it applied to them – were so great that they must have been a central part of his reason for revising the *Gesta Francorum*, even if he did not acknowledge this.

3.1.1 Robert's Identity and the Date of the *Historia*

Robert's identity is obscure compared to Guibert of Nogent and Baldric of Dol (the other two Northern French revisers of the *Gesta*), though not of course compared to the author of the *Gesta Francorum* himself. Robert's *apologeticus sermo* gives his name, with no significant variations in the manuscripts used by the RHC.²²⁴ He also described the circumstances in which he wrote: in a cell of St-Rémi, a prestigious Benedictine Abbey in Rheims. He wrote because it was requested by an abbot (whose name does vary in the manuscript tradition; sometimes being given as *Bernardus*, sometimes *Benedictus*, sometimes just 'B' or 'N').²²⁵ Robert claimed that he was asked to write on the basis of having been present at the Council of Clermont, but made no claim to have actually joined the crusade.²²⁶

Robert has been identified with Abbot Robert of St-Rémi; the editors of the RHC, for example, believed they were one and the same, as did Jonathan Riley-Smith.²²⁷ Some manuscripts do append *quondam abbas Sancti Remigii* to his name when he gives it, though neither Bull and Kempf nor the RHC editors favour this reading.²²⁸ In Carol Sweetenham's introduction to her translation of the *Historia*, however, she argues against their being the same person based on the vagaries of Abbot Robert's difficult

²²⁴ Robert the Monk, RHC, 722, n. 14. (Kempf and Bull do not provide a full critical apparatus on the basis that the text is remarkably stable, but would certainly have noted such an important divergence if any manuscripts displayed it).

²²⁵ Robert the Monk, 3 (721).

²²⁶ Robert the Monk, 3 (721).

²²⁷ *Receuil des Historiens des Croisades: Historiens Occidentaux*, (6 vols) III.xli; Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading* (London, 2009 (2nd edition, first published 1986)), 135-6.

²²⁸ Robert the Monk, 3(722). For some of the manuscripts which do include this gloss, see Robert the Monk, RHC, 722, n. 15.

career. Abbot Robert was a novice at St-Rémi before moving to Marmoutier-lez-Tours. He returned to St-Rémi to become its abbot in 1096, but this was strongly opposed by Abbot Bernard of Marmoutier. Robert was deposed and excommunicated in 1097, apparently as a result of maladministration.²²⁹ He and his supporters succeeded in having his excommunication overturned, but he was forced to retire to the priory of Sénuc as prior. He was made formally destitute by Calixtus II in 1122, once more on the grounds of maladministration, and died the same year.²³⁰ There is some reason to believe that Abbot Robert and Robert the Monk were the same person. They both lived at or near St-Rémi at the same time; some manuscripts even claim Robert the Monk wrote at Sénuc; and both may have been linked with an abbot named Bernard.²³¹ But, as Sweetenham points out, there are also reasons to believe we are dealing with two distinct Roberts. Most importantly, the author Robert himself gave no indication he was anything other than a monk, and indeed his claim to write as ordered by an abbot makes it highly unlikely that he was: abbots could not be subject to one another. Even if the manuscript reading *Bernardus* is accepted for the abbot who compelled Robert to write (it was by the editors of the *RHC*, but it is only in two of the manuscripts they used)²³², it seems highly unlikely that Abbot Robert would have had such praise for Bernard of Marmoutier as he does for this Bernard ('A certain abbot... distinguished by his knowledge of literature and his upright behaviour'),²³³ not to mention the unlikelihood of such bitter rivals commissioning – or accepting a commission from – one another to write anything in the first place.²³⁴

Kempf and Bull defend the possibility that the author Robert was indeed Abbot Robert in their edition of the *Historia*. A crucial detail is that

²²⁹ This was reported to Urban II in a letter from Bishop Lambert of Arras, Archbishop Hugh of Lyon and Abbot Hugh of Cluny: Edmond Martène and Ursin Durand (eds), *Veterum Scriptorum Monumentum Amplissima Collectio*, 6 vols (Paris, 1724-33), IV.998.

²³⁰ The history of Abbot Robert is discussed in more detail in the *Receuil des Historiens des Croisades: Historiens Occidentaux*, III. xli-xliii. With the exception of the letter cited above, the editors largely based their account on Jean Mabillon's *Annales Ordinis S. Benedicti Occidentalium Monachorum Patriarchae* (Paris, 1703). Given that much of Sweetenham and the *RHC*'s conclusions are thus ultimately based on an eighteenth century secondary source, a revisitation of the question of Robert's identity was thus long overdue.

²³¹ Robert the Monk, *RHC*, 722, n.6.

²³² Robert the Monk, *RHC*, 721, n. 8.

²³³ 'Quidam etenim abbas, nomine B., litterarum scientia et morum probitate preeditus...', Robert the Monk 3 (721).

²³⁴ Carol Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade: Historia Iherosolimitana* (Aldershot, 2005), 3-4.

Bernard of Marmoutier died in April 1100, not in 1107 as had previously been assumed. It is thus highly unlikely that he was 'Abbot B', removing one of the primary objections to Abbot Robert having authored the *Historia*. Kempf and Bull note the heavy motif of obedience that runs through the *apologeticus sermo*, and the 'artful and heavily allusive' crafting of its authorial persona. They read the *sermo* as suggesting to those who had opposed Robert's abbacy that he was indeed capable of respecting the instructions of a senior colleague, as evidenced by the very work he had just completed. They even suggest that 'Abbot B' may have been Baldric of Bourgueil, the only high-ranking churchman who took Robert's side (though Baldric's decision to write his own revision of the *Gesta* would be harder to explain if this were true). Kempf and Bull concede that Robert having simply been an otherwise anonymous monk of Saint-Rémi is the 'simpler and neater' solution, but they argue that this requires ignoring the significance of the *sermo apologeticus*. Ultimately, the evidence for and against the identification as it survives is inconclusive: most of St-Rémi's collection of manuscripts were destroyed in a fire in 1744.²³⁵ Abbot Robert remains a strong candidate, but it is by no means certain.

Robert's *Historia* has previously given a date of completion of c.1108, but Kempf and Bull argue that the basis for this is flawed. The 1108 *Magdeburger Aufruf*, a call to crusade against the Wends in Saxony probably written in Flanders, was argued to contain important parallels with Robert. This would have put the date of composition of the *Historia* some time in 1107-8. Sweetenham was cautious, however, as there has always been some doubt about the authenticity of the *Aufruf*.²³⁶ Kempf and Bull do not dispute the dating of the *Aufruf* to between 1107-1110 (the precise circumstances of its authorship would not otherwise matter), but disagree with the strength of its parallels to Robert's version of the speech of Urban II at Clermont. They argue that the structural similarities simply reflect the rhetorical strategies of letter-writing (*ars dictaminis* and the form of a sermon, which closely informed Robert's formulation of Urban's speech.

²³⁵ Robert the Monk, *Historia Iherosolimitana*, xix – xxiv. It is worth noting here that if Kempf and Bull and Stephen Biddlecombe are correct in their respective dating of Robert and Baldric's works, Robert finished his account some three to five years after Baldric finished his own (on the the date of completion of Baldric's *Historia*, see Chapter 4). This makes it seem rather less likely that Baldric would commission Robert to write another revision of the *Gesta Francorum*.

²³⁶ Peter Knoch, 'Kreuzzug und Siedlung. Studien zum Aufruf der Magdeburger Kirche von 1108', *Jahrbuch fuer Geschichte Mittel- und Ostdeutschlands* 23 (1974), 1-33; Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade*, 7; Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading*, 136.

There are also lexical and thematic similarities, but neither are close enough to be indisputably derivative.²³⁷ They argue that a more secure dating coordinate is Robert's reference to Hugh as the brother of King Philip I († July 1108), who was ruling France 'at that time (*ipso tempore*).'²³⁸ This seems to signal that while Philip I was king at the time of the crusade, he had since died. This is one of very few references to events after the end of the narrative, one of the reasons why the text is so difficult to date.²³⁸ Kempf and Bull argue that this evidence points to a slightly later date of completion of c.1110 – though it may have been begun earlier and completed slowly.²³⁹

Over eighty manuscripts of Robert's work survive. The manuscripts are geographically and chronologically quite spread out. A little over a third of the manuscripts can be dated to the twelfth century, and the rest span the thirteenth to the seventeenth centuries. They survive in libraries from London to St Petersburg, including Vienna, Rome and Uppsala – although there is no certainty of the origins of any of the manuscripts, this suggests a very wide spread.²⁴⁰ This seems to be compelling evidence of the popularity of Robert's *Historia*, although Kempf and Bull sound a note of caution in this regard: as they point out, most copyists were simply reproducing the account they happened to have available to them, rather than consciously choosing which they preferred. Minor differences in the earlier dissemination of the manuscripts may have increased 'logarithmically' over time, and once dissemination of *Historia* achieved a certain critical mass, its continuing success as the default resource would have been 'effectively self-sustaining' rather than providing evidence of any considered choice.²⁴¹

3.1.2 Robert's Revision of the *Gesta Francorum*.

Robert's stated aims in revising the *Gesta* were simply to improve its style and add an account of Clermont. As will be seen, however, he so fundamentally changed the concept of the Crusade, and as a consequence of this, the treatment of Muslims, that these must have been central aims of his. The changes he made were extensive. He altered the structure of the text by adding a different beginning. Although Antioch remains the centrepiece, he added weight to events at the beginning and end of the crusade, creating a more balanced account. He added a great deal of material, and dropped some

²³⁷ Robert the Monk xxxvi-xxxviii.

²³⁸ Robert the Monk, xxxviii-xxxix.

²³⁹ Robert the Monk, xxxix-xl.

²⁴⁰ Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade*, 9.

²⁴¹ Robert the Monk, x-xi.

(in particular, details about the south Italian Normans given by the *Gesta* were omitted); a long list is given by Sweetenham.²⁴² Kempf and Bull argued that Robert derived the 'plot architecture' and much of the propositional content from the *Gesta*, but also introduced a significant amount of new material like speeches, and narratives about deeds or deaths of famous crusaders. In addition, episodes were expanded by 'inferring details that the *Gesta Francorum* merely implies, or by filling out the diegesis, the scenic detail, which is seldom developed in the somewhat bald source text'.²⁴³

Sweetenham did not see Robert's portrayal of Muslims as significantly different from the *Gesta Francorum*. On an aggregate level, Sweetenham does have a point. As she wrote, both texts 'describe the Saracens as variously innumerable, incomprehensible and of diverse races', and she noted that both texts have Kerbogha as the central villain.²⁴⁴ Robert depicts Muslims as numerous, behaving or appearing like animals, cowardly, stupid, arrogant and guilty of atrocities. He had little positive to say about them, only seeing them in a good light when they chose to convert. They were literally diabolical.²⁴⁵ These themes will be discussed in further detail below, in addition to Robert's depiction of the structure of Muslim society (which Sweetenham did not discuss) and his understanding of their religion, which was slightly deeper than she realised.²⁴⁶ Sweetenham maintained that there was nothing out of the ordinary in Robert's depiction of Muslims; that it conformed to traditional stereotypes visible in the *chansons de geste*.²⁴⁷ It is not intended here to directly compare the Latin prose narratives to the *chansons*. With regard to the general sentiment that there was nothing unusual about Robert's depiction of Muslims, however, although there is undeniably common ground with his fellow historians, there are in fact a number of important differences between Robert's depiction of Islam and his contemporaries. Indeed, Robert altered the *Gesta*'s depiction of Muslims so much that it must have been one of his reasons for revising the account, though he did not acknowledge it.

²⁴² Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade*, 17-18.

²⁴³²⁴³ Robert the Monk, xii-iii.

²⁴⁴ Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade*, 21.

²⁴⁵ Sweetenham, 'Crusaders in a Hall of Mirrors' 134-6.

²⁴⁶ Ibid, 136.

²⁴⁷ Ibid, 133. See also 1.3.11 above.

Robert also altered the *Gesta* to fit his framework for interpreting the crusade, in line with Jonathan Riley-Smith's views on the 'theological refinement' wrought by Robert, Guibert and Baldric of Dol on their revisions of the work. As Riley-Smith argued, all three emphasised the idea (detectable in the *Gesta* to a lesser extent) that the crusade enjoyed divine approval and support, and was foretold in the Old Testament.²⁴⁸ There was more to Robert's conception of the crusade than Riley-Smith described here, however. Riley-Smith noted elsewhere that Robert saw the crusade as 'an expression of God's anger and vengeance' against Muslims, but did not develop this theme further.²⁴⁹ The theme of crusade as vengeance was picked up by Susanna Throop, who noted that Robert and several other authors saw the crusade as God's vengeance against the Muslims for their recent and historical persecution of Christians, enacted through the crusaders. Throop found that this theme is barely detectable in the accounts of the eyewitness authors (contrary to what had been argued previously) and was discernible only in the twelfth-century accounts written by non-participants. Even in these, she found, the idea of crusading as vengeance was not the only theme, or even the predominant one which they presented.²⁵⁰ Throop underestimated the degree to which this conception of the crusade saturated Robert's account. As well as several specific references to vengeance which Throop did identify, the theme is frequently visible throughout Robert's account. Not the least important of these is how he framed his entire *Historia*: beginning it by attributing to Urban II at Clermont – at the very inception of the crusade – a speech describing the horrific treatment of Christians in the East by the 'Persian' invaders and the necessity of vengeance, and concluding with that vengeance being enacted at Jerusalem and Ascalon. He also frequently made reference to biblical passages that supported this message, and referred to massacres of Muslims unapologetically, sometimes explicitly justifying them in terms of previous Muslim behaviour.

Partly as a result of this, Robert significantly increased the animosity of his account towards Muslims, but the extent and variety of changes he made show that this was also a change he made for its own sake. In many cases, Robert engaged in the rhetorical *color* of *intensificatio*; directly

²⁴⁸ Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading*, 139-142.

²⁴⁹ Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading*, 143.

²⁵⁰ Susanna Throop, *Crusading as an Act of Vengeance, 1095-1216* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011), 48-9, 196.

elaborating passages from the *Gesta*. Robert enhanced and intensified the *Gesta*'s descriptions of violence against Muslims, in a way that both established the totality of God's vengeance and dehumanised the opponents of the crusade. In citing biblical precedence in support of this, Robert also more strongly associated Muslims with enemies from Christian heritage. Although he apparently shared the *Gesta*'s assumption that Muslims were polytheists, Robert very rarely described them as *pagani*. Indeed he used terminology implying otherness – such as *pagani*, *inimici Dei*, etc – relatively rarely compared to the *Gesta Francorum*, intensifying his actual descriptions of Muslims and their actions instead. He associated Muslims with the Antichrist and the Devil more frequently, and emphasised the connection of Kerbogha's mother to the supernatural. He used a great deal more dehumanising comparisons – comparing Muslims to dogs and flies on rotting meat, and even more frequently depicting them as prey animals like startled deer or doves among hawks. He created a stronger impression of Muslims as stupid and cowardly, omitting the *Gesta*'s praise of the Turks' military capabilities; and depicted them as absurdly wealthy and materialistic.

Less relevant to the discussion at hand but indicative of Robert's literary abilities, Sweetenham convincingly shows that he encoded a message about recent Western European history into his account. Robert gave the name Clemens to the Muslim leader the crusaders fought at Ascalon (a fictionalised amalgam of the Fatimid Caliph al-Mustali and his vizier al-Afdal Shahanshah). This was clearly a reference to the antipope 'Clement III', supported by the pro-Imperial faction in the Investiture Contest and the rival of the reforming Popes Gregory II and (crucially) Urban II himself.²⁵¹ Beyond the simple insult implied by the name, Sweetenham noted that Robert associated 'Clemens' with the devil, and set him up as the direct opposite of Urban II. Urban II's speech at Clermont began Robert's account, the speech of Clemens on his defeat ended it; Urban spoke to a huge and enthusiastic audience; Clemens to his the fleeing and dying remnants of his army; Urban spoke eloquently, Clemens spoke with his voice trembling; God inspired Urban's audience to respond, and Clemens found himself deserted by Mohammed. This sharp contrast provided a frame

²⁵¹ For a more thorough exposition of the historical context, see Sweetenham, 'Crusaders in a Hall of Mirrors', 141-4.

for Robert's entire chronicle.²⁵² This analysis is convincing, and it does not necessarily contradict the argument presented here that Robert structured his account around the idea of the crusade as divine vengeance. Rather, it seems clear that Robert was a writer of great abilities, and managed to infuse his account with several messages working on multiple levels. Interpreting the crusade as revenge was central to his purposes, but he was also able to add some subtle and well-executed commentary on recent European history – conveying the message that Urban II and the reform movement had triumphed over 'Clement III' just as the crusaders had triumphed over the Muslims, and (as he wrote explicitly when describing the battle of Ascalon) as Christ had triumphed over Satan through the Crucifixion.²⁵³ The prevalence of surviving manuscripts of Robert's text naturally suggests that his was a popular account. Indeed, he may have intended it to be so: the exaggeration and additional anecdotes in the text may have been intended to increase the accessibility and entertainment value of his text for a general audience.²⁵⁴ Robert also aimed for an 'elegant simplicity' in his Latin, as he noted in his preface.²⁵⁵ Sweetenham argues that Robert's work was intended as propaganda for a new expedition to the Holy Land, associated with Bohemond's trip to France in 1106; an intention that would require appeal to a lay audience.²⁵⁶ This would even be compatible with his interpretation of the crusade as argued here; the idea of crusade as vengeance – vendetta, even – must have been immediately comprehensible to a lay aristocratic audience. Caution is needed, however. As Bull and Kempf argue, the vast majority of copyists were not making a deliberate choice between authors, but copying the only account available to them – as such, even a coincidental early promulgation of Robert's text may have grown exponentially to cause his apparent popularity. These copies were also most often produced in Cistercian scriptoria; indicating if anything an appeal to Cistercians rather than a general appeal (or, indeed, simply that copies of his work were spread as the order itself expanded).²⁵⁷ Kempf and Bull's revised dating of the

²⁵² Sweetenham, 'Crusaders in a Hall of Mirrors', 141.

²⁵³ Robert the Monk, 103-4 (876).

²⁵⁴ One of the strongest pieces of evidence for lay engagement with Latin crusade narratives is Manuscript G of Baldric of Bourgueil's *Historia*, which as discussed below was likely produced for an aristocratic family, with additions made concerning crusading members of the family; this manuscript does indeed include a number of extra anecdotes, although most concern the family directly and may have been added for that reason rather than the general appeal of anecdotes in themselves. See below, 4.4.

²⁵⁵ Robert the Monk, xi, 3.

²⁵⁶ Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade*, 6.

²⁵⁷ Robert the Monk, x.

Historia (c.1110) makes the connection to Bohemond's planned expedition considerably shakier. Propaganda in support of a new crusade may have been Robert's intention, but it is difficult to establish this with any certainty.

It has been suggested that Robert also drew on a lost poetic Latin source that was later used by Gilo of Paris to compose his history of the crusade in verse, the *Historia Vie Hierosolimitana*. Gilo's work drew on the *Gesta Francorum*, but there are also parallels with Robert's text. These range from order and emphasis to specific details not found elsewhere, such as the use of poisoned arrows by the Turks at Nicaea.²⁵⁸ Sweetenham lists the similarities at length.²⁵⁹ There are also significant differences; Gilo only covers the events from Nicaea to before the battle of Ascalon, and each gives details absent from the other's work. The editors of the *Historia Vie* took the view that both Robert and Gilo had used a source which does not survive and Sweetenham accepted this (albeit with some reluctance, noting that 'the First Crusade is a field stalked by the shadowy ghosts of supposed lost sources').²⁶⁰ Kempf and Bull disagree entirely, however, making a convincing case that the resemblances between the texts are better explained by supposing Gilo used the *Historia Iherosolimitana*.²⁶¹ This means that Robert's expansions and departures from this source should be interpreted as the result of his own creative and imaginative engagement with the *Gesta Francorum* rather than the use of a second source.²⁶²

3.2 The Depiction of Muslims in Robert the Monk's *Historia Iherosolimitana*

3.2.1 Terminology

Robert used similar terminology to the *Gesta Francorum*, but he used many of the *Gesta*'s terms less frequently or not at all. His preferred terms for Muslims were *Turci*, *Sarraceni* or *Gentiles*, although he did occasionally use other terms from the *Gesta*. He also introduced a small

²⁵⁸ Robert the Monk, 23 (756); See also *Historia Vie Hierosolimitanae*, 72.

²⁵⁹ Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade*, 29-33.

²⁶⁰ *The Historia Vie Hierosolimitanae of Gilo of Paris and a Second, Anonymous Author*, ed. and trans. C. W. Grocock and J. E. Siberry (Oxford, 1992), lx; Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade*, 34-5.

²⁶¹ Robert the Monk, xii. See also Marcus Bull, 'Robert the Monk and his Source(s)' in M. Bull and D. Kempf (eds) *Writing the Early Crusades: Text, Transmission and Memory* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2014), 127-139, 131-9.

²⁶² Robert the Monk, xiii.

number of new terms, though these have no special importance for the most part. One which gives some insight into Robert's way of thinking was *Medi*, Medes. Robert added them to three of the *Gesta*'s descriptions of compound Muslim forces in which *Persi* were mentioned – *Persi et Medi* are frequently mentioned side by side in the Bible, so Robert obviously thought it appropriate, perhaps even more accurate, to include them.²⁶³ Robert also used the term *Parthi* (Parthians) on one occasion. His description of their use of the tactic known as the 'Parthian shot' (turning around in the saddle to shoot arrows at the enemy while retreating) elsewhere explains the logic behind this.²⁶⁴ As discussed in Chapter 5, Guibert of Nogent believed that the Turks were literally the Parthians, now known by a new name.²⁶⁵ Nicholas Morton believed that this idea that the Turks were the Parthians was universal, but although it is also explicitly claimed by some other sources, there is no certain indication that Robert thought this. It is equally likely that he simply used *Parthi* on this occasion in order to vary his terminology for stylistic reasons, and the term was intended to be understood metaphorically. Certainly, Morton's argument that Robert made the association between the Persians (i.e. the Turks, an association he did make more directly) and the Medes because of the association between the Medes and the Parthians in Justinus is less likely than the Biblical explanation offered above.²⁶⁶

More important, however, is what Robert did with two terms that were used in the *Gesta*: *Turci* and *pagani*. Robert almost completely avoided applying the term *pagani* to Muslims; both instances of this are taken directly from the *Gesta* and were probably accidental. The first occurrence of the word *paganus* in any context is in Robert's version of Urban's speech at Clermont. Urban urged his audience to be moved by 'the worth and greatness of Charlemagne, his son Louis and your other kings who destroyed the pagan kingdoms and brought them within the bounds of Christendom'.²⁶⁷ While this declares Muslims the *equivalent* of the pagans fought by

²⁶³ Robert the Monk, 27 (763), 37 (778), 58 (808). For examples of Persians and Medes in the Bible, see Daniel 6:12, 15:1; 1 Mac. 1:1; Judith 16:12; Esther 1:3, 1:14.

²⁶⁴ Robert the Monk, 25 (760), 84 (845).

²⁶⁵ See below, 5.1.2, 5.2.1, 5.2.5.

²⁶⁶ Morton, *Encountering Islam on the First Crusade*, 194-7.

²⁶⁷ 'Moveant vos et incitent animos vestros ad virilitatem gesta predecessorum vestrorum, probitas et magnitudo Karoli Magni regis et Ludovici filii eius aliorumque regnum vestrorum, qui regna paganorum destruxerunt et in eis fines sancte ecclesie dilataverunt.' Robert the Monk, 6 (728).

Charlemagne, an effective Othering technique in itself, it does not directly classify them as pagans.

Shortly before the crusade reached Antioch, both Robert and the *Gesta* reported, they encountered and defeated *Turci et Sarraceni* in a valley called Rugia, inspiring the local Armenian Christians to surrender to them. In Robert's version, 'they were delighted that the Christians had so bravely defeated and killed the Turks and pagans, and immediately surrendered themselves and their land to them.'²⁶⁸ In the *Gesta*, only pagans were mentioned here.²⁶⁹ Robert probably intended to replace the *Gesta's* *pagani* with a second mention of *Turci et Sarraceni*, but wrote *Turci et pagani* by mistake. The word *paganus* occurs only twice more in Robert's text. Both occur in Robert's description of the vision of an unnamed priest (identified as Stephen Valentine by Raymond of Aguilers)²⁷⁰ at Antioch. In the vision Christ appears and attributes the suffering of the crusaders during the siege to their misbehaviour with 'pagan' women:

I allowed them to suffer all those tribulations and difficulties because they have committed many sins with Christian women, and pagan women...²⁷¹

St Peter then interceded on behalf of the crusaders, because they had liberated his church (i.e. Antioch) from the 'pagans'.²⁷² This incident is taken directly from the *Gesta*, though with considerable rephrasing aside from Robert's retention of the term pagans here. It is odd that Robert would rephrase this passage and still accidentally refer to Muslims as pagans when he usually avoids it elsewhere, but no better explanation presents itself.²⁷³ In all other cases of direct borrowing from the *Gesta*, Robert replaced the term

²⁶⁸ 'Quod videntes Armenii, terre illius habitatores, gavisii sunt, quia videlicet a Christianis tam viriliter Turci et pagani superati sunt et occisi; continuoque cum terra sua reddiderunt se illis.' Robert the Monk, 33 (770).

²⁶⁹ *Gesta Francorum*, 26.

²⁷⁰ John France, *A Critical Edition of the Historia Francorum of Raymond of Aguilers*, (Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Nottingham 1967), 267. Henceforth: Raymond of Aguilers.

²⁷¹ 'Omnes tribulationes et impedimenta que passi sunt ideo evenire permisi, quoniam multa nefanda operati sunt cum Christianis mulieribus, et paganis, que valde displicent in oculis meis.' Robert the Monk, 67 (821); Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade*, 161.

²⁷² Ibid.

²⁷³ In the corresponding passage, the *Gesta* reads: 'Ecce in auxilio oportuno, misi uos sanos et incolumes in ciuitatem, et ecce multam prauamque dilectionem operantes cum Christianis et prauis paganis mulieribus, unde imensus foetor ascendit in caelum.' *Gesta Francorum*, 58. This is one of very few occasions on which, possibly for reasons of decorum, Robert has toned down rather than heightened the *Gesta's* rhetoric.

paganus with another.²⁷⁴ As discussed below, Robert believed Muslims were polytheists, and even suggested that they put up idols to Mohammed; but his apparent effort to avoid applying the term to them suggests that he nevertheless considered them to be something other than *pagani*.

The other important change Robert made to the *Gesta*'s pattern of terminology informs the image of Islam he presents, and may reflect his actual (mis)understanding. Léan Ní Chléirigh has examined the use of national terminology in a number of First Crusade sources. Ní Chléirigh found that the Anonymous quite consistently used the term *Turci* for the Seljuk Turks and *Sarraceni* for the inhabitants of Syria and Palestine under Fatimid rule.²⁷⁵ This implies some awareness of the political, if not necessarily the religious, implications of the major fault line in Islam at the time, between the Fatimid Caliphate on the one hand and the Seljuk-dominated Abbasid Caliphate on the other.

Where the Anonymous used the terms more or less consistently, Robert was much less precise. Robert described the Muslims who took refuge on the roof of the al Aqsa Mosque during the storming of Jerusalem as *copia Turcorum*; the *Gesta* called them *Sarraceni* and *pagani* (15 July 1099).²⁷⁶ When Godfrey of Bouillon and Robert of Flanders laid siege to Djibleh (early 1099), the *Gesta* reported that Raymond of St Gilles appealed for them to abandon their siege and come to his aid against an army of *pagani*.²⁷⁷ Consistent with his preference not to use *pagani*, Robert made them *Turci*.²⁷⁸ A particularly inaccurate use of the word was in Robert's description of the battle of Ascalon (12 August 1099). Robert repeatedly established that the force the Crusaders met at Ascalon were Babylonian.²⁷⁹ He wrote that the Devil stirred up the *admiravisum Babilonie* against the crusaders,²⁸⁰ and reported that Al-Afdal addressed his troops as *o regnum*

²⁷⁴ For examples, compare Robert the Monk, 96 (864) and *Gesta Francorum*, 89; Robert the Monk, 89 (851); *Gesta Francorum*, 82.

²⁷⁵ Léan Ní Chléirigh, *The Crusaders and their Enemies: The Latin Terminology of Group Identity in Chronicles of the First Crusade* (Unpublished PhD Thesis, Trinity College Dublin 2010), 53-6.

²⁷⁶ Robert the Monk, 99 (868). In the *Gesta Francorum* they are referred to as *maxima paganorum* in the directly corresponding sentence, and alternately as pagans or Saracens throughout the account of the massacre. *Gesta Francorum*, 90-1.

²⁷⁷ *Gesta Francorum*, p.84.

²⁷⁸ Robert the Monk, p.92 (855).

²⁷⁹ As discussed in the conclusion, First Crusade sources quite consistently referred to Egyptians as Babylonians, for various possible reasons. See below, 9.3.

²⁸⁰ 'Et Clementem, immo dementem, ammiravisum Babilonie, contra ipsos felle commovit, et cum ipso omnem Orientem excitavit.' Robert the Monk, 102 (871).

Babilonie and *o Babilonici bellatores*.²⁸¹ Despite this, Robert also referred to them as Turks: in describing the preparations, he mentioned that '*nostri quippe Turcorum desiderantes occursum...*'²⁸² Then, in the course of the battle, he wrote that '*Ibi Turcensis arcus nulli eorum profuit, quia impetus nostrorum tam celer tamque densissimus fuit, quod nulli trahere licuit...*'²⁸³ These are particularly clear examples of him using *Turci* interchangeably with other ethnic terms for Muslim in a place in the narrative where the *Gesta* had been careful to distinguish. A more ambiguous example occurs at the second siege of Ma'arrat-an-Nu'man (November-December 1098). When the city was besieged for a second time, the *Gesta* only mentioned '*multitudo Saracenorum et Turcorum et Arabum aliorumque paganorum*' once. The author often used phrases like this simply to give an impression of the number and diversity of the forces faced, in contrast to the unity of the Crusaders;²⁸⁴ he subsequently only referred to the defenders of Ma'arrat-an-Nu'man as *Sarraceni*.²⁸⁵ Robert, however, referred to them only as *gentiles* and *Turci*, making no mention of *Sarraceni*.²⁸⁶ While *Turci* were actually mentioned by the *Gesta*, in omitting *Sarraceni* Robert has clearly misunderstood his source.

Robert seems to have completely missed the significance of the *Gesta*'s switch from *Turci* to *Sarraceni* in this portion of the narrative. It is unlikely that this was deliberate; if Robert had intended to alter the *Gesta*'s text completely in this regard and emphasise the unity of the Muslim opponents of the crusade, he could only have done this effectively by picking one term and sticking to it, which he did not do. Like the *Gesta*, he alternated between *Turci* and *Sarraceni*, but unlike the Anonymous there does not seem to have been a pattern to Robert's usage.

If Robert missed the significance of the language, did he nevertheless grasp that the Crusade had faced two distinct Muslim political entities? His treatment of the *Babylonii* earlier in his account suggests that he did not. But Robert also has an account, unique to him, of the meeting of Fatimid ambassadors with the crusade leaders.²⁸⁷ Although his phrasing is

²⁸¹ Robert the Monk, 104 (875).

²⁸² Robert the Monk, 102 (872).

²⁸³ Robert the Monk, 105 (875).

²⁸⁴ Ní Chléirigh, *The Crusaders and their Enemies*, 62.

²⁸⁵ *Gesta Francorum*, 77-81.

²⁸⁶ Robert the Monk, 87-8 (849).

²⁸⁷ That is, his account of the meeting is unique; the *Gesta* does mention the presence of the emissaries. *Gesta Francorum*, 37.

unfortunately somewhat ambiguous, Robert seemed to believe that the ‘Emir of Babylon (*admiravissus Babyloniae*)’ answers to the ‘King of the Persians (*rex Persarum*).’ As the speech he attributes to the ambassadors says, ‘the Emir of Babylon’ has sent them after ‘a massive council [had] gathered because of [the crusaders] in the palace of the King of Persia and our master’.²⁸⁸ Robert’s assumption that the *admiravissus Babyloniae* shares a palace with the *rex Persarum* is clear, and strongly implies that Robert is thinking of him as the subordinate of the *rex Persarum*. The *admiravissus Babyloniae* was also referred to interchangeably as the *rex Babyloniae* elsewhere, but it may be significant that he was not a *rex* here.²⁸⁹ The crusade leaders’ reply continues this lack of distinction between the Fatimid Egyptians and the Abbasid Seljuks: ‘Neither should your people take any pride in having overcome the effeminate Greek race...’ they replied, rejecting the envoys’ offer of safe conduct to Jerusalem if they will come unarmed.²⁹⁰ This is, admittedly, more ambiguous: Robert may be referring to the Fatimids as the original conquerors of Syria, which they did conquer from the Byzantine Empire, but it is more likely that the Seljuks’ more recent conquest of Asia Minor was what he had in mind if he made any distinction at all. Taken alone, the passage linking the Babylonians to the *Rex Persarum* is ambiguous, but alongside Robert’s apparent failure to recognise the *Gesta*’s distinct terminology, it seems likely that Robert was at best dimly aware of political divisions between the enemies faced by the crusade.

3.2.2 Biblical References.

Robert made extensive use of biblical quotations in support of his argument about the nature of the crusade. This use of scripture to support and legitimise arguments about contemporary political questions was identified by Beryl Smalley, who coined the term ‘political allegory’ to describe it.²⁹¹ As will be shown, Robert frequently quoted passages from the

²⁸⁸ *In aula regis Persarum dominique nostri magnus pro vobis congregatus est conventus...* Robert the Monk, 47 (791); Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk’s History of the First Crusade*, 136-7.

²⁸⁹ Robert the Monk, 103-4, (874).

²⁹⁰ *Nec gloriatur gens vestra, quia superaverit effeminatam gentem Grecorum...* Robert the Monk, 48 (792); Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk’s History of the First Crusade*, 137.

²⁹¹ Beryl Smalley, *The Becket Conflict and the Schools: A Study of Intellectuals in Politics* (Oxford, 1973), 30-6.

Bible which referred to God avenging Himself and His people, and passages which foretold the extent to which His people would be victorious. This had a dual effect, however. Not only did it provide unimpeachable precedent for Robert's arguments, but it also associated Muslims with the ancient enemies of the Children of Israel from the Old Testament. Use of the phrase *inimici Dei* was one of the important ways in which the *Gesta* author sought to establish the Muslim enemies as inherently Other and inimical; more than just rivals for control of Jerusalem and its surroundings, they were the very enemies of God Himself.²⁹² Robert dropped this phrase from his revision (though he used an equivalent phrase once²⁹³), but he incorporated the idea into his overall conception of the crusade as God's vengeance, and reinforced it with references and quotations from the Bible such as these, which cited the enemies of God and His people in the Old Testament as direct precedents for the conflict between Crusaders and Muslims.

From the very first, Robert quoted passages which associated Muslims with the enemies of the Children of Israel in the Old Testament, often explicitly ones in which God avenged Himself on them. In the speech he attributed to Urban II at Clermont, Robert wrote that the Franks were those 'to whom God has given... the strength to humiliate the *hairy scalp* of those who resist you.'²⁹⁴ This was a reference to Psalms 67:22: 'But God will wound the head of His enemies, the hairy scalp of the one who still goes on in his trespasses.' By reference to this passage, Robert was clearly associating Muslims with the barbarous enemies of the Children of Israel in the Bible. But it also has deeper significance: the verse is quite appropriate for Robert's overall theological theme of God using the crusaders to avenge the mistreatment of Christians by Muslims. It comes immediately after Urban II enumerates the 'trespasses' that the Persians are continuing, and asks who better to avenge them ('*Quibus igitur ad hoc ulciscendum*') than the Franks.²⁹⁵

Robert's next use of the Bible in a similar way comes after the crusader victory at Dorylaeum (1 July 1097). Robert reported that they

²⁹² For example: *Gesta Francorum*, 22, 96.

²⁹³ *Inimicos Regis eterni*; 'enemies of the eternal King'. Robert the Monk, 96 (863).

²⁹⁴ '*...pre ceteris gentibus contulit Deus insigne decus armorum, magnitudinem animorum, agilitatem corporum, virtutem humiliandi vericem capilli vobis resistentium.*' Robert the Monk, 6 (728); Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade*, 80.

²⁹⁵ Robert the Monk, 6 (728).

celebrated their victory by singing a hymn closely based on chapter 15 of the Book of Exodus:

Gloriosus est, Domine, in sanctis tuis, mirabilis in maiestate tua; terribilis atque laudabilis, et faciens mirabilia. Dexterā tuā, Domine, percussit inimicum, et in multitudine gloriæ tuæ deposuisti adversarios nostros. Dixerat inimicus: "Persequar et comprehendam illos, dividam spolia, implebitur anima mea, evaginabo gladium meum, interficiet eos manus mea". Sed tu, Domine, nobiscum fuisti, tanquam bellator fortis, et dux et protector fuisti in misericordia populo tuo quem redemisti. Nunc, Domine, cognoscimus quia portas nos in fortitudine tua, ad habitaculum sanctum tuum, ad sanctum scilicet Sepulcrum tuum.²⁹⁶

The chapter in question recounts Moses and the Israelites' celebration at their deliverance by God from Pharaoh; it takes place immediately after the Egyptian chariots are swept away in the Red Sea.²⁹⁷ The association of Muslims with the Egyptians of Exodus has clear implications, and the parallels with previous wars in the same sacred landscape are a natural comparison for an author such as Robert to have made. But Robert avoids any parts of Exodus 15 that specifically mention Egyptians rather than generic enemies, and it is likely that he wished in this case to emphasise the assistance of God rather than the parallels between the Muslims and the Egyptians of Exodus. Though Robert can't have been

²⁹⁶ 'Thou art glorious in Thy saints, O Lord, and wonderful in majesty; *fearful in praises, doing wonders* [Ex. 15:11]. *Thy right hand, O Lord, hath dashed in pieces the enemy* [Ex. 15:6], *and in the greatness of thine excellency thou hast overthrown them that rose up against thee* [Ex 15:7]. *The enemy said, I will pursue, I will overtake, I will divide the spoil; my lust shall be satisfied upon them; I will draw my sword, my hand shall destroy them* [Ex 15:9]. But Thou, Lord, wast with us a strong warrior, and *Thou in thy mercy hast led forth the people, which thou hast redeemed*. Now we realise, God, that Thou art *guiding us in Thy strength unto thy holy habitation* [Ex 15:13], Thy Holy Sepulchre.' Robert the Monk, 27-8 (763); Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade*, 112.

²⁹⁷ Chapter 15 of Exodus begins: '*Tunc cecinit Moses et filii Israhel carmen hoc Domino*' (Exodus, 15:1). Robert's basis for this hymn is thus more likely to be entirely scriptural rather than something that was actually sung by the crusaders. It does not appear in Guido Maria Dreves' *Analectica Hymnica Medii Aevi* (Leipzig, 1895). There is *some* possibility that it was sung on crusade without finding its way into any of Dreves' sources, but this investigation has not yet thrown up any reason to believe Robert – a non-participant – would have had any special knowledge of this, and it fits his argument about the nature of the crusade a little too neatly. It is far more likely to be the result of Robert's efforts to demonstrate the legitimacy of his interpretation of the crusade.

entirely blind to what this passage implied about Muslims, he never does explicitly make this connection. More important for his purposes was the direct intervention of God in this passage – indeed it is one in which God can be seen to be taking revenge, even if not explicitly so.

The following chapter is a passage Robert introduced to the *Gesta* about the robbing of Muslim corpses after a battle. In doing so he quotes the Bible; demonstrating that it was a ‘sequence of events worthy of high praise’.²⁹⁸ He quoted Luke 1:53 – ‘*Ensuriens etenim suos replevit bonis, divites vero non suos dimisit inanes...*’²⁹⁹ He went on to say that this was exactly what had been promised by the prophecy in Isaiah 60:15-16:

Ponam te in superbiam saeculorum, gaudium
ingenerationem et generationem; et suges lac gentium, et
mamilla regum lactaberis, et scies quia ego Dominus
salvans te, et redemptor tuus fortis Jacob.³⁰⁰

He included his own exegesis of this passage, in which he explained that it prophesied the subjugation of worldly power to men of nobility – that is, to Christians.³⁰¹ Robert celebrated the plundering of defeated Muslim forces again when describing a foraging expedition from Antioch (28 December 1097). With supplies running low during the siege, Bohemond and Robert II of Flanders took a large force into Muslim territory. ‘Oh God who oversees all things, how swiftly do you come help those labouring under dangers and difficulties’, Robert wrote, foreshadowing the success of this expedition, claiming that what Solomon wrote in *Proverbs* had come to pass: ‘*Conservatur justo substantia peccatoris* (the wealth of the sinner is

²⁹⁸ Robert the Monk, 28 (764).

²⁹⁹ ‘For *He hath filled His own with good things* and those not His own *he hath sent empty away...*’ Robert the Monk, 28 (764); Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk’s History of the First Crusade*, 113.

³⁰⁰ ‘I will make thee an eternal excellency, a joy of many generations. Thou shalt also suck the milk of the Gentiles, and shalt suck the breast of kings: and thou shalt know that I the Lord am thy Saviour and thy Redeemer, the mighty one of Jacob.’ Robert the Monk, 28-9 (764); Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk’s History of the First Crusade*, 113. Cf Isaiah 60:15-16: ‘...*ponam te in superbiam saeculorum gaudium ingenerationem et generationem. Et suges lac gentium et mamilla regum lactaberis et scies quia ego dominus salvans te et redemptor tuus fortis Jacob.*’

³⁰¹ ‘*Superbia saeculorum, nobilitas est virorum illustrium; mamilla regum, divitiae thesauros suos in terram fodientium. Quae nobilitas mamilla regum pascitur, quum ei mundana potestas subjicitur. Et inde habet gaudium et laetitiam non tantum in hac generatione praesenti, sed et in futura saeculorum generatione.*’ Robert the Monk, 29 (764).

laid up for the just)'.³⁰² The foragers encountered another large force; Muslim reinforcements bound for Antioch; and handily defeated them in the next chapter. In the camp of the defeated Muslim forces, the crusaders found an abundance of supplies and beasts of burden. According to Robert, it was 'a matter for wonder and joy' that God had so provided for his followers, and acted as He had previously done for the Israelites when they tried to cross the lands of gentile kings who denied them access to the roads.³⁰³ The latter is a reference to *Numbers* 21:21-31, in which King Sihon of the Amorites refused to allow the Children of Israel to cross his kingdom.³⁰⁴ Marching out against them, he was defeated, and the Israelites occupied the kingdom. Robert repeated his quotation of *Proverbs* 13:22 in an incident as the crusade proceeded from Antioch to Jerusalem: they found the town of Caphalia deserted but full of food, its inhabitants having fled at their approach; and so once again, '*conservatur justo substantia peccatoris*'.³⁰⁵

It seems at first glance as if Robert was attempting to justify the behaviour, but in that case, why add these accounts? He also seems to go far further than mere justification in his celebration of 'the wonders of God at work'.³⁰⁶ Robert writes about plundering by the crusaders not in a spirit of apology, but one of triumph. He cites biblical precedent for God's approval of – even His participation in – the plundering of His people's enemies. As Robert's exegesis of Isaiah indicates, his aim was to show how totally God's vengeance was enacted through the crusaders. By implication, these passages also emphasised Muslim alterity in no uncertain terms: Muslims were explicitly the equivalent of Gentile kings like Sihon of Amorites; Christians were 'His own', and Muslims were 'sent empty away'.³⁰⁷

³⁰² *O rerum omnium moderator Deus, quam citius subvenis in periculis et necessitate laborantibus, ut illud impleretur quod Salomon scripsit in Proverbiis: Conservatur justo substantia peccatoris!* (*Proverbs* 13:22). Robert the Monk, 37 (778); Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade*, 124.

³⁰³ *Mirandum et gaudendum erat...* Robert the Monk, 38 (779).

³⁰⁴ *Sic quoque filii Israel olim faciebat, cum per terram gentilium regum transire cupiebant, et illi publicum vie regie incesum eis denegabant.* Robert the Monk, 18 (779).

³⁰⁵ Robert the Monk, 90 (851-2). In the same context, Robert also mentions a castle full of *Sarraceni* who, terrified at the approach of the crusaders, threw sheep and other animals over their walls at the crusaders in the belief that all they wanted was supplies. A similar incident occurs in the *Gesta* (82) but Robert has exaggerated it for comic effect.

³⁰⁶ *...Deum mirabilem in suis operibus...* Robert the Monk, 28 (764); Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade*, 113.

³⁰⁷ Luke 1:53, as quoted by Robert above.

Following the *Gesta*'s lead, Robert included a long passage in which Kerbogha's mother pleaded with him not to attack the Christians, quoting from the Bible to prove to him that God will help the crusaders and that their victory has been foretold. The passage is obviously a fantasy, though the suggestion that Kerbogha's mother fulfils a role similar to that of Pontius Pilate's wife helps to make sense of her scriptural knowledge. Pilate's wife warned him against condemning Jesus in Matthew 27:19: there may be a precedent for Kerbogha's wife here in the tradition of 'an unlikely instrument extolling the word of God'.³⁰⁸ Robert changed the Biblical passages which Kerbogha's mother quoted, to better suit his agenda. He had her warn Kerbogha of God's power and His propensity to wreak revenge on his enemies, quoting Deuteronomy and referring to God's defeat of Pharaoh, King Sihon of the Amorites, King Og of Bashan and the Kingdoms of Canaan.³⁰⁹ God is on the side of the Christians, as he promises in Exodus 23:20-23. This, Kerbogha's mother says, 'is the same God who is angry with our race because we have not listened to his words or done his will', and so He has sent the crusaders against them.³¹⁰ She quotes Psalm 106 and either Deuteronomy or the Book of Joshua to demonstrate that the crusaders' victory has been foretold: 'from the east and from the west, from the north and from the south shall your coast be (Psalms 106:3). There shall be no man to stand before you (reminiscent of both Deuteronomy 11:24-5 and Joshua 1:4-5).' In Deuteronomy, God promises the Children of Israel that He will 'drive out all these nations from before you', and that all the land from Lebanon to the Euphrates to the sea will be theirs; in Joshua He renews the promise after Moses' death. Psalm 106:3 indicates again just how extensive the victory of the Christians will be; how thoroughly God's vengeance will be enacted through them.

More oblique references may also have been used with the intention of signifying meaning to alert readers. Robert used the word *vindicare* on a few appropriate occasions, a term characteristic of Old Testament passages

³⁰⁸ Ní Chléirigh, *The Crusaders and their Enemies*, 71.

³⁰⁹ '...reddam ultionem hostibus meis, et his qui oderunt me retribuam. Inebriato sagittas meas sanguine, et gladius meus devorabit carnes (Deuteronomy 32:40-1).' Robert the Monk, 61-2 (812). Pharaoh is defeated in Exodus chapter 14, Sihon in Numbers 21:21-9 and Og in Deuteronomy 29:7.

³¹⁰ *Genti nostrae iratus est Deus ille, quia nec audimus vocem ejus, nec facimus voluntatem; et idcirco de remotis partibus Occidentis excitavit in nos gentem suam.* Robert the Monk, 62 (812); Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade*, 154.

in which God wrought revenge on persecutors of the Children of Israel.³¹¹ Robert first used the term to describe the capture of Antioch (2 June 1097); he wrote, ‘the Christians entered the city of Antioch, and delivered it (*vindicaverunt*) from its invaders at the point of the sword.’³¹² There is no direct parallel to this passage in the *Gesta*: the word choice was entirely his own. On the other occasion, Robert wrote of Godfrey of Bouillon’s behaviour in the storming of Jerusalem: uninterested in plunder, Godfrey ‘was desperate to make the enemy pay [*ab eis vindicare*] for the blood of the servants of God which had been spilt around Jerusalem.’³¹³ This, too, was Robert’s own wording. This choice of Old Testament language would have served to subtly reinforce Robert’s overall conception of the crusade as God’s vengeance for Muslim persecution of Christians wrought through the crusaders, reminding alert readers of the Biblical precedent for such events.

3.2.3 Animal Imagery

As Sweetenham noted, Robert made frequent comparisons between Muslims and animals, usually prey animals or vermin.³¹⁴ Dehumanising in itself, Robert’s imagery was usually calculated to depict Muslims as timid or cowardly, or on less frequent occasions as disgusting or wild. This tendency is all but absent from the *Gesta Francorum*. In one case, Robert’s use of such descriptions overlaps with the former theme; he says that the Muslim forces that suddenly appeared at Dorylaeum covered the ground like ‘*locusta et bruccus, quorum non est numerus*’.³¹⁵ This is a quotation from Psalms

³¹¹ Many examples, but see in particular: Deuteronomy 32:43: *Laudate gentes populum Eius quia sanguinem servorum suorum ulciscetur et vindictam retribuet in hostes eorum...*, ‘Praise his people, ye nations, for he will revenge the blood of his servants: and will render vengeance to their enemies...’; Ezekiel 25:15: *Et dabo ultionem meam super Idumeam per manum populi mei Israhel et facient in Edom iuxta iram meam et furorem meum et scient vindictam meam dicit Dominus Deus*, ‘And I will lay my vengeance upon Edom by the hand of my people Israel: and they shall do in Edom according to my wrath, and my fury: and they shall know my vengeance, saith the Lord God’; and Ezekiel 25:17: *...et scient quia ego Dominus cum dederam vindictam meam super eos*, ‘...and they shall know that I am the Lord, when I shall lay my vengeance upon them.’

³¹² *Quarto nonas junii, Christiani in urbem Antiochie introierunt, et in ore gladii de suis eam inuasoribus vindicaverunt*. Robert the Monk, 56 (805); Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk’s History of the First Crusade*, 147.

³¹³ ‘*Dux vero Godefridus, non arcem, non aulam, non aurum, non argentum, non quaelibet spolia ambiebat; sed cum Francigenis suis sanguinem servorum Dei, qui in circuitu Iherusalem effusus fuerat, ab eis vindicare satagebat; et irrationes et contumelias quas peregrinis intulerant, ulcisci cupiebat*’. Robert the Monk, 99 (868); Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk’s History of the First Crusade*, 200.

³¹⁴ Sweetenham, ‘Crusaders in a Hall of Mirrors’, 134.

³¹⁵ ‘...like locusts and grasshoppers, and that without number.’ Robert the Monk, 27 (763); Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk’s History of the First Crusade*, 111.

104:34: '*dixit et venit lucusta et bruchus cuius non erat numerus*'.³¹⁶ The psalm recalls the plagues visited on the Egyptians, but the comparison to numerous (and verminous) animals is more likely to have been what Robert had in mind than its direct biblical significance. Muslims are here being compared to a plague rather than its recipients, and the implication that the crusaders are the Egyptians in this scenario would have been nonsensical to Robert's readers.³¹⁷ Similarly, though without referring to the Bible, Robert also wrote that Muslim forces in the final battle at Antioch 'swarmed from every side like flies on rotting matter.'³¹⁸

Robert also wrote of Muslims as being like hares fleeing from dogs (twice), fawns sprung from traps or does shot with arrows, frightened does and stags, birds shot by hunters, and doves startled by hawks.³¹⁹ The last of these, Robert also used twice, quoting from Ovid's *Metamorphoses*.³²⁰ These make up the bulk of Robert's comparisons of Muslims to animals; for the most part they are timid, easily startled or easily killed prey animals. On one occasion the crusaders themselves are referred to as butchers in an abattoir; implicitly, the Muslims are the slaughtered animals.³²¹ Along similar lines, Robert twice referred to the crusaders cutting through Muslim forces like a reaper through the harvest: their passivity was a recurring theme.³²² The *Gesta* switched back and forth between Muslims as fierce and intimidating; and cowardly and ineffectual; depending on narrative necessity.³²³ As can be seen here and elsewhere, one of Robert's revisions to the *Gesta* was to make this more consistent; he created an image of the opponents of the crusade as noticeably more timid and passive than his source.

³¹⁶ 'He spoke, and the locust came, and the bruchus, of which there was no number'.

³¹⁷ Nevertheless it is interesting that this occurs immediately before Robert's hymn based on Exodus chapter 15 discussed above. Perhaps one reminded him of the other.

³¹⁸ '*Sicut enim putridini musce confluere solent, sic et ipsi undique conveniebant*'. Robert the Monk, (76) 832; Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade*, 174.

³¹⁹ Hares fleeing dogs: Robert the Monk, (23) 757, 63 (813); Fawns and does: 31 (767); Frightened stags and young does: p 74 (830); birds: 105 (876); Doves and hawks: 29 (764), 152 (865).

³²⁰ '*...illi, sicut trepide columbe a facie accipitris, ita ante faciem eorum fugiebant, columbe/assolent/sic fugiunt et nostris terga dederunt*,' Robert the Monk, 110 (865). The latter is identified by Bull and Kempf and the RHC editors as a quote from *Metamorphoses*, v. 605, but from the similarity of the highlighted words (emphasis mine) it is clear that Robert had it in mind in the former case too.

³²¹ Robert the Monk, 105 (876).

³²² Robert the Monk, 38 (778), 44 (786).

³²³ See Chapter One above.

There are exceptions to this tendency. Robert wrote that ‘an infinite number of Turks... were panting like wild beasts’ for the arrival of the People’s Crusade (the less organised group of crusaders led by Peter the Hermit and Walter the Penniless who preceded the larger army made up of contingents led by the high nobility)³²⁴; he wrote that a truce at Antioch was broken when a crusader named Walo was killed by ‘armed dogs’³²⁵; and he described the last stand of a crusader who was surrounded by Muslims during the storming of Antioch as like a bear defending itself from Molossian hounds (sporting dogs popular at the time).³²⁶ Though these are less passive, they are far from positive, and in the case of the People’s Crusade and the unnamed crusader at Antioch, they are distinct in context from the other examples. Robert wrote of the People’s Crusade dismissively; they were poorly led and ill-disciplined.³²⁷ They were easily defeated by the Turks, unlike the better-led men who followed. While bear-baiting hounds are strong and warlike when compared to hares or doves, there is still a clear hierarchy between the single, powerful Christian fighter who is like a bear and the Muslims who can only defeat him by ganging up and persecuting him.

In an article on the use of animal imagery in crusade accounts, Natasha Hodgson suggested that contemporary authors may have used particular animals for the traits associated with them in classical tradition.³²⁸ The main source for such knowledge in the Middle Ages was Isidore of Seville’s *Etymologiae*. Isidore’s writings on the hare, the doe and the hawk lend themselves well to the kinds of comparison Robert is making. The hare ‘is a speedy animal and quite timid’³²⁹; the doe (*damula*) ‘is so called because she flees ‘from one’s hand’ (*de manu*). She is a timid animal and

³²⁴ *Turci enim numerus infinitus erat, qui adventum illorum bestiali mente sitiēbat.* Robert the Monk, 9 (732).

³²⁵ *...armati canes...* Robert the Monk, 50 (795).

³²⁶ *Unus tamen in superiori turris fastigio remansit... Ille enim, ut vidit se solum esse derelictum, tamen in se animum gerens invictum, ut ursus inter molossos, coepit se utrinque defendere.* Robert the Monk, 57 (807).

³²⁷ Stealing lead from the roofs of Constantinople and selling it back to the Greeks, for example: *Ecclesias enim et urbis palatia destruebant, et, quae in eis erant auferentes, plumbum quo tegebantur abstrahēbant et Graecis vendebant.* Robert the Monk, 9 (732).

³²⁸ Natasha R. Hodgson, ‘Lions, Tigers, and Bears: Encounters with Wild Animals and Bestial Imagery in the Context of Crusading to the Latin East’, in *Viator* 44(1) (2013), 65-94, 66.

³²⁹ Isidore of Seville, *The Etymologies of Isidore of Seville*, trans. Stephen A. Barney, W. J. Lewis, J. A. Beach and Oliver Berghof (Cambridge, 2011, first published 2006), XII.i.23 248. Henceforth: *Etymologiae*.

unwarlike...'³³⁰ Robert *might* have consulted Isidore looking for apt comparisons, but more likely the *Etymologies* simply indicate to us the associations which these animals carried for Robert. These are not especially surprising in the case of young does and hares, though Isidore's emphasis on the speed of the hare and the 'unwarlike' nature of the doe may add depth to our understanding of Robert's descriptions. The hawk, however, did have less obvious traits in Isidore, which make it an even more apt metaphor for the crusaders. Robert and others were often at pains to present the crusaders as the smaller, more poorly-equipped force in their encounters with Muslims, while according to Isidore, 'the hawk (*accipiter*) is a bird armed more with spirit than with talons, bearing great valor in its small body.'³³¹ Isidore's writings on the dove contain nothing of relevance, but it may be that this supposed trait of hawks caused the relevant passage from Ovid's *Metamorphoses* to seem even more apt to Robert.

The rest of the animals to which Robert compared Muslims either do not appear in Isidore's work (*bruccus*, *molossos*), or he says nothing that indicates any deeper significance. Isidore says nothing especially ferocious of bears, for example, and has nothing but praise for dogs. Robert must have had other traditions in mind when comparing crusaders to the former and Muslims to the latter (though it does fit with his comparisons of crusaders to dogs in other contexts: he apparently had quite a nuanced attitude to dogs).³³²

3.2.4 Muslim Cowardice and Stupidity

As implied by many of his comparisons of Muslims to weak, timid animals, Robert more consistently depicted Muslims as cowardly and stupid than the *Gesta* author had. Conor Kostick has observed that, while Turkish soldiers tended to be respected by First Crusade authors, the same is not really true of the Fatimids.³³³ The *Gesta* praised the Turks' prowess, but there is no such praise for the *Sarraceni*, and the Fatimid forces at Ascalon

³³⁰ Ibid., XII.i.22, 248

³³¹ Ibid., XII.vii.55, 267-8.

³³² Bears: *Etymologiae*, XII.ii.22, p 252; Dogs: *Etymologiae*, XII.II.25, p 253; Doves: *Etymologiae*, XII.vii.61, 268; Flies: *Etymologiae*, XII.viii.11, 270; Locusts: *Etymologiae*, XII.viii.9, 270. Isidore uses *cerva* (doe) only in the masculine (*cervus*) to describe deer in general, about which he says nothing along the lines of his description of *damulae*: *Etymologiae*, XII.i.18-19, 248.

³³³ Conor Kostick, 'Courage and Cowardice on the First Crusade 1096-1099', *War in History* 20:1 (2013), 32-49, 47-8.

are subject to a humiliating rout.³³⁴ Robert, however, lessens the distinction by omitting the *Gesta*'s praise of the Turks and adding more accusations of cowardice and stupidity.

At first, the Turks were 'scared out of their wits' by fear of the People's Crusade. This came just one chapter after Robert wrote that they were 'panting like wild beasts'³³⁵ in anticipation of the crusader's arrival, however, and the Turks soon discovered that their fear was unwarranted. They violently defeated this first contingent of crusaders. But as mentioned, Robert thought little of the People's Crusade, and the Turks became significantly less formidable when faced by the full force of the crusade. They fled Nicaea 'in a way that was not exactly slow or unenthusiastic';³³⁶ Turks attacked the crusader camp at the battle of Dorylaeum before being put to flight by Bohemond;³³⁷ and shortly thereafter the arrival of Raymond of Toulouse and Bishop Adhemar of Le Puy caused them to be 'struck rigid with terror'.³³⁸ They fled the battlefield, and Robert included the *Gesta*'s passage in which 'Soliman' (Kilij Arslan I ibn-Suleiman, Sultan of Rûm 1092-1107) encountered an Arab relieving force and warned them of the crusaders, convincing them to flee also.³³⁹

In all these examples, Robert was following the *Gesta*,³⁴⁰ but in the context of his omission of the *Gesta*'s praise of the Turks, they take on more significance; rather than emphasising the success of the crusaders against a truly formidable enemy, they become evidence of the Turks being fundamentally less worthy than the crusaders. Robert added more examples; he reported that the Turks fled 'like a fawn sprung from a trap or a doe shot by arrows' (see above) when the crusaders approached Heraclea (Summer, 1097).³⁴¹ The *Gesta* actually reported a fight here, though it still resulted in the Turks fleeing.³⁴² Similarly, while the *Gesta* wrote that after the Battle of the Iron Bridge before Antioch (6 March 1098), 'the survivors no longer had the courage to howl and gabble day and night, as they used to', Robert

³³⁴ *Gesta Francorum*, 21, 95-6.

³³⁵ See above.

³³⁶ '...nimis pigri et inertes ad montana redire voluerunt...' Robert the Monk, 23 (757); Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade*, 105.

³³⁷ Ibid, 25 (760).

³³⁸ '...obriguerunt timore magni...' Robert the Monk, 27 (762); Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade*, 108.

³³⁹ Ibid, 29-30 (764).

³⁴⁰ *Gesta Francorum*, 2, 14-15, 18-20.

³⁴¹ Robert the Monk, 31 (767).

³⁴² *Gesta Francorum*, 23-4.

paraphrased this and added that 'some lost all confidence and fled, sneaking secretly out of the city.'³⁴³ A related addition Robert made to the *Gesta* was his accusation that the Turks used poisoned arrows at Nicaea, Dorylaeum and twice at Antioch, emphasising the cowardly and underhand nature of their tactics.³⁴⁴

Robert also emphasised the stupidity of the Muslims, beyond what the *Gesta* wrote. Both included an account of the capture of Tortosa (early 1099) by Raymond Pilet and Raymond of Turenne, who managed to trick the inhabitants into fleeing the city at night by lighting fires all around to make it seem as if the entire crusader army was present.³⁴⁵ Robert added many more examples. He referred to the defenders of Albara as a 'drunken multitude'.³⁴⁶ 'Stupidity is a distinguishing characteristic of infidels', he wrote when describing the encounter of Bohemond's foraging party with a large Muslim force mentioned above; the Muslims divided into two columns and tried to encircle the crusaders, but that 'was stupid'.³⁴⁷ He similarly criticised Kerbogha's orders to his men before the final battle for Antioch: 'when they march out to fight surround them on all sides and do not let even one escape or live a moment longer than is necessary; if you leave them alive for a while they will wreak havoc on our men before they are all killed.'³⁴⁸ This 'shows Kerbogha's stupidity', because it terrified his men. It was 'hardly surprising' that Kerbogha 'was foolish enough to use such idiocies, because the spirit of wisdom does not enter the souls of the perverse.'³⁴⁹

³⁴³ 'Sic itaque superati sunt Turci magnanimitate a Francis, siluitque deinceps garrula vox eorum, stridor dentium, et cotidianorum clamoritas conviciorum. Jam vero dimissis vultibus ibant, et plerique omnino diffidentes, furtim de civitate exeuntes, fugiebant.' Robert the Monk, 46 (788); Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade*, 134. Cf *Gesta Francorum*, 41.

³⁴⁴ Robert the Monk, 22-3 (756), 25 (760), 44 (786), 75 (831).

³⁴⁵ *Gesta Francorum*, 84; Robert the Monk, 92 (854). Robert mentions 'immense flaming pyres (*immensos rogos ignium*)' where the *Gesta* only mentioned 'fires (*ignes*)'; a piece of rhetorical exaggeration that seems somewhat counterproductive in this case.

³⁴⁶ *Temulente multitudini*, Robert the Monk, 84 (845).

³⁴⁷ 'Que divisio stulta fuit, quoniam stultitia in cordibus incredulorum semper requiescit.' Ibid, 38 (778); Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade*, 124.

³⁴⁸ '...cum ad prelium venerint, undique eos circumvallate, ne alicui sit locus divertendi, nec spacium diu vivendi: quoniam si eis aliquandiu licet vivere, antequam omnes interficiantur, magnas strages de nostris operabuntur.' Robert the Monk, 71 (827); *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade*, 166.

³⁴⁹ 'In hoc apparet quia Corbanam stultus erat...Nec mirandum si insipiens loquitur amentiam, quia spiritus sapientie non intrat in malivolam animam. Robert the Monk 71-2 (827); Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade*, 166-7.

3.2.5 Robert's Use of Violence

Robert greatly expanded and exaggerated many of the *Gesta's* accounts of violence against Muslims, but with the exception of his account of Clermont, he did not intensify descriptions of violence by Muslims. This may indicate an intention to present the victory of the Crusaders as more total and one-sided, but it also reinforces his conception of the crusade as vengeance. The atrocities of the Muslims are described at Clermont and in Robert's account of the fate of the People's Crusade, which he reproduces quite faithfully from the *Gesta*. In a sense, they form the prelude to the 'real' crusade. From that point on, what was relevant was God's vengeance, and so Robert produced graphic and vivid accounts of violence against Muslims, sometimes explicitly justified by their past behaviour. In writing his account of Urban II's speech at Clermont, Robert seems to have drawn on a letter purporting to be from Alexios I Comnenos to Count Robert I of Flanders, appealing for his help against the Turks.³⁵⁰ According to Robert, the pope said:

They throw down the altars after soiling them with their own filth; circumcise Christians, and pour the resulting blood either on the altars or into the baptismal vessels... And what can I say about the appalling debauchery of women, which it is better to pass over in silence than to spell out in detail?³⁵¹

The letter made much the same accusations, though it went into explicit detail about the rape of women (and men).³⁵² Robert also added his own vividly gory details; he had Urban claim that:

The latter statement is a reference to Wisdom 1:4, '*...qouniam in malivolam animam non intrabit sapientia...*'

³⁵⁰ The letter was included with many of the manuscripts of Robert's *Historia*, but it also existed independently. It can be found in Heinrich Hagenmeyer, *Die Kreuzzugsbriefe aus dem Jahre 1088-1100* (Innsbruck, 1901), 130-6.

³⁵¹ '*Altaria suis feditatibus inquinata subvertunt, Christianos circumcidunt, cruoremque circumcisionis aut super altaria fundunt. aut in vasis baptisterii immergunt... Quid dicam de nefanda mulierum constupratione, de qua loqui deterius est quam silere?*' Robert the Monk, 5 (727-8); Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade*, 79-80.

³⁵² Hagenmeyer, *Kreuzzugsbriefe*, 130-6. Guibert of Nogent had access to the same letter, but this vague reference of Robert's is the only overlap in the sections they used; Guibert ignored the part about baptismal fonts and focused solely on the rape. He explicitly included a summary of the letter rather than including it in Urban II's sermon at Clermont. Guibert of Nogent, 101-2. The letter was probably composed for use in Bohemond's propaganda campaign, and disseminated as an *excitatorium*

When they feel like inflicting a truly painful death on some they pierce their navels, pull out the end of their intestines, tie them to a pole and whip them around it until, all their bowels pulled out, they fall lifeless to the ground. They shoot arrows at others tied to stakes; others again they attack having stretched out their necks, unsheathing their swords to see if they can manage to hack off their heads with one blow.³⁵³

In the same vein, he adopted the *Gesta Francorum*'s account of the fate of the People's Crusade, in which a bishop was killed while celebrating mass and some of those captured alive were tied to posts and shot at – possibly where he got the idea for his previous mention of that activity.³⁵⁴ This, then, was the persecution of Christians which God sent the crusaders to avenge. After this point, Robert wrote about violence by Muslims in far less detail.

Robert adopted some passages of violence against Muslims from the *Gesta* with little change; both described the shedding of so much blood into the river outside Tripoli that the water in the cisterns of the city was dyed red.³⁵⁵ He also exaggerated many of the *Gesta*'s statements. The *Gesta* author wrote of a battle outside Antioch at which so many Muslims died that the river ran red with blood; Robert adopted this and added that 'the piles of bodies in the river stopped the current and forced it to flow back the other way'.³⁵⁶ He added more detail to the *Gesta*'s account of the massacre at Albara (September 1098), which simply stated that Raymond of St Gilles massacred the Muslims there. In Robert's version:

for his expedition against the Byzantine Empire, explaining how both authors saw it. See Einar Joranson, 'The problem of the Spurious Letter of Emperor Alexius to the Count of Flanders', *American Historical Review* 55 (1950), 811-832.

³⁵³ 'Et quos eis placet turpi occubito multare, umbilicum eis perforant, caput vitaliorum abstrahunt, ad stipitem ligant, et sic flagellando circumducunt, quoadusque, extractis visceribus solo prostrati corruunt. Quosdam stipiti ligatos sagittant; quosdam, extento collo et nudato, gladio appetunt et utrum uno ictu truncare possint pertentant.' Robert the Monk, 5 (727-8); Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade*, 80.

³⁵⁴ Robert the Monk, 11 (734-5); Cf *Gesta Francorum*, 4.

³⁵⁵ 'Tantum ibi humani sanguinis fusum est, quia aqua rubicunda facta est, que in civitate fluebat, et eorum cisternas replebat.' Robert the Monk, 93 (856), *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade*, 192. Cf *Gesta Francorum*, 85.

³⁵⁶ 'Quippe densitas corporum fluminis impediabat cursum, et retrogrado incessu ire cogebat retrorsum.' Robert the Monk, 45 (787); *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade*, 134. Cf *Gesta Francorum*, 41. The battle took place on 6 March 1098.

The count ordered that all should be put in chains, and those who refused to acknowledge Christ the Redeemer should be beheaded. So many heads were seen to fall; so many boys and girls were deprived of what should have been a long life. This was the judgment of God: the city had belonged to the Christians and had been taken from them with the same macabre behaviour.³⁵⁷

Robert also added a passage describing Godfrey of Bouillon's exploits in the storming of Jerusalem (where the *Gesta* author only wrote that the crusaders broke into the city and there was a slaughter):

Meanwhile Duke Godfrey had no desire for the citadel, the palace, gold, or silver or any kind of spoils. Instead at the head of his Franks he was desperate to make the enemy pay for the blood of the servants of God which had been spilt around Jerusalem, and wanted revenge for the insults they had heaped on the pilgrims.³⁵⁸

Godfrey, a certain Wicher, and 'many thousands of chosen soldiers' tore through the city; they 'slashed human bodies from head to abdomen, to the right and the left and on both sides',³⁵⁹ up to the Temple of Solomon, where, in a direct intensification of the *Gesta*'s account of blood flowing all over the floor of the Temple, Robert wrote:

So much human blood was spilt there that the bodies of the slain were revolving on the floor on a current of blood; arms and hands which had been cut off floated on the blood and found their way to dead bodies so that

³⁵⁷ 'Precepit enim comes ut omnes vinculaarentur et qui in Christum salvatorem credere nollent decollarentur. Illic visi sunt tot capite plecti, totque pueris cum puellis subtracta est vita longi temporis. Iudicium enim Domini fuit hoc quia Christianorum fuerat civitas illa eisque simili mortis ludibrio ablata.' Robert the Monk, 82 (840); Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade*, 178-9. Cf *Gesta Francorum*, 75.

³⁵⁸ 'Dux vero Godefridus, non arcem, non aulam, non aurum, non argentum, non quolibet spolia ambiebat; sed cum Francigenis suis sanguinem servorum Dei, qui in circuitu Iherusalem effusus fuerat, ab eis vindicare satagebat; et irrisiones et contumelias quas peregrinis intulerant, ulcisci cupiebat.' Robert the Monk, 99 (868); Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade*, 200. Cf *Gesta Francorum*, 90-1.

³⁵⁹ 'Nunc vero, absque ulla refragatione, tam ipse quam Guicherus... multaque electorum millia militum, a summo capite usque ad renes secabant humana corpora, et dextra leuaque per utraque latera.' Robert the Monk, 99 (868); Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade*, 200.

nobody could work out which body the arm had come from which was attached to another headless body.³⁶⁰

Violence against Muslims, especially in such a way as it is depicted so unsympathetically in Robert's *Historia*, has a dehumanising effect; it implies that they are beneath sympathy. Most importantly, in several cases Robert added small comments explicitly justifying the violence against Muslims, as seen above with his accounts of Albara and Godfrey's actions in Jerusalem. This was how Robert established his concept of the Crusade as divine vengeance. Indeed, in beginning his history with the accounts of the violence perpetrated by Muslims against Christians which he attributed to Urban's speech at Clermont, he framed the entire crusade as justified by the behaviour of the Muslims.

3.2.6 Muslim Wealth and Materialism

Like the *Gesta*, and like many other sources, there is a detectable theme of Muslim wealth in Robert's *Historia*. As argued in previous chapters, this can be connected to a view of Muslims as materialistic; overconfident in their numbers and equipment, in contrast to the crusaders' trust in God. The extremes of Muslim wealth suggested by Tudebode's golden-armoured emirs,³⁶¹ or Ralph of Caen's description of the contents of the Temple of Solomon³⁶² are not found to the same extent in Robert, but he often found occasion to emphasise the material wealth of the enemy. Robert wrote of the riches to be found in the camp of the defeated Turkish forces at Dorylaeum: 'Who could possibly describe the rich pickings of clothes and the sheer amount of gold and silver they found?'³⁶³ With the spoils captured, God made the poor rich and clothed those who had been half-naked in silk. The camp was also full of valuable beasts of burden of all kinds.³⁶⁴ As in the *Gesta*, Robert reported that the Turks buried their dead with gold coins and

³⁶⁰ 'Tantum ibi humani sanguinis effusum est, quia cesorum corpora, unda sanguinis impellente, volvebantur per pavimentum, et brachia sive truncata manus super cruorem fluitabant et extraneo corpori iungebantur, ita ut nemo valeret discernere cuius erat corporis brachium, quod truncato corpori erat adiunctum.' Robert the Monk, 99 (868). Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade*, 200-1. Cf *Gesta Francorum*, 91.

³⁶¹ Tudebode, 72.

³⁶² Ralph of Caen, *Gesta Tancredi in Expeditione Hierosolymitana*, Recueil des Historiens des Croisades: Historiens Occidentaux, 6 vols (Paris, 1866), III.144.

³⁶³ 'Et quis referre potest quantam ibi abundantiam vestium, quantam auri argentique copiam reppererunt?' Robert the Monk, 28 (764) Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade*, 112.

³⁶⁴ Ibid.

weapons.³⁶⁵ Kerbogha's mother warns him that, though he may now be surrounded 'with every efflorescence of royal Oriental riches', he will lose all if he attacks the crusaders.³⁶⁶ The emir of Tripoli was able to provide 15,000 bezants and fifteen horses, as well as other supplies, in return for a peace settlement.³⁶⁷ Cutting open their corpses, crusaders even discovered gold bezants and coins that had been swallowed by the inhabitants of Ma'arrat-an-Nu'man.³⁶⁸ He had the Fatimid vizier al-Afdal Shahanshah claim that Mohammed's tomb was 'ornamented with far more gold, jewels and precious objects' than the Holy Sepulchre.³⁶⁹

Robert also presented Muslims as being particularly concerned with material things, and unable to understand the faith of the crusaders. He followed the *Gesta* in claiming that, having failed to convince him not to attack the Franks, Kerbogha's mother left taking with her all the riches she could lay her hands on;³⁷⁰ and that Kerbogha offered land and promotion to the Christians if they would renounce their faith.³⁷¹ He added examples of his own: Robert wrote that Kerbogha made preparations for a retreat signal as the crusader army came out from Antioch for the final battle for the city. In the *Gesta*, he simply ordered that if a fire was lit in the vanguard it would be the signal for retreat; Robert changed this to an order to the emir who guarded his treasure to flee immediately with all Kerbogha's possessions if he saw the signal fire.³⁷² 'Clemens', Robert's name for al-Afdal, was even more concerned with wealth.³⁷³ In his extended version of the lament the *Gesta*'s author attributed to the vizier at Ascalon, Robert had him assume the crusaders' motives had been material:

³⁶⁵ Robert the Monk, 46 (788); *Gesta Francorum*, 42.

³⁶⁶ 'Nunc vero omni flore Orientalium regum ac divitum stipatus...' Robert the Monk, 63 (813); Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade*, 156.

³⁶⁷ Robert the Monk, 93-4 857.

³⁶⁸ Robert the Monk, 87 (848).

³⁶⁹ '...quoniam auro, gemmis, cunctisque opibus pretiosis, magis insignita est tua seplura quam sua.' Robert the Monk, 107 (878); Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade*, 210.

³⁷⁰ '...secumque reportavit quicquid spoliolum adipisci potuit'. Robert the Monk, 64 (814); Cf *Gesta Francorum*, 56.

³⁷¹ Robert the Monk, 71 (826); Cf *Gesta Francorum*, 67.

³⁷² 'Tunc quippe mandavit admiralio suo, qui suum custodiebat thesaurum, ut, si ignem accensum in capite sui exercitus videret, fugam protinus arriperet, et omnia que sua erant secum gestaret, aliosque fugere compelleret.' Robert the Monk, 73 (829). Cf *Gesta Francorum*, 68-9.

³⁷³ As discussed in the introduction to this chapter, Sweetenham argued persuasively that attributing the name 'Clemens' to al-Afdal was part of a message about recent Western European history which Robert integrated into his account. Sweetenham, 'Crusaders in a Hall of Mirrors', 141.

They saw us glorying in our contentment, coveted our riches, carried that covetousness back to their own country and told those men everything. Now they thirst for our silver and gold and spill our blood mercilessly for its sake.³⁷⁴

Of course, Robert made it clear from the beginning that this was not the case; he thus depicts al-Afdal as incapable of understanding the true religious motivations of the crusaders. He portrays the vizier as particularly obsessed with money: al-Afdal complains that he had brought his soldiers to Ascalon 'at unthinkable cost', and laments the 'considerable expense' wasted on bringing wood for siege machines which he was defeated without even having a chance to use.³⁷⁵

As in the *Gesta*, this attribution of wealth to the Muslims – and even more so in Robert, of an obsession with wealth – corresponded to an attributed tendency to view the battles of the crusade in strictly (and misguidedly, from the Christian point of view) material terms. Kerbogha, in particular was susceptible to this; describing the crusaders as 'mad (*insensata*)' for thinking to invade with the poor weapons he believed they had,³⁷⁶ and insisting to his mother that 'no other army is strong enough to prevail',³⁷⁷ because 'I have more lords and emirs with me than the Christians put together'.³⁷⁸ Muslims frequently trusted in their numbers. At Nicaea they were 'terrified' of the crusaders but 'because they were confident in their large numbers', they didn't flee.³⁷⁹ The same thing occurred in a battle near Antioch in late 1097, in which a Muslim force was apprehensive at first but

³⁷⁴ *Gloriam nostre felicitatis viderunt, divitias nostras concupierunt, concupiscentiam secum in terram suam detulerunt, et istis nuntiaverunt. Nunc igitur isti sitiunt aurum argentumque nostrum, et ob hac tam crudeliter effundunt sanguinem nostrum.* Robert the Monk, 106 (877); Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade*, 209.

³⁷⁵ *'Fortiores totius Orientis milites innumerabili pretio conduximus... Multo argenti dispendio paraveram ligna ad construendas turres ligneas, et omnigenis machinas in circuitu Iherusalem...' Ibid*, 107 (878); Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade*, 210.

³⁷⁶ Robert the Monk, 60 (810).

³⁷⁷ *'Nulla virtus bellantium valet nobis resistere; nec valet alter exercitus nostro prevalere.'* Robert the Monk, 63 (813); Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade*, 156.

³⁷⁸ *'Plures mecum sunt optimates et admiraldi, quam sint omnes insimul congregati.'* Robert the Monk, 62 (813); Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade*, 156.

³⁷⁹ *'Turci vero de montanis descendentes, ut eminus nostrorum agmina conspexerunt, timore percussi sunt; et nisi in sua multitudine confiderent, fuge presidium, frenis retroflexis, arriperent...' Robert the Monk*, 23 (757); Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade*, 105.

decided to take on the numerically inferior crusaders. Robert made his point clear here; they trusted in their numbers, ‘but what use is it fighting those who receive divine help?’³⁸⁰ He reinforced this point in Bohemond’s conversation with Pirrus that led to the latter’s conversion: ‘Oh Pirrus, surely the things the Lord Jesus Christ (in whom we believe) achieves through us must seem truly miraculous to you? The fewer we are, the stronger we become; whereas you become weaker as your numbers grow...’³⁸¹ He consistently depicted Muslims in this regard as lacking in faith, and concerned only with mundane things – quite unlike the crusaders, who trusted in and were supported by God.

3.2.7 Muslim Beliefs

Like most authors of First Crusade accounts, Robert did not give much detail about what he thought Muslims believed, but he did include some. As mentioned above, Robert seems to have avoided use of the term *pagani* to describe Muslims. He remained convinced they were polytheists, however, having both Christians and Muslims refer to multiple Muslim deities.³⁸² He also accepted the *Gesta* author’s claim that Turks were buried with gold coins and weapons.³⁸³ The name of Mohammed was clear to Robert from his source (if we allow both authors a little freedom with their transliteration; *Machumet* (the *Gesta*) and *Mathome* (Robert) are at least somewhat recognisable).³⁸⁴ Robert, however, hinted at a more concrete idea of Mohammed’s identity than the *Gesta* author, who never gave any clarification as to who he was. Robert referred to Mohammed as the *praeceptor*, the teacher, of the Muslims who lamented the desecration of Muslim graves at Antioch (after the battle on 6 March 1098).³⁸⁵ Mohammed

³⁸⁰ Robert the Monk, 36 (777).

³⁸¹ ‘O Pirre, nonne tibi magnum videtur esse miraculum, quod per nos operatur Dominus Jesus Christus, in quem credimus? Quia quanto nos sumus pauciores, tanto et fortiores; vos vero quanto numerosiores, tanto et imbecilliores...’ Robert the Monk, 52 (797); Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk’s History of the First Crusade*, 143.

³⁸² The translator Herluin’s message to Kerbogha on behalf of the crusade leaders included a reference to ‘your infernal gods (*infernales dii tui*)’; Robert the Monk, 70 (825); Kerbogha’s mother pleaded with her son ‘in the names of all our divinities (*per omnia nostrorum numinum nomina*)’, and attributed her knowledge that the crusaders would win to ‘the responses of the oracles of our divine powers (*numinum nostrorum responsa*)’; Robert the Monk 62-3 (813).

³⁸³ See above.

³⁸⁴ *Gesta Francorum*, p.96; Robert the Monk, 106 (877); the manuscript designated Z by the RHC editors also reads *Machomet* here; Robert the Monk, RHC, 877, n. 11

³⁸⁵ Robert the Monk, 46 (788); Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk’s History of the First Crusade*, 135. Sweetenham translated the word as ‘master’ here, but ‘Teacher, instructor, preceptor’ are the definitions given by Lewis and Short; and Niermeyer does not give ‘master’ as a meaning the word acquired in the Middle Ages. Lewis

was also the *preceptor* of Pirrus;³⁸⁶ and al-Afdal addresses him as *preceptor noster et patrone*, ‘our teacher and protector’.³⁸⁷ Robert’s use of *preceptor* suggests at least vague awareness of Mohammed’s position as the Prophet and founder of Islam. The contrast strikingly demonstrates how absent any definition of Mohammed is from the *Gesta*. In this, Robert was more accurate Peter Tudebode, who seems to have assumed Mohammed was one of the gods of the Muslims, though not nearly as detailed as Guibert of Nogent.³⁸⁸ Robert also wrote of Mohammed as being worshipped with ornate shrines and idols.³⁸⁹ While *imago* can carry value-neutral meanings such as ‘image’ (the translation favoured by Sweetenham), it is the same term used by Ralph of Caen to describe the lavish idol of Mohamed he reported was erected in the Temple of God; it is therefore very likely that something similar was also what Robert had in mind.³⁹⁰

3.2.8 The Structure of Muslim Society

Robert shared the same essential beliefs about the structure of Muslim society with the *Gesta*. The Sultan was a *rex*, the Caliph (of whom there was only one) was their *apostolicus*.³⁹¹ Muslims offered fealty to one another; Kerbogha offered to make knights (*equites*) of all of the Christians if they would renounce their faith; and emirs seemed to fulfil the same military and political functions as dukes and counts.³⁹² On certain things they differed slightly. The *Gesta* mentioned Khorosan very frequently; it was the

and Short give ‘a commander, ruler’ as a possible post-classical translation of *praeceptor*. If ‘temporal ruler’ is what Sweetenham meant by ‘master’, this is possible, but the alternate meaning of ‘a teacher, instructor’ seems far more likely. Robert usually referred to the Emir of Babylon and the King of Persia as the Muslim’s temporal rulers (see 45, 47, 60, 103 – 4). ‘Spiritual master’ would fit the context, but it is not a meaning which is supported by Lewis and Short or Niermeyer; the translation ‘teacher’ therefore seems most likely. J. E. Niermeyer and C. Van De Kieft, ‘Praeceptor’, in *Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus*, 2nd ed., (Leiden: Brill, 2002); Charlton T. Lewis and Charles Short, ‘Praeceptor’ in *A Latin Dictionary*, (Oxford: Clarendon, 1987 (first published 1879)).

³⁸⁶ Robert the Monk, 51 (796); Sweetenham translates *preceptorem meum* as ‘my teacher’ on this occasion. Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk’s History of the First Crusade*, 141

³⁸⁷ Robert the Monk, 106 (877). Sweetenham reverts to ‘master’ this time. Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk’s History of the First Crusade*, 209.

³⁸⁸ Tudebode, 51, Guibert of Nogent, 94-99.

³⁸⁹ Al-Afdal laments: ‘*O Mathome, Mathome, quis unquam venustiori te cultu colitur, in delubris auro argentoque insignitis, pulchrisque de te imaginibus decoratis...?*’ Robert the Monk, 107 (878); Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk’s History of the First Crusade*, 210.

³⁹⁰ Ralph of Caen, 695.

³⁹¹ Robert the Monk, 60 (811).

³⁹² Fealty: Robert the Monk, 59 (809); Kerbogha’s offer: Robert the Monk, 71 (876); Emirs performing military and political roles, often subject to a higher authority like a count or duke: Robert the Monk, 45 (787), 51 (796), 62 (813), 73 (829), 91 (853).

homeland of the Turks in his account.³⁹³ He had also associated the Turks with Persia, but Robert almost completely replaced mentions of Khorosan with Persia. Even the one exception, in which Shems-ed-Daula, son of Yaghi Siyan, the erstwhile ruler of Antioch, warned Kerbogha that the crusaders would not stop until they had driven the Turks out of Rum, Syria and Khorosan, is different in Robert: In all the manuscripts used by the RHC, the word Robert used is much closer to the Biblical town of *Chorozaïm*, cursed by Christ in the Gospels for ignoring the miracles performed there and thought in later eschatology to be the future birthplace of the Antichrist.³⁹⁴

3.2.9 Muslims and the Supernatural

From the context, it does not seem especially likely that Robert intended his reference to *Chorozaïm* above to strongly associate Muslims with the Antichrist; his one use of the term was not one which suggested (as many in the *Gesta* did) that it was the homeland of the Turks. The association is not strong, *Chorozaïm* is just a place, along with Syria and Rûm, from which the crusaders will drive out the Muslims. Nevertheless, Robert did directly associate Muslims with the Antichrist on one occasion, referring to them as *satellites Antichristi*.³⁹⁵ There is no strong eschatological tendency to Robert's work, and this is the only example; it was thus most likely just a term of vituperation rather than something important to Robert's conception of Islam.³⁹⁶

Robert associated Muslims much more strongly with the devil. There were a few examples of this in the *Gesta*, but Robert made these associations frequently, and in his own locations in the text.³⁹⁷ The Turks who marched against Peter the Hermit and the People's Crusade were a

³⁹³ *Gesta Francorum*, 4, 5, 15, 39, 50-2, 67.

³⁹⁴ Robert the Monk, 59 (809); *Gesta Francorum*, 50. Chorozaïm appears in Matthew 11:21 and Luke 10:13. On Chorozaïm as the birthplace of the Antichrist, see A. V. Murray, 'Coroscane: Homeland of the Saracens in the *Chanson de Geste* and the historiography of the Crusades', *Aspects de l'épopée romaine. Mentalités, idéologies, intertextualités*, ed. H. Van Dijk and W. Noonan (Groeningen, 1995), 177-84.

³⁹⁵ Robert the Monk, 72 (828).

³⁹⁶ Flori does attribute to Robert an interpretation of the conflict along eschatological lines, pointing to Robert's opposition of the *milites Christi* to the *satellites Antichristi*, but although such concepts were clearly on Robert's mind to some degree, as argued above this is in fact a rare idea in his work. Flori himself later acknowledges that a view of the crusade as being in itself the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy, rather than a part of eschatological prophecy yet to fully unfold is much more prominent in Robert's work. Flori, *Chroniqueurs et Propagandistes*, 135, 136.

³⁹⁷ *Gesta Francorum*, 18, 40, 42.

diabolica legio, and Nicaea was liberated from *diabolica captivitas*.³⁹⁸ Some Muslim soldiers fled the capture of Harim, near Antioch; Robert wrote that many were killed by local Armenian and Syrian Christians in ambushes: 'And thus the sons of the Devil went from one ruin to another, and received the end they deserved.'³⁹⁹ As mentioned above, Robert had Herluin refer to 'your infernal gods' when addressing Kerbogha, and later a Turkish soldier at the final battle for Antioch was killed by Hugh of Vermandois and 'yielded his soul to the infernal deities'.⁴⁰⁰ Connections to the devil came thick and fast when Robert got to the battle of Ascalon: 'that writhing servant and slippery eel', 'the root of all malice', the devil, 'stirred up the Emir of Babylon' and was thus behind the Fatimid attack on the crusaders. Robert described al-Afdal as 'the emir of the Devil's Babylon', whose defeat by 'the Lord... through his followers' mirrored the way in which Christ defeated the Devil with the cross.⁴⁰¹

As well as associations with the Devil and the Antichrist, Robert emphasised the supernatural activities of Kerbogha's mother. This brings his account closer to a tradition of seeing Muslims as capable of magic, not found in the *Gesta* but found in Raymond of Aguilers and some later sources.⁴⁰² The *Gesta* referred to a prophecy of Christian victory discovered in *nostra pagina* – translated as the Koran by Hill, but not necessarily referring to anything more specific than general books of prophecy – as well as the *uolumina* of the Christians, which she has confirmed with astrology.⁴⁰³ The *uolumina* must refer to the Bible, as the *Gesta* has Kerbogha's mother

³⁹⁸ Robert the Monk, 11 (734), 24 (759).

³⁹⁹ 'Sicque filii Diaboli, secundum suum meritum, de ruina in ruinam receperunt interritum.' Robert the Monk, 43 (784); Sweetenham quite idiomatically translates *de ruina in ruinam* as 'from the frying pan into the fire', but the above more accurately reflects the original Latin. Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade*, 130.

⁴⁰⁰ *Infernales Dii*, Robert the Monk, 70 (825); Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade*, 165. 'Diis infernalibus animum commendavit', Robert the Monk, 75 (831); Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade*, 171.

⁴⁰¹ '...ille tortuosus serpens et lubricus anguis... Et Clementem, immo dementem, admiravimus Babiloniae, contra ipsos felle commovit, et cum ipso omnem Orientem excitavit. Speravit etenim totius malitie praesumptor omnes illos et urbem delere...' Robert the Monk, 102 (871); Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade*, 204.

Erat autem feria VI in qua Salvator generis humani Diabolum, regem Babiloniae, trophæo crucis prostravit, et nunc iterum admiravimus sue Babilonie per satellites suos Dominus superavit. Robert the Monk, 103-4 (874); Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade*, 206.

⁴⁰² Raymond of Aguilers, 342; Anonymous, *The Old French Continuation of William of Tyre*, trans. Peter W. Edbury in idem, *The Conquest of Jerusalem and the Third Crusade: Sources in Translation*, (Farnham, 1996), 40.

⁴⁰³ *Gesta Francorum*, 55.

repeatedly quote from it.⁴⁰⁴ Robert dropped the *Gesta*'s mentions of books, though he still has Kerbogha's mother quote the Bible, as discussed above. He greatly expanded the methods she used to arrive at this prophecy. Not just the words of the biblical prophets had been consulted, but the responses given by the oracles of their gods; *magi*, *aruspices* and *arioli* had cast lots and examined the entrails of animals, and Kerbogha's mother herself confirmed these prophecies with astrology and divination with entrails and shoulder blades.⁴⁰⁵ *Magi*, *arioli* and *aruspices* is a reference to Daniel 2:27-8, in which Daniel admonishes Nebuchadnezzar that his *sapientes*, *magi*, *arioli et aruspices* cannot reveal anything to him, and that God alone has the knowledge he seeks. Kerbogha's mother is thus also implicitly associated with an (actual) king of Babylon.⁴⁰⁶ The passage is typical of the kind of rhetorical exaggeration Robert engaged in, but this is not to say that he did not believe it; rather than demonstrating mere stylistic flourish Robert could well have been adding details which he sincerely believed must be true. Either way, the result was increased connection to the supernatural in Robert's conception of Islam as compared to that of his source.

3.2.10 Other ways of viewing Muslims

As discussed in the *Gesta* chapter, the anonymous author does not always seem to have viewed Muslims as Others. In particular, the well-known passage he included praising the Turks as warriors demonstrates at least a grudging respect for them as opponents.⁴⁰⁷ He also wrote of the conversion of Muslims with approval, and his account does not betray any difficulty accepting the peace settlements that were made with the rulers of many cities between Antioch and Jerusalem.⁴⁰⁸ Robert omitted this praise, consistent with his general approach. But with one exception, he is much closer to the *Gesta*'s approach to peace agreements, suggesting some nuance

⁴⁰⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁰⁵ Robert the Monk, 62-3 (813-4). Sweetenham recommends Gerald of Wales, *Itinerarium Cambriae* I.11 in *Giraldi Cambrensis Opera* VI, ed. J. E. Dimock (London, 1868), for 'everything one could possibly wish to know about the use of shoulder blades in divination in the twelfth century.' Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade*, 156, n. 37.

⁴⁰⁶ 'Et respondens Daniel coram rege, ait: *Mysterium, quod rex interrogat, sapientes, magi, arioli et aruspices nequeunt indicare regi: Sed est Deus in caelo revelans mysteria, qui indicavit tibi, rex Nabuchodonsor, quae ventura sunt in novissimis temporibus...*' Daniel 2:27-8. The same passage is quoted in a similar context by Albert of Aachen, 258.

⁴⁰⁷ *Gesta Francorum*, 21.

⁴⁰⁸ Ibid., 44-7, 71, 83-6, 81, 83.

even to his harsh view of Muslims and his conception of the crusade as violent and bloody (but justified) revenge against them.

With just the omission of one crucial passage, Robert significantly changed the *Gesta*'s representation of Islam. Robert left out the whole of the *Gesta*'s passage in praise of the Turks. Not every reviser of the text found it objectionable. Guibert of Nogent rephrased it considerably, but kept the broad outline – even the part about the common ancestry of the Turks and the Franks, though he emphasised that this was simply their opinion.⁴⁰⁹ As mentioned above, this recontextualised Robert's descriptions of the Turks as cowardly; they become much more forceful without this nuance. Robert made his account much less sympathetic to Muslims simply by removing this one passage.

Nevertheless, Robert retained the *Gesta*'s stories of the conversion of Muslims, most prominently those of Pirrus and Ahmed Ibn Marwan. Pirrus was commander of one of the gate towers of Antioch, whose betrayal led to the Christian capture of the city. In the *Gesta*, Bohemond convinced him to open his gate to the crusaders and convert to Christianity, promising him great riches if he did so.⁴¹⁰ Robert made some changes to this account, but he does not seem any less pleased with the turn of events than the *Gesta*. He does, admittedly, remove any hint of material reward offered by Bohemond, but this is probably due to his overall theological approach; victory could hardly be attributed to God if it were due to bribery.⁴¹¹ Instead, he inserts a conversation in which Pirrus asks Bohemond where the soldiers all clad in white whom he has seen fighting with the crusaders come from; Pirrus has been granted a vision of the heavenly host even before the Christians saw it at the final battle for Antioch.⁴¹² When Robert comes to the conversion of Ahmed ibn Marwan, the commander of the citadel of Antioch, he also adds that ibn Marwan and those of his garrison who chose to convert had seen the army of saints and martyrs.⁴¹³ Robert's adding something of the miraculous to these accounts of conversion may indicate a belief that it was *only* under such circumstances that conversion could occur, as suggested by

⁴⁰⁹ Guibert of Nogent, 158.

⁴¹⁰ *Gesta Francorum*, 44-7.

⁴¹¹ Robert the Monk, 51-2 (796-8).

⁴¹² Robert the Monk, 51 (796).

⁴¹³ Robert the Monk, 78 (835).

Joshua Birk,⁴¹⁴ but he was nevertheless quite pleased that it did. He wrote that 'all were delighted and thanked Almighty God' at Bohemond's news that ibn Marwan wished to convert, and used Pirrus as a noble example of faithfulness.⁴¹⁵ Like the *Gesta* author, Robert's conception of Muslims as Other thus seems to have been strictly a religious one; conversion erased the difference and converts could be praised and celebrated.

Robert included all of the peaceful settlements that were made with cities along the route from Antioch to Jerusalem. Robert reported the agreements with Shaizar, Maraclea, Djibleh and Tripoli without adding any comment indicating disapproval.⁴¹⁶ This is at odds with his conception of the crusade as God's vengeance, and suggests the ability to also think of Muslims in more practical terms. But there is little else Robert could do with the material the *Gesta* provides here. More telling, perhaps, is his account of the truce called at Antioch. This truce appears only in Robert and Gilo of Paris's *Historia Vie Hierosolimitanae*.⁴¹⁷ The result is the same in both; a certain knight named Walo lets his guard down too much and is assaulted and killed by Muslims, breaking the truce. Though Robert is probably thus relying on his other source for this incident (whether it was the *Historia Vie* itself or a lost source used by both), the fact that he chose to include the incident is telling. It is likely that he deliberately included this incident to demonstrate that Muslims were untrustworthy and that agreements with them could not be relied upon, in the absence of any detail on how the arrangements with the cities south of Antioch turned out in the long run.

3.3 Conclusion

As with the *Gesta Francorum*, Robert the Monk apparently assumed that the basic structure of Muslim society was more or less the same as that of Western Christendom. Muslims offered fealty to one another; offered to make knights of converted Christians, and *emirs* seem to have occupied the same niche as counts or dukes. Robert was aware from his source of the

⁴¹⁴ Joshua C. Birk, 'The Betrayal of Antioch: Narratives of Conversion and Conquest during the First Crusade', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 41(3) (2011), 463-485, 474-5.

⁴¹⁵ 'Placuit omnibus, Deo omnipotenti gratias agentibus.' Robert the Monk, 78 (835); Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade*, 174. For Pirrus as an exemplar, see 56 (805).

⁴¹⁶ Robert the Monk, 89 (851), 91 (854), 92 (855), 93-4 (857).

⁴¹⁷ Robert the Monk, 49-50 (794-5); Grocock and Siberry, *The Historia Vie Hierosolimitanae of Gilo of Paris*, 127. Albert of Aachen did mention the occurrence of truces at Antioch generally, however, although he did not discuss any specific instances. Albert of Aachen, 290.

titles, at least, of the Sultan and the Caliph. To see them as a king and a pope respectively, as he did, is a simplification (especially in the Caliph's case) but not entirely inaccurate.

So much Robert learned – or agreed with – from his source. But Robert did not display all the same knowledge as the *Gesta Francorum*. He did not notice the anonymous author's distinction between *Turci* and *Sarraceni*, using both interchangeably in parts of the text where the *Gesta* author was careful not to. His treatment of the Babylonians suggests that it was not merely the *Gesta* author's use of terminology that Robert did not understand, but that there was any distinction at all. Thus, in contrast to the *Gesta*, Robert created an image of a monopolar Muslim world, with the Persian Sultan being the ultimate power behind the Turks, Kerbogha, and 'Clemens', the *admiravissus Babiloniae*. Persia rather than Khorosan was more often alluded to as the centre of this world; a minor change of emphasis given that Khorosan was a province of Persia, but a noticeable tendency. Robert may actually have interpreted *Corosanum* as the biblical *Chorozaim*, as his spelling suggests, but he makes no direct statements or allusions to this effect. Too much should not be allowed to rest on orthography.

In terms of Muslim beliefs, a striking feature of Robert's account compared to the *Gesta Francorum* is his efforts to remove almost every reference to Muslims as *pagani*. However, despite only referring to them as *pagani* in some probably accidental cases and seeming to have some idea of who Mohammed was, Robert still wrote of Muslims as polytheists. They practiced pagan-like burials with grave goods, and he may have thought they worshipped idols; their beliefs and practices marked them definitively as Others. They were, however, not *pagani*, though Robert does not offer an alternative classification. Robert associated them with the Antichrist, more for defamatory than eschatological purposes; and frequently associated them with the devil, by whom he claimed al-Afdal was influenced. He also built on the *Gesta*'s mention of Kerbogha's mother's astrology to associate her and all Muslims with supernatural divination practices. He also elaborated on the *Gesta*'s depiction of them as wealthy and materialistic, exaggerating their wealth and their obsession with it. Not only did he frequently depict them trusting in their numbers against the God-assisted crusaders, but he also had them make statements which indicated their complete inability to

understand the motives of the crusaders: they were utterly materialistic and lacking in faith.

Muslims, for Robert, were cowardly and stupid – much more consistently so than the *Gesta* author, who respected the Turks as warriors. He omitted this praise and added more examples of cowardice and stupidity, making the image of Islam presented by the *Gesta* more consistent. Much of the animal imagery he introduced to the *Gesta* supported this image of them as cowardly – they were like timid prey animal; doves, hares or deer. On other occasions, though, he used animal imagery to depict them as wild, subhuman or verminous. Robert's omission of the *Gesta*'s praise of the Turks is especially crucial; the only Muslims he would praise were those who converted – though the fact that he did praise them indicates that their Otherness was entirely religious to him, and that race or ethnicity were of comparatively little relevance. Although he included the peace settlements the *Gesta* reported without comment, it is significant that the one truce which he added was broken by criminal Muslim behaviour.

The above ways of viewing Muslims all contributed to a more consistently harsh image of Muslim alterity, depicting Muslims as utterly strange and wholly inferior to Christians. This is in line with the harsher treatment demanded by his vision of the crusade as divine vengeance. Throop argued that the idea of the crusade as divine vengeance was shared by many crusade historians, Robert included, but while it was present, she thought that it was a common but secondary concern.⁴¹⁸ In fact, in Robert's case, the idea permeated and shaped his revision of the *Gesta Francorum* and its depiction of Muslims. His vision of the crusade as vengeance was built into the very framing of the narrative. Robert added the beginning he, Guibert of Nogent and Baldric of Dol all felt was missing from the *Gesta*; Urban II's sermon at the council of Clermont. Robert used the sermon to emphasize the appalling persecution of Christians of which he wished to establish that Muslims were guilty. All that followed was thus presented in the context of this persecution, described by Urban II himself at the very inception of the crusade. And who, Robert had the pope ask, would avenge this suffering, if not the crusaders?⁴¹⁹ Robert's account ended with the luridly violent massacres of Muslims at Jerusalem and Ascalon, significantly intensified compared to the *Gesta*, and he added detail to passages

⁴¹⁸ Throop, *Crusading as an Act of Vengeance*, 50 – 1, 55, 196.

⁴¹⁹ Robert the Monk, 6 (728).

describing many of the massacres that occurred along the way from Antioch to Jerusalem. But Robert's efforts to establish his vision of the crusade as divine vengeance went much deeper than this. His account was saturated with biblical quotations and allusions in defence of his thesis, from quoting psalms about God's vengeance in Urban II's sermon itself to the extensive use he made of the battle of Ascalon falling on a Friday: just as God had defeated the Devil by suffering on the cross on Good Friday, so now he defeated the people of the Devil through His people, the crusaders.⁴²⁰

Robert greatly expanded and exaggerated many of the *Gesta's* accounts of violence against Muslims, but with the exception of his account of Clermont, he did not intensify descriptions of violence by Muslims. This may indicate an intention to present the victory of the Crusaders as more total and one-sided, but it also reinforces his conception of the crusade as vengeance. The atrocities of the Muslims are described at Clermont and in Robert's account of the fate of the People's Crusade, which he reproduces quite faithfully from the *Gesta*. In a sense, they form the prelude to the 'real' crusade. From that point on, what was relevant was God's vengeance, and so Robert produced graphic and vivid accounts of violence against Muslims, sometimes explicitly justified by reference to their past behaviour.

Muslims were cowardly and stupid, in Robert's opinion; their beliefs were strange and they were linked to the supernatural. He had little interest in the structure of their society; adding little knowledge to the *Gesta's* and apparently misunderstanding one of its major insights. But even further, Muslims were evil, associated with the Devil and the Antichrist, and they were guilty of horrifying persecution of Christians. They were entirely and irrevocably Other. Nothing less than their complete defeat and subjugation was justified, and this was what God had set out to achieve through the crusaders: to avenge the persecution of Christians by the total defeat of the Muslims.

⁴²⁰ Robert the Monk, *Historia Iherosolimitana*, 103 – 4.

4 The *Historia Ierosolimitana* of Baldric of Bourgueil

4.1 Introduction

Baldric, abbot of Bourgueil and later archbishop of Dol (1108-30), completed his *Historia Ierosolimitana* early in the twelfth century. Like Robert the Monk and Guibert of Nogent's works, this was consciously and explicitly a revision of the anonymous *Gesta Francorum*, which these three authors all agreed was too simplistic to do justice to the grandeur of what had been achieved by the crusade. The work consists of a prologue followed by four books, a structure shared by all extant copies, a number of which include the title *Historia Ierosolimitana* in the *incipit*. This title may well have been Baldric's own.⁴²¹ Baldric's importance has often been underestimated. For over a century, the most recent available edition was that of the *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades*, which used just seven manuscripts and seemed to suggest Baldric's version was one of the less popular crusade histories. The new edition by Stephen Biddlecombe has shown that over three times as many manuscripts have at least in part survived, of which he made use of twenty. Baldric's work seems to have been considerably better-known than has been appreciated. Similarly, despite having been dismissed as adding 'little that was not in the *Gesta* beyond a more flowery style,'⁴²² Baldric made considerably more changes to the narrative and message of the *Gesta* than has been recognised. This included changes to the *Gesta* author's depiction of Muslims.

4.1.1 Baldric's Identity

Baldric identified himself in the prologue of his work, as *Baldricus, Burguliensium fratrum abbas* in manuscripts which descend from his original work completed at Bourgueil and added some variations on *postea uero Dei misericordis Dolensium archiepiscopus* in manuscripts which include the minor revisions he made subsequent to becoming archbishop of

⁴²¹ Stephen Biddlecombe (ed.), *The Historia Ierosolimitana of Baldric of Bourgueil* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2014), ix.

⁴²² Colin Morris, 'Peter the Hermit and the Chroniclers' in *The First Crusade*, ed. J. Phillips (Manchester, 1997), 24.

Dol (this two-stage process is discussed further below).⁴²³ He gave the further detail that he was ‘nearly sixty (*pene sexagenariam*)’ when he began the work, a detail that is vital for dating the *Historia*.⁴²⁴ The cartulary of Bourgueil has been lost, but some documents survive in eighteenth-century copies, including two histories of the abbey in French and Latin, which concur on his death at age 84. Meanwhile the cartulary of the Abbey of St Pierre-de-Préaux records his death in 1130, on which basis it is generally agreed that he was born in 1046. He mentions his birth at Meung-sur-Loire, near Orléans, in one of his poems.⁴²⁵ His poetry also gives some clues to his family background: in *De sufficientia votorum suorum* he mentions a pregnant sister whose husband is the *uilius* of a (probably metaphorical) farm. Such a position would have been somewhat insulting if his brother-in-law was of landowning status, which strongly suggests that Baldric’s sister and he himself were of humble origin.⁴²⁶ Baldric was the author of many surviving poems, which have attracted the most scholarly attention of his output.⁴²⁷ His prose output included a number of saints’ lives in addition to the *Historia*.

It is not known where Baldric received his education. Although he lived within reach of many notable cathedral schools and was the contemporary of some of the eleventh century’s best-known scholars, Biddlecombe is inclined to believe the implications he made in his poetry that he had received a good basic education in his home town but was subsequently self-taught. He was too consistent in this regard for it to have simply been a humility *topos*, Biddlecombe argues, and indeed rather than humility it would have suggested a great deal of self-glorifying disrespect for his teachers if he had had them.⁴²⁸ Baldric became a monk at the Benedictine abbey of St Peter at Bourgueil between 1060-1070, and became first prior then abbot of the monastery. The evidence for the precise dates of his promotion to these positions is contradictory. Whatever the exact dates, he seems to have achieved high office from humble origins by his early to

⁴²³ Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, 3.

⁴²⁴ Ibid.

⁴²⁵ Baldric of Bourgueil, xiv. Baldric of Bourgueil, *Carmina* 153.32, *Emme ut opus suum perlegat*, ed. Jean-Yves Tilliette, 2 vols (Paris, Académie des Belles Lettres, 2012), II.60.

⁴²⁶ Baldric of Bourgueil, xiv.

⁴²⁷ See Baldric of Bourgueil, *Carmina*, ed. and trans. Jean-Yves Tilliette (Paris: Académie des Belles Lettres, 2012), v-lx. Biddlecombe also provides a brief overview of the scholarship around Baldric’s poems and *Vitae* in the introduction to his edition of the *Historia*; Biddlecombe, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, xi-xii.

⁴²⁸ Biddlecombe, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, xv-xvii.

mid-thirties. He was subsequently appointed archbishop of Dol by Pope Paschal II in 1108.⁴²⁹ Baldric presented himself as a man of humble origins who rose to high status in the church over a long career, and this seems to have been an honest self-depiction. On the basis of the variety, quantity and quality of his literary output, Biddlecombe concludes that 'it is probably fair to consider Baldric one of the most eminent authors of his time and place.'⁴³⁰

4.1.2 Dating

Determining the date at which Baldric began the *Historia Ierosolimitana* is relatively straightforward: as mentioned, he writes in the prologue that he was nearly sixty (*pene sexagenariam*) when he started his work.⁴³¹ Assuming that this means he was fifty-nine and barring any challenge to his generally accepted birth year of 1046, this means he began the *Historia* in 1105.⁴³² Baldric has been thought to have finished the work in 1108 or later, but Biddlecombe argues instead for a two-stage process of composition with a considerably earlier initial date of completion.⁴³³ In his view, Baldric finished the original work at Bourgueil in 1105 (creating a 'Bourgueil recension', of which the manuscripts Biddlecombe designates by the sigla A, M, and N are witnesses), and subsequently made some minor revisions after becoming archbishop of Dol (resulting in a 'Dol recension', of which the remaining surviving manuscripts are witnesses).⁴³⁴ Given his new duties as archbishop; the difficulties of the task (Baldric was appointed against the wishes of the cathedral chapter, whose choice of archbishop was overruled); and the loss of Bourgueil's excellent library and working environment; Biddlecombe argues, it is very likely that the *Historia* was finished before his promotion. There are also textual indications of this two-stage process. One of the clearest indications is the addition of a phrase along the lines of 'and afterwards archbishop of Dol' to Baldric's

⁴²⁹ Ibid, xviii-xxiii.

⁴³⁰ Ibid, xxiv.

⁴³¹ Baldric og Bourgueil, 3.

⁴³² Biddlecombe, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, xxiv.

⁴³³ A. C. Krey, *The First Crusade: Accounts of Eyewitnesses and Participants* (Princeton, 1921), 13: 'after 1107'; Stephen Runciman, *A History of the Crusades*, 3 vols (Cambridge, 1951, I.330: 1110; Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading* (London, 1993), 48: 1108.

⁴³⁴ A: Paris, Bibliotheque Nationale de France, MS 5134; M: Paris, Bibliotheque Nationale de France, MS Latin 5133; N: Paris, Bibliotheque d'Arsenal, MS Arsenal 1161.

introduction of himself in the prologue in all manuscripts except for A, M, and N, acknowledging his change of status between initially completing the work and then copying it with minor additions. Another of the changes common to these manuscripts is the addition of the names of many notable French people who had been on the crusade (as well as Alan, the steward of the cathedral of Dol), reflecting the different social milieu in which Baldric operated as archbishop.⁴³⁵

4.1.3 Baldric's revision of the *Gesta Francorum*

In his prologue, Baldric set out his intention to improve a certain anonymously-authored account of the First Crusade; this was the *Gesta Francorum*. Biddlecombe attributes Baldric's motivation for producing this revision in part to literary pride, and this was almost certainly the case.⁴³⁶ Baldric described the *Gesta* as a 'rustic little book', a 'dishevelled and uncultivated text', which even those with the simplest tastes would find unappealing.⁴³⁷ The great events of the crusade were diminished (*uiluerat*) by the *Gesta*'s lack of stylistic elegance, and Baldric hoped that his improvements would please future Christians and remind them of these momentous events.⁴³⁸ To this end, Baldric made extensive use of poetic devices such as alliteration, assonance, paradox, *paronomasia* and rhyming clauses to develop both the readability and performative quality of text. He also included many more biblical and classical allusions and stylistic borrowings, adding 'literary weight' to the work: in Biddlecombe's analysis, he set out to make his *Historia* 'not just authoritative and informative but also enjoyable.'⁴³⁹ Biddlecombe specifically suggests his changes would also have enhanced the performative quality of the work, suggesting a possible intent to appeal to a broad audience of both laypeople and well-educated clerics who would have appreciated his allusions. Indeed, Baldric is the author for whom we have the most concrete evidence of audience engagement with his work; in the form of Manuscript G (discussed further below).⁴⁴⁰ In this, as Biddlecombe's investigation has shown, he seems to have been considerably more successful than previously thought. As mentioned above, three times more manuscripts than the *RHC* editors used

⁴³⁵ Biddlecombe, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, xxiv-xxv, xxvi-xxix

⁴³⁶ Biddlecombe, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, xxv.

⁴³⁷ '*libellum rusticum*', '*incompta et inculta lectio*', Baldric of Bourgueil, 4.

⁴³⁸ *Ibid.*

⁴³⁹ Biddlecombe, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, xxx. For more detailed analysis of Baldric's use of poetic devices and allusions, see xxxi- xxxviii.

⁴⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, xxx-xxxii; on Manuscript G, see below, 4.4.

survived (at least in part), demonstrating that the *Historia* was much more widely copied than the previous edition implied. Baldric's work was also used extensively by his successors – notably the chronicler Orderic Vitalis, who relied more closely on the *Historia Ierosolimitana* than on any of his other sources, and had a very high opinion of Baldric. Use of the *Historia* continued until at least the fourteenth century, as evidenced by a manuscript that is mostly a copy of Humbert of Romans' *De predicatione crucis* but which incorporates Baldric's version of Urban II's speech at Clermont.⁴⁴¹

Nevertheless, as with the other revisers, one must be careful not to dismiss Baldric's changes to the *Gesta* as merely literary, as in the assessment by Morris quoted above. As Riley-Smith noted, it was 'so much more' than merely 'a graceful reworking of the *Gesta Francorum*'.⁴⁴² As discussed in Chapter 2, the *Gesta* was not so lacking in poetic sophistication as Baldric and his contemporaries' dismissal of it has led many historians to believe. These revisers did still find it lacking, however, and in Biddlecombe's view this was more than merely an issue of style for Baldric. Biddlecombe includes extensive analysis of the theological interpretation of Eastern Christians as part of the *familia Christi* which Baldric added to the *Gesta*, and the efforts he made to expand the depiction of the characters who appear in the work (focusing on Bohemond) to make them more plausible. This, too, was an essential part of Baldric's efforts to 'dignify' the history of the First Crusade.⁴⁴³ Baldric also added an interpretation of the crusade similar to Robert's, albeit less prominent; as Flori noted, it is implicit in his account of the history of Jerusalem prior to the crusade. Jerusalem had been chastised by God through the 'Saracens' for turning away from Christ; but eventually they too had tried His patience by their abuses of the Holy Places and the eastern Christians, and so the time had come for the Christians of the West to chastise them in turn.⁴⁴⁴

4.2 The Depiction of Muslims in the *Historia Ierosolimitana*

Baldric made an explicit claim to neutrality between Christians and Muslims, at least in terms of their military capabilities. He declared that he

⁴⁴¹ Ibid, lx-lxxiii.

⁴⁴² Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading*, 136.

⁴⁴³ Ibid, xl-xli.

⁴⁴⁴ Flori, *Chroniqueurs et Propagandistes*, 113-14; see Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, 6-10.

would restrain his natural sympathy for the Christians so that he did not diminish their achievements by depicting the Muslims as a weak enemy:

I will busy myself with advancing the truth with restraint;
and my mind's favour, with which I nevertheless will be
bound to Christianity, I will correct with truth's censure.
If I dilute the strength of the gentiles, I will detract from
the labours of the Christians, as if I had declared that our
race fought against an unwarlike race.⁴⁴⁵

As shown below, Baldric did not really succeed in this, assuming that he meant it sincerely to begin with. It may have been simply a rhetorical device: having claimed to the reader that he was being neutral and made some efforts to appear to be, any discrepancy between the prowess of the crusaders and their enemies would have appeared all the more legitimate. Lest the crusaders appear, as he said, to have easily defeated an unformidable enemy, he declared at the outset that this was not the case. Having made some token efforts to appear neutral, however, he emphasised the prowess of the crusaders considerably more than that of their enemies.

For all that Baldric's claim to neutrality extended only as far as their fighting ability, his depiction of Muslims is generally one of the less negative of the contemporary crusade histories. Muslims in his depiction are not especially savage, nor does he dwell on their moral character. He develops the *Gesta*'s depiction of them as pagans – something which is inherently negative – but he does not do so in a way that further emphasises the negative qualities of pagans; rather he seems to have added detail (much of it classically-tinged) in order to make his account more stylistically attractive for the reader. Baldric takes opportunities to praise their abilities more often than the *Gesta*, but this is frequently through the addition of laudatory adverbs (Muslims 'bravely' or 'strongly' defend themselves, as discussed below), whereas the results of the crusaders' efforts are frequently emphasised through much more vivid descriptions than those of their enemies. He often follows the *Gesta* in its depictions of Muslims as stupid or cowardly, adding a few examples of his own, and introduces an elaborate theme of Muslim pride. He obscured or failed to recognise the difference the *Gesta* established between

⁴⁴⁵ 'Proferende siquidem ueritati temperanter studebo; et animi mei fauorem, quem tamen maxime Christianis debeo, ueritatis censura castigabo. Si enim gentilium robur plus iusto attenuarem, Christianorum fortitudini et laboribus detraherem, dum tanquam aduersus gentem imbellem genus nostrum hiatu temerario dimicasse declamarem.' Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, 4.

Turks and Saracens, with little indication that he was aware of any division at all. He constructs a mindset for Muslims in which doubt is very prominent, leaning heavily on classical concepts like *fortuna* and the golden age. These themes in Baldric's depiction of Muslims will now be examined more closely.

4.2.1 Terminology

The terminology Baldric used for Muslims is discussed by Ní Chléirigh, who found that Baldric largely used the same terms as the *Gesta*, but in somewhat different ways. Most notably, he did not retain the *Gesta*'s distinction between *Turci* and *Sarraceni*, using the two terms synonymously. This may have been due to not recognising what the anonymous author had done; or it may have been because of Baldric's awareness that *Sarracenus* was a term that had long been used of Muslims in general, not a specific group of them.⁴⁴⁶ If Baldric was making a conscious change, this would suggest that he did not consider the distinction worth making, as he does not replace the *Gesta*'s terminological distinction with any other indication of a separate Turk and Saracen identity. (As discussed below, he might still have understood some political division to exist, but he made no clear statements to this effect.) It is not possible to say with any certainty whether or not this change was deliberate. For the most part, Baldric used the same 'national' terms in the same way - *Arabes*, *Azymitae*, *Publicani*, *Agulani*, *Curti*, *Persi*, and *Babilonii* all appear in places directly taken from the *Gesta*.⁴⁴⁷ Baldric's 'theological' terms are also similar to the *Gesta*'s: he referred to Muslims as *barbari* and *pagani*, using both terms synonymously with others. He used *gentiles* much more frequently, however; Ní Chléirigh describes it as his 'preferred' term.⁴⁴⁸ Baldric also introduced the terms *Amalechitae*, *Jebusitae*, *Agareni* and *Ismahelitae*. These will be discussed further in their context as allusions to Biblical peoples.

4.2.2 Biblical Allusions

Baldric drew more explicit parallels between the crusaders and the Children of Israel – and their respective enemies – than the *Gesta*

⁴⁴⁶ This is suggested by Ní Chléirigh, *The Crusaders and their Enemies*, 106-7.

⁴⁴⁷ Ní Chléirigh, *The Crusaders and their Enemies*, 107-8; for examples cf Baldric of Bourgueil, 35, 59, 91; and *Gesta Francorum*, 20, 45, 83.

⁴⁴⁸ *Barbari* and *Pagani*: Baldric of Bourgueil, 9, 10, 13, 26, 39, 66, 90, 91, 92, 93, 95-6, 107, 109. *Gentiles*: Baldric of Bourgueil, 10, 11-4, 18, *passim*. For analysis, see Ní Chléirigh, *The Crusaders and their Enemies*, 109-113.

Francorum. In the speech he attributed to Urban II at Clermont, Baldric wrote that the crusade was prefigured by the events of Exodus: 'The sons of Israel, led out of Egypt, who, by crossing the Red Sea, prefigured you with Jesus as leader, by their own arms avenged themselves on that country. From that place they expelled the Jebusites and others gathered, and lived in the terrestrial Jerusalem, the likeness of the heavenly Jerusalem.'⁴⁴⁹ Thus, using the allegorical and anagogical senses of scripture familiar in twelfth-century Biblical exegesis, he equated the crusaders with the followers of Moses (emphasising the difficulty of the journey) and the Muslims specifically with the Jebusites. He repeated this latter comparison soon after, referring to the *Turci* as *nefandiores quam Iebuseos*,⁴⁵⁰ although his immediately subsequent reference to brandishing swords at 'Saracens' probably indicates that he was not using *Turci* and *Saraceni* precisely here, and simply intended them to mean 'Muslims' generally.⁴⁵¹ The Jebusites were one of the peoples God said he would drive from Israel when He promised that land to the Hebrews (also ordering the Hebrews to destroy their places of worship); the comparison thus emphasised the illegitimacy of the Muslim occupation of the Holy Land, tied to their incorrect religion.⁴⁵²

In the same speech, Baldric also compared Muslims directly to Amalekites: 'Ours is to pray, let yours be to fight against the Amalekites. We will extend, with Moses, an indefatigable hand, praying to heaven; you undaunted warriors must thrust forth and brandish a sword to Amalech.'⁴⁵³ As Ní Chléirigh argues, part of Baldric's intention here was to emphasise the 'palpable nature' of the assistance the clergy would give to the crusaders, comparable to Moses' role in the war between the Israelites and the Amalekites (in Exodus 17:8-13, Moses influences the course of the battle by raising or lowering his hands, causing one side or the other to prevail).⁴⁵⁴ However, Baldric's choice of this particular Biblical incident may also have been intended to convey a very hostile message about the Muslims, by

⁴⁴⁹ 'Filii Israel ab Egyptus educti, qui, Rubro Mari transito uos, prefiguraerunt, terram illam armis suis, Iesu duce, sibi uindicauerunt; Iebuseos et alios conuenas inde expulerunt; et instar Ierusalem celestis, Ierusalem terrenam incoluerunt.'

Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, 8.

⁴⁵⁰ Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, 9.

⁴⁵¹ Ní Chléirigh, *The Crusaders and their Enemies*, 114.

⁴⁵² Exodus 34:10-13. The same promise was also made in Exodus 33:1-2, though without the instruction to destroy the places of worship of the Jebusites and other tribes.

⁴⁵³ 'Nostrum est orare, uestrum sit contra Amalechitas pugnare. Nos extendemus cum Moyse manus indefessas, orantes in celum, uos exerite et uibrate intrepidi preliatores in Amalech gladium.' Baldric of Bourgueil, 9-10.

⁴⁵⁴ Ní Chléirigh, *The Crusaders and their Enemies*, 114.

comparing them to the Amalekites in particular. The Amalekites were a nomadic tribe prone to opportunistic attacks on the Israelites. Beginning with the passage Baldric is referencing, the Bible repeatedly mentions God's desire that every single member of the tribe be killed: 'Then the Lord said to Moses, "Write this as a memorial in a book and recite it in the ears of Joshua, that I will utterly blot out the memory of Amalek from under heaven."' (Exodus 17:14). This becomes a command in Deuteronomy 25: 17-19: 'Remember what Amalek did to you on the way as you came out of Egypt, how he attacked you on the way when you were faint and weary... Therefore when the Lord your God has given you rest from all your enemies around you, in the land that the Lord your God is giving you for an inheritance to possess, you shall blot out the memory from under heaven; you shall not forget.' God also commanded Saul to wipe out the Amalekites: 'Thus says the Lord of Hosts, "I have noted what Amalek did to Israel in opposing them on the way when they came out of Egypt. Now go out and strike Amalek and devote to destruction all that they have. Do not spare them, but kill both man and woman, and infant, ox and sheep, camel and donkey"' (1 Sam 15:2-3)'; and this was eventually accomplished after Agag, king of the Amalekites was captured (1 Samuel 15:7-8). Hostility is also mentioned in less explicitly genocidal terms in Numbers 24:20, Judges 3:13, 6:3, 6:33, and 1 Chronicles 4:42-3. While Baldric's attention is on the comparison between Moses and the clergy in this first battle with the Amalekites, those of his readers familiar with the Old Testament would also have been reminded of the extreme hostility of God and the Children of Israel to the Amalekites, with strong implications for how Muslims should be seen – and, given his mention of prefiguration, how complete their defeat ought eventually to be. Baldric shows himself here to be an accomplished biblical scholar, concerned to exploit the allegorical sense of Scripture in order to legitimise the crusaders' mission.

Baldric also used the terms *Agareni* and *Hismaeliti* to refer to Muslims.⁴⁵⁵ Both terms derive from Ishmael, the illegitimate son of Abraham by his handmaiden Hagar. As Ní Chléirigh showed, these terms were used as general terms encompassing all Muslims – they were used of both Turkish and Fatimid forces, and also used synonymously with *pagani*.⁴⁵⁶ The term *Saracenus* itself had also historically been understood in the same terms. It

⁴⁵⁵ *Hismaelitae*: Baldric of Bourgueil, 41, 66; *Agareni*, Baldric of Bourgueil, 62, 91, 99.

⁴⁵⁶ Ní Chléirigh, *The Crusaders and their Enemies*, 114-5.

was explained by Isidore of Seville as a term the *Hismaeliti* or *Agareni* applied to themselves in order to claim legitimate descent from Abraham's wife Sara. As Isidore shows, the association of the Saracens with the Ishmaelites and Hagarenes predated the rise of Islam, but the belief that this was their origin continued well into the Middle Ages (though it does not appear in any of the crusade narratives considered here. It may have been unknown to the authors or they may have taken it for granted that their audience already knew it: this likely depended on the author).⁴⁵⁷ Further to the implication of illegitimacy that use of the terms conveyed, the Old Testament also predicted of Ishmael that he would be 'a wild man; his hand will be against every man, and every man's hand against him (Genesis 16:12)'. So, by transference, were his descendants, the *Agareni*, *Ismaheliti* or *Saraceni*, whichever name was given to them. The term *Agareni* was used even of Christians, as a term of abuse intended to evoke this very wild and contrary nature: the anonymous anti-Gregorian author of the *Annales Romani* repeatedly referred to the reform papacy's southern Italian Norman allies in the struggles of the mid-eleventh century as *Agareni*.⁴⁵⁸

There is an element of scriptural narrative structure to Baldric's version of the exchange between Kerbogha and his mother. Kerbogha is warned that his plans are contrary to God's will, arrogantly ignores the warning, and a short time later he is utterly defeated. In particular, it may be that Baldric was basing Kerbogha in part on Pharaoh in Exodus: although there are no direct scriptural references, he established Kerbogha as hard-hearted and stubborn at the beginning of the passage. His mother scolds him for failing to seek her advice before moving against the Christians: 'Why have you presumed to leave your mother unconsulted and unsaluted, oh man with a heart of lead? Oh stony chest, oh liver of steel, which the memory of a

⁴⁵⁷ See, for example, Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiae* IX.i.6 and IX.i.57. While Isidore was extremely influential, R. W. Southern noted that the connection had also been made earlier by Eusebius and Josephus. R. W. Southern, *Western Views of Islam in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, MA, 1962), 16-17. See also K. S. Beckett, *Anglo-Saxon perceptions of the Islamic World* (Cambridge, 2003), pp. 90-115.

⁴⁵⁸ Anonymous, *Annales Romani*, ed. G. H. Pertz, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* Scriptores V, 470-471. According to Perz, the *Annales* were written roughly contemporaneously by a number of different eyewitness authors. For more information see David Whitton, 'The *Annales Romani* and Codex Vaticanus Latinus 1984', *Bulletino dell'Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio evo e Archivio Muratoriano* 84 (1972-1973), 125-143.

mother does not soften...'⁴⁵⁹ In the absence of a direct scriptural reference this analysis is inevitably somewhat subjective, but Kerbogha's mother's mentions of his 'heart of lead' and 'stony chest' may have been intended to evoke Pharaoh, whose heart was 'hardened' by God such that he failed to listen to Moses (Exodus 9:12). The phrase 'hearts of stone' also appears in the Bible, regarding those who have heard God's word but refused to accept it.⁴⁶⁰ Baldric's heart of lead and stony chest which will not be softened seem to be almost dancing around these biblical phrases.

4.2.3 Muslim Beliefs

Baldric's *Historia* elaborated considerably on the *Gesta*'s depiction of Muslims as polytheistic pagans. He retained the use of *pagani* to refer to Muslims, and seems to have been more inclined towards applying a classical pagan model than his contemporaries.⁴⁶¹ In particular, the *Gesta Francorum*'s two mentions of Mohammed are silently omitted from Baldric's account, and no other hint of his name or identity is added elsewhere.⁴⁶² This was the most striking indication in the *Gesta* that the author was not just adhering to a classical model of non-Christians, and the omission itself makes Baldric's depiction of Muslims considerably closer to that model. However, in the absence of any comment from him, it is impossible to be entirely certain as to why Baldric chose to remove these mentions of Mohammed's name. His implication (discussed below) that the inhabitants of Antioch had abandoned their traditional gods for Christianity but had since returned to them does strongly suggest that he had little if any idea that Islam was a new religion distinct from what had been believed in the region before Christ. Given his low opinion of the *Gesta* author's level of education, then, he may not have trusted his source. Not recognising the

⁴⁵⁹ 'Quid igitur matrem inconsultam, matrem insalutatam, o homo plumbei cordis aufugere presumpsisti? O pectus silicinum, o iecur adamantinum, quod non emolliuit matris memoria...' Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, 64.

⁴⁶⁰ See Ezekiel 11:19-21: 'I will remove the heart of stone from their flesh and give them a heart of flesh, so that they follow my statutes and keep my ordinances... But as for those whose heart goes after their detestable things and their abominations, I will bring their deeds upon their own heads, says the Lord God.'

⁴⁶¹ For examples of pagans, see Baldric of Bourgueil *Historia Ierosolimitana*, 4, 6, 68, 91-2, 97-9, 102, 117.

⁴⁶² The *Gesta Francorum* included two instances of Muslims swearing to Mohammed, at pages 52 and 96. The corresponding passages in Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, omit Mohammed: 'Iuro enim me nullatenus reuersurum, donec Siria et Romania in libertatem redacta, Apuliam quoque meo subdiderim dominio (64), and omit any oath altogether, respectively: 'Quicquid sit, unum erit, in eos denuo non erigar, sed potius ad patriam meam, ignominiosus donec uixerem, reuertat' (119).

name Mohammed from any of his own reading, and in the absence of any actual detail as to the Prophet's identity in the *Gesta*, Baldric may have assumed the anonymous author simply made it up. An alternative explanation is suggested by comparison with the *Gesta*'s other revisers. Tudebode thought Mohammed *was* one of the Muslims' gods; Guibert had a relatively accurate, albeit highly distorted, idea of who the Prophet was; and Robert added some small measure of clarity to the *Gesta* by referring to Mohammed as the Muslims' *praeceptor*.⁴⁶³ All of the revisers who retained the name of Mohammed thus had (or thought they had) a clearer idea of who he was, derived from some knowledge they had external to the *Gesta*. Baldric, perhaps, simply did not (he would not have found his source helpful, after all), and quietly avoided the issue to avoid embarrassment. It is also possible that Baldric considered too much detail about non-Christians (such as the name of Mohammed) incompatible with the moral instruction which was one of the inherent aims of the genre of *historia*. Any one, or even a combination, of these may be why Baldric chose to omit this information. Intriguingly, a line in his famous poem *Adelae Comitissae* is suspected by the poem's editor to be an allusion to Embricho of Mainz's *Vita Machometi*. However, the correspondence is not a strong one, and if Baldric did know this work, there is absolutely no indication in the *Historia*.⁴⁶⁴

In removing Mohammed from the account provided by his source, was Baldric deliberately trying to make Muslims conform more closely to a classical model? There are some indications that this may have been the case, but if so, he was not entirely thorough and systematic in his efforts. Notably, the first time he deliberately set out to say something about Muslims, Baldric referred to them using both *pagani* and the biblical term *gentiles* in the same sentence.⁴⁶⁵ On one occasion, he even implied that Muslims worshipped a single god. However, this is not to say that Baldric understood (or intended to accurately depict) Muslim monotheism: he

⁴⁶³ Varying ideas about the identity of Mohammed are discussed further below in the conclusion to this thesis, 8.4. See also 2.4, 3.2.7; 5.2.2.

⁴⁶⁴ The phrase *lucida signa poli* in *Adelae Comitissae* is compared to the phrase *lucida stella polum* in Embricho's *Vita*; both are poetic ways of referring to the sky. Baldric of Bourgueil, *Carmina* 134 *Adelae Comitissae*, ed. Jean-Yves Tilliette (Paris: Société d'édition Les Belles Lettres, 2002) 134.498, n. 183.

⁴⁶⁵ As noted above, Baldric claimed to have remained neutral between Christians and Muslims, lest '*paganis detrahendo Christianis mendax et mendosus temere faueam; et si quid fortiter et audacter gentiles egerunt, eorum fortitudini et audacie zelando aliquid decerpam*.' Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, 4 (emphasis mine).

contradicts this implication elsewhere, and even on this occasion what he describes is not simple monotheism. In Baldric's version of the lament of al-Afdal at Ascalon, the defeated Emir invokes a single Creator, and then mentions separate singular Christian and Muslim gods, opposed to one another:

‘O creator of everything, what is this? ...Either their God is omnipotent, and fights for them; or ours is angry with us, and with a bitter fury has greatly chastised and refuted us.’⁴⁶⁶

In this instance, Baldric seems to interpret their beliefs as a kind of partisan monotheism: they have their one god and the Christians have their own.⁴⁶⁷ Both biblical and classical knowledge may lie beneath this assertion; indeed it is very possible that both traditions were entirely compatible for Baldric, and both influenced him here. However, the model which more closely resembles what Baldric attributes to al-Afdal here is provided by the Old Testament, which at times speaks of the gods of the other tribes who are neighbours of the Children of Israel. Baldric's idea here is particularly reminiscent of a passage in I Kings. Towards the end of his reign, Solomon was led astray by his foreign wives and permitted temples to be set up to other gods. Ashtoreth the goddess of the Sidonians, Moloch the god of the Ammonites and Chemosh the god of Moab are specifically mentioned, among unnamed gods of other tribes.⁴⁶⁸ This notion of single gods of particular tribes opposed to the God of Israel is quite similar to what Baldric writes here, and may well be the underlying influence behind the passage. To Baldric, these other gods described must have been false in one way or another (whether entirely fictitious or demons posing as gods). Indeed later in I Kings, Elijah challenged the priests of Baal to a contest in which God emerged the clear winner, and Baal was revealed to be powerless, if not non-existent.⁴⁶⁹ Elijah's mocking comment at I Kings 18:27 is a little reminiscent

⁴⁶⁶ ‘*O omnium creator, quid est hoc? ... Aut illorum Deus omnipotens est, et pro eis pugnat; aut noster nobis iratus est, et nos nimis austero furore redarguit, et castigat.*’ Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, 118.

⁴⁶⁷ As mentioned in the *Gesta Francorum* chapter, the anonymous author's conversation between Kerbogha and his mother may also indicate he thought Muslims believed this; see above, 2.2.2.

⁴⁶⁸ ‘*Sed colebat Salomon Astarthem deum Sidoniorum et Moloch idolum Ammonitorum... Tunc aedificavit Salomon fanum Chomos idolo Moab in monte qui est contra Hierusalem et Moloch idolo in filiorum Amon. Atque in hunc modum fecit universis uxoribus suis alienigenis quae adolebant tura et immolabant diis suis.*’ III Regem XI.V-VIII (I Kings 11:5-8).

⁴⁶⁹ III Regem XVIII:XIX-XL (I Kings 18:19-40).

of al-Afdal's concern that his god is powerless against the Christians' or has turned against the Muslims: 'Cry with a louder voice, for he is a god, and perhaps he is talking, or is in an inn, or on a journey; or perhaps he is asleep and must be wakened'.⁴⁷⁰ It is clearly not a direct reference, but may indicate a common tendency to emphasise the lack of certainty to which non-believers were subject – a frequent theme in the *Historia*, as will be seen. Writing from the point of view of a non-Christian, Baldric emphasises the doubt which must plague them. Where he depicts Christians as certain of God's omnipotence, favour, and that He alone exists (not to mention asserting his own certainty of this), Baldric depicts Muslims as dealing with the uncertainty of multiple gods, of which theirs may not be the most powerful and may even have abandoned them.⁴⁷¹ Indeed, as will shortly be argued, Baldric, drawing on his scholarly background, often made an effort to depict the worldview of a non-Christian as he thought it must be, and this inherent lack of confidence is a recurring theme.

Baldric was not only an accomplished biblical scholar but also a distinguished classical scholar. It is also possible, then, that Baldric was thinking in classical rather than biblical terms here: that his al-Afdal believed in multiple gods, two of whom were the patron gods of the Muslims and Christians respectively, as Athena was for the ancient Athenians, for example. The singular gods he attributed to each faith still seems distinct from the idea of some among the many gods having a higher regard for particular races of people, and this statement does perhaps fit a little more comfortably with the Biblical passage quoted above. However, this may be the best way of reconciling the words he attributed to al-Afdal with a statement placed in the mouth of Kerbogha. Responding to the crusader claim that Antioch was rightfully Christian property due to its conversion by St Peter, Kerbogha retorted that before Peter the land had belonged to his people, but by Christian deceit, the populace 'was turned away from the worship of their gods, and it was seduced, having been deceived into your most foolish heresy'.⁴⁷² Baldric was arguing that shared Christianity confers

⁴⁷⁰ '*clamate voce maiore deus enim est et forsitan loquitur aut in diversorio est aut in itinere aut certe dormit ut excitetur*' III Regem XVIII:XVII (I Kings 18:27).

⁴⁷¹ For examples of Baldric's certainty that God assisted the crusaders, see Baldric of Bourgueil, 32, 38-9, 47, 53, 64 (attributing the assertion to Kerbogha's mother), 78, 81, 83, 98, 113.

⁴⁷² '*...a Deitatis sue cultura auertit, eosque in nugacissimam sectam uestram deceptos seduxit.*' Baldric of Bourgueil, 78.

the right to the land on the otherwise foreign crusaders, but he allows Kerbogha to make the counter-claim that the people of his ethnicity retained the right to it (evidently being unaware of the recent advent of the Seljuks), whatever their religion. Kerbogha's attitude strongly implies approval of the ancient inhabitants' belief in their gods. Thus in this instance Baldric's intention to depict Muslims as polytheists is straightforward, and may have been more strongly influenced by classical models than the model presented by the Book of Kings. It is also evident from this passage that he was unaware of Islam's relatively recent birth, and thought there was direct continuity between the beliefs of the *Turci* and *Sarraceni* and the beliefs of people in the region before Christ.

It is impossible to say whether a model based on I Kings or on classical sources was a stronger influence on Baldric. Although al-Afdal's remarks more closely resemble the passage in the book of Kings highlighted above, Baldric was extremely erudite and displayed many classicising tendencies in the *Historia*, and either model could be behind Kerbogha's comments. Neither model excludes the other. That they would have seemed entirely compatible to a twelfth-century intellectual like Baldric is confirmed by Isidore of Seville's treatment of the 'gods of the gentiles' in his highly influential *Etymologiae*. Isidore discussed Baal and other Old Testament deities of the Children of Israel's neighbours alongside the Roman pantheon without distinction, except to note by whom they had been worshipped, having introduced them both with the same explanation of how they came to be (ancient heroes and kings whose reputations had grown to the point that they were worshipped).⁴⁷³ Due to the strong likelihood of biblical influence here, however, it cannot be definitively argued that Baldric was editing the *Gesta* to apply a more uniformly classical pagan model to his interpretation of what Muslims believed in this instance. In other ways, however, Baldric did seem to adhere more closely to a classical model.

Baldric's version of the conversation between Kerbogha and his mother appears to contradict the version of Muslim beliefs he offered elsewhere, but in this case he is simply using these characters to convey his own arguments.

⁴⁷³ Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiae* VIII.xi 1-104.

As with all the other versions, Kerbogha's mother is convinced of the existence and omnipotence of the Christian god: 'the God of the Franks is in fact omnipotent, who, unless they have previously gravely offended him, always protects them victorious'.⁴⁷⁴ This is consistent with her being used as a mouthpiece for the author's views, however, and here as in the other accounts is not intended to reflect what Baldric actually thought Muslims believed. Kerbogha's response is simply the inverse: 'These men and us are the same; and against impure and uncircumcised men, not against God, nor God against us, we fight'. Reasonable as this appears to modern sensibilities, it could hardly be further from Baldric's own point of view. Where the *Gesta* depicted Kerbogha as a confused polytheist who thought that Bohemond and Tancred were the gods of the Christians, Baldric simply makes him the wrongheaded counterpart of his mother, continuing their discussion in the same terms.⁴⁷⁵ The statement does seem to imply that Kerbogha only believed in one god, possibly the Christian God, but considered him irrelevant to the proceedings. It is most likely, however, that Baldric was still using his Muslim characters as mouthpieces for a discussion of God's assistance of the crusade, and unconcerned with making Kerbogha's apparent view here match al-Afdal's.

Although it is impossible to be certain exactly what influenced Baldric's understanding of Muslim theology, he did portray their beliefs according to a more coherently classical model in other respects. On one occasion, Baldric claimed that Muslims worshipped idols, which they had set up in the Temple of Solomon: 'But what of the Temple of Solomon, to say nothing of that of the Lord, in which the barbarian nations venerate their idols, which they have placed there, in a manner against right and divine will?'.⁴⁷⁶ Baldric's mention of idols lacks the detail of Ralph of Caen's, being more in line with that of Fulcher of Chartres, but it is noteworthy that all three accounts specifically mention the Temple Mount as the site of an idol.⁴⁷⁷ While there may be some unresolved relationship between Fulcher of Chartres and Ralph of Caen that could explain their agreement, none has

⁴⁷⁴ '*Deus Francorum reuera omnipotens est, quem nisi prius grauiter offenderint, semper eos uictoriosos protegit.*' Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, 64.

⁴⁷⁵ See above, 2.2.2.

⁴⁷⁶ '*Sed quid templum Salomonis immo Domini pretermisimus, in quo simulacra sua barbare nationes contra ius et fas modo collocata uenerantur?*' Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, 7.

⁴⁷⁷ See below, 7.2.1; 8.2.1.

ever been suggested between Baldric and either of the other two authors.⁴⁷⁸ This point of consistency may be the result of Baldric and one or both of the other authors making the same classical reference: Flavius Josephus's *Antiquitates Judaicae* mentioned Caligula's failed attempt to install a statue of himself in the temple in Jerusalem, as part of taking a hard-line policy against the Jews' varyingly accepted refusal to treat the emperor as a deity.⁴⁷⁹ The authors may have included this allusion as nothing more than a reference to demonstrate their erudition, or may have been influenced by Josephus to believe that this was the kind of behaviour which could be expected from 'pagan' conquerors of Jerusalem. Latin translations of Josephus's Greek text were circulating in the Middle Ages, and both Baldric and Fulcher are known to have had access to at least one of his works. Baldric referred to Josephus's *De Bello Judaico* (which, if he was using the Latin translation by Rufinus, was probably compiled together with the *Antiquitates*),⁴⁸⁰ and Fulcher drew on both for topographical descriptions.⁴⁸¹ Ralph is not known to have had access to Josephus (although his most recent translators observed in their introduction that this had yet to be thoroughly investigated), but it may well be no coincidence that two of the three authors to mention an idol in the Temple are known to have had access to translations of Josephus.⁴⁸²

Unfortunately, however, there are no direct textual similarities, which inevitably leaves this argument inconclusive. It is also possible that this was nothing more than a rumour which coincidentally resembled something mentioned by classical historians (Tacitus also reported Caligula's efforts, but he is not known to have been read by any of these three authors).⁴⁸³ If so, it would have been a remarkably widespread rumour. Although the other writers were apparently not influenced by it, it must have

⁴⁷⁸ See below, 7.1, 7.2.1.

⁴⁷⁹ Flavius Josephus, *Antiquitates Judaicae* 18.55-7; 18.261

⁴⁸⁰ 'Quod quomodo acciderit, legenti gesta Titi et Vespasiani indifficulter patebit: quam lectionem uir eloquentissimus Iosephus stilo celebri consecrauit.' Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, 5 (identified by Biddlecombe as a reference to Josephus's *De bello Judaico* in the index of references on page 47).

⁴⁸¹ Fulcher of Chartres, *A History of the Expedition to Jerusalem, 1095-1127*, Trans. Frances Rita Ryan, Edited and with an introduction by Harold S. Fink (Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1969), 44.

⁴⁸² Bernard S. Bachrach and David S. Bachrach (trans.), *The Gesta Tancredi of Ralph of Caen: A History of the Normans on the First Crusade* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2005, rpr. 2010), 5.

⁴⁸³ Cornelius Tacitus, *Historiae* 5.9, ed. Charles Dennis Fisher (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911). Accessed on www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.02.0079%3ABook%3D5%3Achapter%3D9 8 February 2016.

reached Europe by the early twelfth century and survived for a considerable length of time in the Holy Land itself. There are other examples of such rumours apparently entering oral culture before being recorded independently by authors of crusade histories: several apparently independent accounts of Godfrey of Bouillon's great feat of arms in which he supposedly cut a Turkish warrior in half with his sword were worked into revisions of the *Gesta* and other sources, for example.⁴⁸⁴ It may even be the case that an observation by some erudite person had entered oral culture; if Guibert of Nogent is to be believed when he claims his sources for his account of Mohammed's life were oral, then the crusading histories also contain precedent for a literary tradition entering oral culture.⁴⁸⁵

Baldric also retained the *Gesta*'s reference to grave goods discovered in Muslim graves. Baldric does not alter the description of the burials, so they resemble classical practices no more (or less) closely than the *Gesta*.⁴⁸⁶ Although, as discussed above there is reason to believe the *Gesta* author was reporting what he actually saw here and not applying a classical model, the description is not inconsistent with Baldric's more classicising tendencies.⁴⁸⁷

Baldric's interpretation of the worldview of Muslims also bears the hallmarks of classical Roman pagan attitudes. He attributed to the Muslims a sense that their civilisation is in decline: the heroic, military age of their civilisation has passed, and in their decadence they will inevitably lose to the more warlike Christians. As Kerbogha's mother admonished him:

'...you ought to have reflected how unaccustomed to fighting are the troops that you have gathered from all sides. For not to conceal the truth, our nation is golden, that one is iron. Yet ours is courageous enough, but less effective in the hand; it is much inexperienced and

⁴⁸⁴ In particular, see below, 4.4, concerning a variant manuscript of Baldric to which an account of this was added.

⁴⁸⁵ See below, 5.1.3, 5.2.2.

⁴⁸⁶ '*Que autem subumulauerunt, palliorum et preciosarum exuiiarum gazis persecuti sunt; et arcus et pharetras et plurimos bizanteos mortuorum procurationi adiecerunt.*' Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Iherosolimitana*, 52.

⁴⁸⁷ See above, 2.2.2.

untried in these labours, because the old age of this nation grows apace in peace.’⁴⁸⁸

This corresponds to a broad theme of decline due to peace widespread in the writings of Roman historians, from Polybius to Livy.⁴⁸⁹ The reference to ‘golden’ and ‘iron’ races also closely resembles the similar classical *topos* of the ages of man, in which the ‘golden age’ declined into the ‘iron age’. This view of societal decline and the uncertainty of their cause corresponds to other attitudes Baldric ascribes to Muslims: it may thus have been how he genuinely believed they thought. In any case, it is perhaps worth emphasising that it was based on an entirely inaccurate supposition: the Muslim world had been enjoying no such period of peace at that time.

Furthermore, Baldric seems to attempt to present something of the psychology of a non-Christian, in a way clearly influenced by Ancient Rome. Denied Christians’ confidence in God’s favour, like Romans his Muslims worry deeply about the vicissitudes of *fortuna*. Shams ed-Daula, son of the ruler of Antioch defeated by the crusaders, is given an elaborate speech not present in the *Gesta*. He beseeches Kerbogha to help him as fortune has turned against him, and it behoves all great men to reflect on how their fortune might turn and so show mercy to others:

‘Most invincible prince, struck by hostile *fortuna* I am compelled to approach you as a suppliant and to ask for help from Your Generous Munificence... Think, in what circumstances I have fallen, and reflect upon the vicissitudes of worldly tribulation, which *fortuna* considers for me with her sideways glance... It is characteristic of a fortunate and generous man to regard the calamities of another as one’s own, and to expend an extensive compassion upon another’s wretchedness. Aid

⁴⁸⁸ ‘...opportuerat te perpendere quam insuete sunt preliandi quas undequaque corrogasti copie. Ut enim ueritatem nullatenus tacuerim, nostra gens aurea est, illa ferrea. Nostra tamen satis animosa est, sed manu minus efficax inexperta et expers est multum huiusce laboris, quoniam admodum effloruit in pace senectus istius nationis.’ Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, 64.

⁴⁸⁹ John Burrow, *A History of Histories: Epics, Chronicles, Romances and Inquiries from Herodotus to the Twentieth Century* 2nd ed., (London: Penguin, 2009). On Polybius, see 80-1; on Livy see 96-7.

me, therefore, as you would wish to be aided if *fortuna* touched you with my difficult circumstances.⁴⁹⁰

Kerbogha's mother, in a version of a scene present in all the revisions, admonishes her son for entrusting himself to unreliable *fortuna* in planning to attack the Christians:

It is however certainly dangerous for you to commit yourself to two-headed Fortune (*anceps fortuna*). It is doubtful on whose side Mars would rather smile.⁴⁹¹

Kerbogha's mother displays even more pagan characteristics than Shams ed-Daula here, however: she refers to *Fortuna* in the way that a Roman poet would refer to the deity, not merely the abstract concept. *Anceps Fortuna*, two-headed fortune, not only implies physical characteristics, but conforms to the correct classical style of always referring to a god(dess) with one of her attributes.⁴⁹² As can be seen above, she then goes on to warn that it is unclear whose faction Mars will favour in the battle.

Baldric may also have intended to depict Muslims as having a deep concern for their *lares* and *penates*, the household deities of Ancient Rome, although this is by no means certainly his intended meaning: 'Moreover, they said that they were defeated ... unless those who have been inactive protect their sons and wives, and what remains of their *lares* and *penates*.⁴⁹³ However, *lares* and *penates* could also refer to homes themselves by transference even in classical literature, as is most likely the case when Baldric refers to the Nicaeans defending their walls and *penates*, if not also in the above instance.⁴⁹⁴

⁴⁹⁰ 'Princeps inuictissime, inimica lesus fortuna, supplex ad te compellor accedere, et auxilium a liberali munificentia tua rogare... Cogita, inquam, in quos deuenerim casus perpende mundane tribulacionis uicissitudines, que me modo fortuna obliquo respicit intuiti, michi nuper arridebat, et tunc patre obtimo et ciuitate inclita gratulabar... Fortunati et liberalis hominis est, alienas calamitates autumare, suas aliene miserie largam impendere misericordiam. Succurre ergo michi, quo tibi succurri uelles animo, si te fortuna meo tetigisset incommodo.' Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, 61.

⁴⁹¹ '...periculosum est certe ancipiti te committas fortune. Dubium est enim cui potius mars arriserit parti...' Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, 64 – 5.

⁴⁹² See, for example, Cicero, *Oratio pro Marcello* 5; and Tacitus, *Historia* 3.18.

⁴⁹³ 'Preterea inglorios se esse dicebant... nisi filios et uxores penatesque suos lariumque suorum residuum suppellectilem desides turentur.' Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, 60.

⁴⁹⁴ '...muros penatesque suos magna ui defensare...' Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, 23. See also Charlton T. Lewis and Charles Short, 'Lares' and 'Penates' in *A Latin Dictionary*, (Oxford: Clarendon, 1987 (first published 1879)).

Strangely, despite making her seem distinctly more pagan than the *Gesta Francorum*, Baldric drops any hint of the supernatural activities of Kerbogha's mother.⁴⁹⁵ He also omitted her quotations from the Bible (attributing her knowledge to no particular source), which makes more sense in the context of making her conform to a classical model. Ní Chléirigh also argues that Baldric did not accept the *Gesta's* idea that a pagan woman could be a conduit of truth, but Kerbogha's mother's message is still broadly similar to what she says in the *Gesta*.⁴⁹⁶ Baldric may simply have thought familiarity with the Bible on her part stretched credibility, even in a stylised passage. In either case, no reason for removing the references to astrology and soothsaying suggests itself: this could even have been added to or developed to conform more closely to a Roman model in its own right, or to emphasise the apartness of Kerbogha's mother, as Robert the Monk did.⁴⁹⁷ The change may simply be due to Baldric's personal taste.

At first glance, Baldric seems to illustrate Housley's argument that authors of crusade sources defaulted to classical models better than the other revisers, although there is probably also Old Testament influence in his depiction of Muslim beliefs.⁴⁹⁸ It is likely, however, that the references to Roman deities are simply to be read as metaphorical: Mars standing for victory in battle, *Fortuna* for fortune, and *lares* and *penates* for valuable household items, or the homes themselves. Baldric did use Mars in this sense in his poetry, in a context which was clearly not literal, and used *lares* and *penates* to refer to home in the preface to his *Life of Robert of Arbrissel*.⁴⁹⁹ His construction of their worldview – the sense of decline and obsession with *fortuna* – does point to a reliance on Roman pagans as a model, and such a model could also have influenced his interpretation of Muslim polytheism. But Housley's theory would also suggest this was because of the ease with which it could be applied, due to a lack of interest in depicting the enemy. Baldric went out of his way to add these details to the foundation he

⁴⁹⁵ Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, 64-5.

⁴⁹⁶ Ní Chléirigh, *The Crusaders and their Enemies*, 122-3.

⁴⁹⁷ See above, 3.2.9.

⁴⁹⁸ Housley, 'The Crusades and Islam', 196-7.

⁴⁹⁹ Mars is mentioned several times in Baldric's poetry, in ways which Jean-Yves Tilliette translated as standing in for war or combat. See Baldric of Bourgueil, *Carmina*, ed. and trans. Jean-Yves Tilliette, 2 vols, (Paris: Société d'édition Les Belles Lettres, 2002), 8:146 – 150 (I.28); 134:295 – 8, 397 (II.11, 14). In the dedicatory letter of his *Life of Robert of Arbrissel*, Baldric praises Petronilla of Chemillé for having left her *penates* and the *lares* of her father to enter religious life. Jacques Dalarun et al (eds), *Les deux vies de Robert D'Arbrissel, fondateur de Fontevraud : légendes, écrits et témoignages*, (Turnhout: Brepols, 2006), 130.

inherited from the *Gesta*. Rather than Muslims being an afterthought, this points to a particular interest in understanding the mindset of non-Christians – though the mindset he attributed to them was undoubtedly influenced by classical models. This may simply have been all that was available to Baldric, though we should not discount the possibility that he was also, even primarily, depicting the mindset of Muslims in more distinctly classical terms as a more intellectual exercise: displaying his own erudition and making references for the entertainment of similarly-educated readers.

4.2.4 Muslim Society

Baldric also followed the *Gesta*'s tendency to depict Muslim social and political relations in Western terms, as when Shams ad-Daula offers fealty to Kerbogha.⁵⁰⁰ The Sultan (here given the inaccurate name Soliman) and Caliph both appear, still assumed to correspond to the roles of king and pope.⁵⁰¹ Khorosan (*Corosanum*) remains the perceived centre of the Turkish world.⁵⁰² In one crucial respect, however, Baldric's depiction of Muslim society differs from the *Gesta*'s. As discussed above, he did not maintain the *Gesta Francorum*'s relatively consistent tendency to use *Turci* to refer to the Turks and *Sarraceni* to refer to the subjects of the Fatimid Caliphate. He may, however, have retained his source's awareness of some political distinction between the leaders to whom Kerbogha answered and the 'Babylonian' forces faced at Ascalon. This would suggest that rather than missing what the *Gesta* author was trying to establish entirely, he may simply have disagreed with the use of *Sarraceni* to indicate a specific Muslim group rather than Muslims as a whole, and may not have considered it necessary to be strictly accurate with his use of *Turci*. It is difficult to establish for certain how aware he was even of this political distinction, however. Baldric *does* write in terms of two separate leaderships, but most of what he writes that indicates this was carried over directly from the *Gesta*, and may simply be echoes of that source rather than demonstrating Baldric's comprehension of what they indicated. It is possible that he consciously retained these indications of separate political structures while obscuring the *Gesta*'s distinctions of terminology for his own rhetorical purposes, but they may also be nothing more than artefacts of his source. It is possible that he simply did not notice the implicit distinction he replicated. It may also be the

⁵⁰⁰ Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, 61.

⁵⁰¹ Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Iherosolimitana*, 60, 63.

⁵⁰² Baldric of Bourgueil, *Hisotira Iherosolimitana*, 15, 61, 63.

case that he noticed and did not actively try to to erase the *Gesta*'s distinction between 'Turks' and 'Saracens', but having obscured it by using the terms synonymously, he did not consider it important to establish the distinction by other means.

As in the *Gesta*, Kerbogha is the leader of the army of the sultan of Persia, whom he addresses as 'great king Soliman' (this name for the sultan is apparently Baldric's own invention).⁵⁰³ He also answers to the Caliph, *gentis suae apostolico*, who has given him 'a licence to rage against *Christiani*', and whom he addresses as *noster papa*.⁵⁰⁴ Apparently separate from this hierarchy, we find references to the emir of Babylon. The Fatimid vizier al-Afdal Shahanshah is seemingly to whom Baldric is referring by this term: shortly before the battle of Ascalon in which he led the Fatimid forces, the crusaders receive word that the *admiravissus Babilonius* is there.⁵⁰⁵ Baldric thus followed his source in either conflating al-Afdal and the Fatimid Caliph al-Mustanzhir, or simply being entirely unaware of the existence of the latter.⁵⁰⁶ This same *admiralius* (the orthography of the term varies) had sent emissaries to the crusaders at Antioch, as in the *Gesta*.⁵⁰⁷ The attitude and relationship of the emissaries to the inhabitants of Antioch is obscure, but this is also the case in the *Gesta Francorum*: Baldric had little information from his source, and did not omit or obscure any of it. In the absence of any direct statement to the contrary, it is more likely than not that Baldric (and his source) intended something close to the truth; that they were representatives of a thus-far neutral power come to observe and open diplomatic relations, but neither Baldric nor the *Gesta* made this clear.

Like his source, Baldric ceased to mention the Sultan and the (Abassid) Caliph after the crusade entered Fatimid lands, and never suggested any connection between these figures and the emir of Babylon. As in the *Gesta*, the Emir of Tripoli promised to convert and offer fealty to the crusaders if they succeeded in defeating the Emir of Babylon. This suggests Tripoli owed some allegiance to Babylon, but again, nothing is confirmed and it comes directly from the *Gesta*, making it impossible to be certain how much thought Baldric gave the matter. Baldric thus implied that the

⁵⁰³ Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Iherosolimitana*, 60, 63.

⁵⁰⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁰⁵ Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Iherosolimitana*, 113.

⁵⁰⁶ See *Gesta Francorum*, 37, 42, 86, 88, 93, 96-7.

⁵⁰⁷ Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Iherosolimitana*, 47, 52; Cf *Gesta Francorum*, 37, 42.

Babylonians had a separate power structure to the Turks, but said nothing to directly confirm this.⁵⁰⁸ Furthermore, all of these vague references to these figures were directly adopted from the *Gesta Francorum*: given this vagueness, Baldric may not have consciously intended anything by following his source here.

Two references Baldric did add are suggestive, but also inconclusive. In his opening remarks, he wrote that Jerusalem had been subject to the Emir of Babylon 'for a long time'.⁵⁰⁹ Shortly afterwards, in his report of Urban's speech at Clermont, the pope twice referred to the Holy City being in Turkish hands.⁵¹⁰ This, of course, was true: Jerusalem had been subject to the Fatimid Caliphate, but by the time of the council of Clermont it had been captured by the Seljuks. However, as tempting as it may be to view this as confirmation that Baldric thought of the Turks and the Fatimids as separate groups, given his tendency to use *Turci* synonymously with other terms, it is impossible to say for certain in the absence of a direct reference to this changing of hands (such as Guibert of Nogent made).⁵¹¹ It is certainly possible that this is more than just a coincidence, but caution must be exercised.

The accumulation of so much inconclusive evidence, however, in the absence of any strong indications to the contrary, should perhaps incline us towards thinking that Baldric was aware of at least the political distinction between the Saracens subject to 'Babylon', and the Muslims (whom he referred to with many different terms) who were subject to the Sultan. This possible recognition of their differing political leadership aside, however, there is no indication that Baldric was aware of either the depth or the details of the divisions between Sunni Turks and Shi'ite subjects of the Fatimid Caliphs.

Baldric did know – or assumed – that Muslims were circumcised.⁵¹² This is an interesting assertion in light of his tendency otherwise to connect them either to classical pagans or the enemies of the children of Israel: it much more closely associated them with contemporary Jews. This was not incompatible with Baldric's association of the crusaders and the Children of Israel in twelfth-century thought: while the Jews of the Old Testament were

⁵⁰⁸ Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Iherosolimitana*, 100; Cf *Gesta Francorum*, 83-6.

⁵⁰⁹ Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Iherosolimitana*, 5.

⁵¹⁰ Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Iherosolimitana*, 7, 9.

⁵¹¹ See below, 5.2.1, 5.2.5.

⁵¹² Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Iherosolimitana*, 59.

understood through allegorical readings to prefigure the Christians and so to be suitable *exempla*, the Jews of the New Testament were thought of primarily in terms of the Jewish leadership's treatment of Christ. As the letters of Paul established that circumcision was no longer necessary in the new order brought about by the Incarnation, but was still practised by Jews, it would then follow that the Muslims were emulating the 'wrong' Jews – the ones whom Baldric asserted were considered *inimici Dei* along with Saracens and heretics.⁵¹³ This may have been a particularly subtle depiction of Muslims as the inverse of the crusaders. On the other hand, it is not consistent with Baldric's usual points of reference for depicting Muslims: classical pagans and the *gentiles* of the Old Testament. It may simply have been based on an accurate piece of information that found its way to him, without being intended to carry any deeper significance – though, even in this case, it would have served to more firmly establish the otherness of Muslims, in a particularly prurient manner.

4.2.5 Violence

Baldric's depiction of violence between Christians and Muslims is not a major departure from that of his source, but he did make changes – both rephrasing the *Gesta*'s wording and adding some incidents and observations of his own. As discussed in the introduction, Baldric made an explicit claim to neutrality between the Christians and the Muslims, lest in allowing his (entirely proper, in his view) prejudice to come to the fore, he diminish the achievements of the crusaders. However, despite this avowed attempt to be neutral, he tended to describe Christian violence against Muslims in more graphic terms than vice versa. His admitted bias was towards depicting the crusaders as stronger and more effective is the most likely explanation for this. Compare his version of the attack on the Christians returning from St Symeon

...they attacked them, now with arrows, now with swords, now with lances, now with missiles; they killed them mercilessly, and shouted at them, gnashing teeth... Those who were able either hid, fled or escaped alive; to others occurred a lethal fate, what grief, they lay dead.⁵¹⁴

⁵¹³ Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Iherosolimitana*, 19.

⁵¹⁴ *Impetebant igitur eos nunc sagittis, nunc ensibus, nunc lanceis, nunc missilibus. Obstruncabant eos in misericorditer, et clamitabant in eos dentibus stridentes... Si*

with his account of the crusaders' defeat of a sally by the Turkish defenders of Antioch a few pages earlier:

There was much crashing of weapons, and from the bronze helmets fire sent out glittering sparks. They inflicted wound upon wound, and a great deal of blood coloured the field purple. You could see intestines hanging out; and you could see both severed heads and dismembered bodies dying here and there..⁵¹⁵

Although extreme violence is indicated in both cases, the account in which the crusaders are victorious is considerably more graphic, emphasising their strength more than that of the Turks.

This is a tendency throughout the *Historia*. Incidents of extreme violence perpetrated by Muslims are described (or even merely hinted at) in far less detail than many of the incidents of extreme violence used against them.⁵¹⁶

In most cases these incidents were adopted directly from the *Gesta Francorum*, although a few are heightened. Baldric describes greater killing at the storming of Antioch, and some unusually graphic violence at the final battle for the city, for example,⁵¹⁷ and altered the *Gesta*'s account of the massacre in Jerusalem. In this latter case, Baldric compressed it, combining

qui potuerunt seu latitare, seu effugere, uiuentes euasere; alii letali sorte praeuenti, pro dolor, occubere.' Ibid, 50.

⁵¹⁵ '*Fragor armorum multus erat, et ab hereis casidibus ignis elucubratus scintillabat. Vulnera uulneribus illidebantur, et campi nimio sanguine purpurabantur. Intestina uideres dependentia; et uideres et cesa capita, et trunca corpora passim oppetentia.*' Ibid, 46.

⁵¹⁶ Other incidents of vividly-described violence against Muslims: (p. 24) the severed heads of captives are catapulted into Nicaea; (p. 40) captured Turks are beheaded before Antioch; (p. 50) The Orontes runs red with blood at the battle of the Iron Bridge; (p. 59) the streets are clogged with corpses in the aftermath of the storming of Antioch and (p. 91) at Ma'arrat an-Nu'man; (82) mutilations, shattered skulls, and scattered entrails at the final battle for Antioch; (p. 99) the river which supplied Tripoli turned red with blood and all the cisterns were contaminated; and (110) blood spilled in the Temple of Solomon reaches the crusaders' calves. By contrast, most incidents of extreme violence by Muslims against Christians (of which there are fewer) are much less vividly described: (pp 6-8) In Urban's speech at Clermont, the pope described the oppression of Christians in the Holy Land, but not in any great detail; (pp 14-15), in one of the few more vivid images, some members of the 'People's Crusade' are tied to posts and shot with arrows; (p. 31) The Turks attack ferociously at Dorylaeum but without vividly described results; (p. 41) many Christians are killed in an attack on the crusader camp at Antioch, but with little detail; (p. 81) The Turks initially fight hard at the final battle for Antioch but again without vividly-described results; (pp 87-8) Rainald Porchet and his followers are routed from Ma'arrat an-Nu'man and many are killed, but without graphic detail.

⁵¹⁷ Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Iherosolimitana*, 58-9; 82. Cf *Gesta Francorum*, 47, 67-71.

the two slaughters described by the *Gesta* and intensifying its phrasing. In his account, the people of the city fled to the Temple of Solomon where 'no one knows the number of them who were killed, but their blood, which flowed through the temple, reached the calves of those going on foot.'⁵¹⁸ Increasing the amount of blood in this passage was a convenient method of intensification, with the most extreme versions being Robert the Monk's and Raymond of Aguilers'.

Baldric did not justify Christian violence against Muslims in the explicit way Robert the Monk did. Like the *Gesta* author, this violence was probably not intended as a conscious part of his program for depicting Muslims (to the extent that the *Gesta* author had one, that is, and the greater but perhaps not full extent to which Baldric did). Rather the intention was to establish that the crusaders faced a great threat, which they defeated overwhelmingly. Nevertheless, the dehumanising effects of the *Gesta*'s treatment of violence remain – Muslims were still depicted as both barbarically violent, and as the acceptable targets of extreme violence. In Baldric's case, however, there was considerably more imbalance in how graphically effective each side was presented, resulting in a reduced impression of Muslims as barbaric in favour of greater emphasis on the effectiveness of the crusaders.

4.2.6 Concern with Material Matters

Baldric also retained the *Gesta*'s depiction of Muslims as concerned with the material world: they were often depicted as certain of victory due to their numbers or strength of arms (although this was at odds with his depiction of them elsewhere as perceiving themselves to be subject to the whims of *anceps fortuna*). As in the *Gesta*, they trusted that their numbers would win out at Dorylaeum.⁵¹⁹ Kerbogha referred to having more emirs alone than the entire crusader army in conversation with his mother, and Al-Afdal was perplexed that the 'beggarly' crusaders have defeated his huge army.⁵²⁰ Baldric also added some similar statements of his own. He referred

⁵¹⁸ '*Numerum eorum qui perempti sunt nemo nouit; sed sanguinis eorum, qui per templum defluebat, usque ad suras ambulancium attingebat...*' Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, 110.

Cf *Gesta Francorum*:

'*Ibique talis occisio fuit, ut nostri in sanguine illorum pedes usque ad cauillas mitterent.*' *Gesta Francorum*, 90-1.

'*...sanguis illorum per totum templum flueret...*' *Gesta Francorum*, 91.

⁵¹⁹ Baldric of Bourgueil, 24, 31

⁵²⁰ Baldric of Bourgueil, 65, 118.

to Kerbogha's army as relying on their 'wide multitude of collected *nationes*, and in its singular boldness, just as they boasted'; and in Kerbogha's letter to the Muslim faithful, he explicitly mentioned '...trusting in your [the Caliph and the Sultan's] favour and in our arms...'⁵²¹ In particular, he added a blasphemous note to this, with Kerbogha defying Christ in his arrogance: '...Your crucified one, whom you spread before you, who was not able to rescue himself from the outrage of the cross, will rescue you from our hands?...'⁵²² This is an elaboration of the *Gesta*, but much the same impression of Muslims is given.

4.2.7 Arrogance and Pride

The above passages were also examples of Muslim arrogance. Baldric developed this much further than the *Gesta*, in another of his attempts to describe a Muslim mindset: in this case, one which is strongly influenced by pride. He repeatedly describes a kind of code of honour which compels Muslims to fight, in which their self-worth is bound up in their readiness to defend themselves and their families. Baldric emphasises this to a unique degree. He introduced this theme in his own narration, describing the attitude of the Muslim world to the initial Christian capture of Antioch: 'Moreover, they said that they were undistinguished if the many did not crush the dullness of the few, if the natives did not drive out the foreigners from their territories, if they did not in hostile fashion avenge the blood shed by their own companions, if they did not protect their children and wives and their *lares* and *penates*, and the rest of their paraphernalia'.⁵²³ Baldric echoed this sentiment in part of the speech he attributed to Kerbogha's mother: 'If you want to triumph over the *Christiani* (indeed you could easily destroy them utterly), you will both acquire a great name for yourself, and you will restore freedom to our race. But if you dissemble to fight against them, what remains except the ruin of your house and kin...?'⁵²⁴ He repeats this again in Kerbogha's letter to the Muslim faithful: 'But we think ourselves to be

⁵²¹ Baldric of Bourgueil, 60, 63.

⁵²² Baldric of Bourgueil, 78.

⁵²³ '*Preterea inglorios se esse dicebant, nisi multi paucorum stoliditatem compescerent, nisi aduenticios indigene a suis finibus dissicerent, nisi suorum sanguinem hostiliter effusum ulciscerentur, nisi filios et uxores penatesque suos lariumque suorum residuam suppellectilem desides tutaerentur.*' Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, 60.

⁵²⁴ '*Si de Christianis triumphare uolueris, potes etenim eos indifficulter disperdere, et magnum tibi nomen adquires, et gentem nostram libertati restitues. Quod si contra eos dimicare dissimulaueris, quid restat nisi ut domum et cognationem tuam perditum ire contendat?*' Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, 61.

insufficient unless indeed we overwhelm their territories with our company of soldiers, and swallow all of their goods.⁵²⁵ While this is not the most alien sentiment that Baldric might have attributed to Muslims, it does contribute to developing a particular individual depiction of them. This particular element of Baldric's Muslims takes on othering force in the strong and repeated emphasis on their being driven to fight by personal honour and pride. Baldric was probably setting up a deliberate contrast with the motivation he attributed to the crusaders. See Urban II's words in Baldric's version of the sermon at Clermont:

It is horrible, brothers, it is horrible, that you extend a rapacious hand towards Christians; it is a lesser evil to brandish your swords against Saracens; it is a uniquely good thing, since it is charity to offer your lives for your brothers.⁵²⁶

Urban II's admonishing of his audience that it was an act of love to brandish a sword at a Saracen in defence of a brother is superficially similar to the Muslims concern to defend their families mentioned above, but there is a subtle but important difference between *why* each group was driven to defend their loved ones. For Christians, in Baldric's view of the crusade, it was in part *caritas*, the Christian love of one's neighbour, that drove them to fight – specifically, to offer up their own lives for the sake of others. This was a widely-shared view, as Riley-Smith has famously argued (indeed, he argued that it was essential to the theological justification of the crusade).⁵²⁷ This view found similar expression even in the letters of the contemporary popes. Urban II wrote of the crusaders that 'they have committed their property and their persons [to the crusade] out of love for God and their neighbour'; and Paschal II later echoed the sentiment in a letter to the crusaders: 'we remember how many things you gave up for love of God, how many dangers you underwent for the well-being and salvation of your

⁵²⁵ '*Sed hoc parum nobis esse censemus, nisi etiam fines eorum manipulis nostris operiemus, et omnia bona eorum absorbeamus.*' Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, 63.

⁵²⁶ '*Horrendum est, fratres, horrendum est, uos in Christianos rapacem manum extendere; minus malum est in Sarracenos gladium uibrare; singulare bonum est, quia et caritas est, pro fratribus animas ponere.*' Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, 9.

⁵²⁷ Jonathan Riley-Smith, 'Crusading as an act of Love' in Constance Hoffman Berman (ed.), *Medieval Religion: New Approaches* (London: Routledge, 2005), 49-67.

brothers.’⁵²⁸ This was the Christian ideal with which Baldric was contrasting Muslim motivation for opposing the crusaders. For Muslims, he claimed, it was simply that their pride and self-worth was bound up in acting this way. The attitude he attributed to Muslims was one in which they fought to preserve their honour or prevent shame; indeed he repeatedly emphasised how they felt they must fight to avoid shame. Only incidentally did they help their brothers: to Baldric, Christians fought out of selflessness, Muslims out of self-regard.

All of Baldric’s references to this supposed attitude of Muslims are concentrated close together, and one must consider whether he intended them to suggest something universal about all Muslims or more specifically about Kerbogha and his followers (the absence of a distinction between Turks and other Muslims elsewhere indicates that it is at least not intended to be characteristic of the Turks as a group). The first time Baldric brings up this idea he is describing the effect of the news of Antioch’s fall on Kerbogha’s approaching army, and the next two occasions are also closely associated with that leader, as noted. But when he introduces the concept he speaks in general terms about all of the army, not just Kerbogha personally. When he goes on to introduce Kerbogha he says that that army which the *atabeg* had gathered consisted of ‘innumerable races, namely Turks, Saracens, Arabs, Paulicians, Azimites, Kurds, Persians, *Agulani* and others...’⁵²⁹ This was a rhetorical device emphasising the size of the army, rather than a literal enumeration of its component parts, and one which was inherited from the *Gesta*.⁵³⁰ The attribution of this attitude to the army as a whole before Kerbogha himself, followed by a description of that army as huge and made up of many parts, suggests that Baldric did intend to depict this as a general Muslim tendency. Even if he did not really think all of these ethnic groups were united in Kerbogha’s army (and he may well have done), he did not think it was inaccurate to imply that they all had the same attitude.

⁵²⁸ ‘...res et personas suas pro Dei et proximi caritate exposuerunt.’ Hagenmeyer, *Kreuzzugsbriefe*, 137;

‘...rememoramini, quanta pro amore Domini reliqueritis, quanta pro fratrum salute et ereptione pericula subieritis...’ Hagenmeyer, *Kreuzzugsbriefe*, 178-9.

Both translated by Throop in *Crusading as an act of Vengeance*, 62.

⁵²⁹ ‘...gentes innumeras, Turcos videlicet, Sarracenos, Arabes, Publicanos, Azimitas, Curtos, Persas, Agulanos, et alio...’ Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Iherosolimitana*, 60.

⁵³⁰ Ní Chléirigh, *The Crusaders and their Enemies*, 61-2.

4.2.8 Cowardice and Stupidity

Baldric often retained the *Gesta*'s depiction of Muslims as cowardly and stupid. He reproduced the *Gesta*'s account of the meeting between Kilij Arslan and a force of Arabs he encountered while fleeing Dorylaeum with only minor changes.⁵³¹ Similarly, Baldric retained the unnamed castle whose inhabitants drove out livestock in the hopes that the crusaders would be satisfied, and then fled in the night; and Raymond Pilet and Raymond the Viscount's fooling the inhabitants of Tortosa into fleeing by lighting extra campfires at night.⁵³² Baldric elaborated the *Gesta*'s depiction of Kerbogha as both sides deployed for the final battle for Antioch. He was at first, 'if it is possible, of such impetuosity and stupidity, that he did not imagine a people would risk to come against him,'⁵³³ but despite putting on a brave front, 'it is said that he was somewhat afraid, and that the savage man paled before the rage [of the crusaders]?'⁵³⁴ Once the crusaders emerged from the city, Kerbogha 'grew rigid with greater fear, with his usual strength of body dissolved, his spirit froze.'⁵³⁵ Baldric attributed more noble motives to his preparations for retreat, however and did not make this seem as cowardly as Robert the Monk did.⁵³⁶ In Baldric's version, while Kerbogha suddenly loses confidence, he orders one of his emirs to be prepared to retreat if a signal fire was lit, 'lest perhaps the people who were with him or in tents might all die.'⁵³⁷ He is primarily motivated by concern for his followers, unlike in Robert's version, though he is still fearful. Once battle was joined, however, 'fear...falling from heaven, struck the Turks with terror' and once they had been put to flight, they were ambushed by Armenians and Syrians who 'slaughtered them like wandering sheep, for, because of the great panic, [they were] heedless of defence.'⁵³⁸ Once the battle was won, ibn Marwan asked for the banner of the *Christiani* specifically out of fear.⁵³⁹ These remarks were added by Baldric. The same defenders of Ma'arrat an-Nu'man,

⁵³¹ Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Iherosolimitana*, 34-5.

⁵³² Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, 96.

⁵³³ 'Tante siquidem animositatis et stoliditatis erat, ut nullam generationem audere sibi uenire obuam arbitraretur.' Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, 80.

⁵³⁴ 'Dicitur etiam aliquantum timuisse, et pre ira efferum expalluisse.' Ibid.

⁵³⁵ '...maiori metu dirigit, solutisque solitis uiribus corporis, animo frigit.' Ibid.

⁵³⁶ See above, 3.2.4.

⁵³⁷ '...ne forte populus qui cum eo erat, uel in papilionibus, totus deperiret.' Ibid.

⁵³⁸ 'Timor tamen super Turcos illapsus diuinitus eos exterruit...' Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Iherosolimitana*, 82; 'Mactabant siquidem eos uelut oues errantes, utpote, pre pauore nimio,'⁵³⁸ totius defensionis immemores.' Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Iherosolimitana*, 83.

⁵³⁹ 'Admiralius quoque, qui in municipio ciuitatis remanserant... antequam omnes Franci redissent, timore perterritus, Christianorum uexillum rogauit, et accepit.' Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Iherosolimitana*, 83.

whose ‘unwearied strength’ had previously allowed them to hold off the Christians (as seen above), ‘were terrified to desperation, and were thrown headlong and irrevocably into flight,’ once they realised that their walls had been breached.⁵⁴⁰ Following the *Gesta* in this tendency, and adding to it, does somewhat undermine Baldric’s efforts to emphasise the crusaders’ achievement. Essentially, despite setting out a more coherent program in his introduction, he preserves some of the *Gesta*’s inconsistency with regard to how threatening Muslims appear in his account. This is also reflected in his tendency to describe the violence they committed against crusaders less vividly than violence perpetrated by the crusaders, as discussed above. These depictions of fearful Muslims do fit into a theme of depicting Muslims as lacking confidence that runs through Baldric’s account, as also reflected in his discussion of their concern with *fortuna* and belief that their society is in decline.

4.2.9 Muslims as Praiseworthy

Where the *Gesta* seems to have a very haphazard program of denigrating Muslims at one turn and building them up as opponents who demonstrate the valour of the crusaders at another, Baldric clearly set out his intention to be ‘balanced’: not to allow his natural bias towards Christians to diminish the Muslims’ strength because this would detract from the labours of the crusaders.⁵⁴¹ Overall, he does seem to have made some efforts to add more praise of their effectiveness in battle. He added conspicuous extra praise of their bravery. The inhabitants of Nicaea defended their walls and homes ‘with great strength’ and ‘bravely’ opposed the spears of the crusaders;⁵⁴² and later, despite attempts to undermine their morale by catapulting severed heads from a defeated relief force into the city, ‘the courageous gentiles resisted the Christians not a little’.⁵⁴³ Also at Nicaea, Baldric reported that the *Franci* praised the defenders’ industriousness in

⁵⁴⁰ ‘...ad desperationem usque timuerunt, et in fugam irreuocabiliter precipitati sunt.’ Baldric of Bourgueil, 92.

⁵⁴¹ Baldric of Bourgueil, 4.

⁵⁴² ‘Gentiles qui intus erant, econtra uiriliter instare, muros penatesque suos magna ui defensare... et superuenienti telorum nimbo se audacter opponere.’ Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Iherosolimitana*, 23.

⁵⁴³ ‘Non tamen gentiles minus animosiores Christianis resistebant,’ Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Iherosolimitana*, 24.

repairing their walls overnight after a breach had been made.⁵⁴⁴ When contact was first made with the defenders of Antioch, they were ‘fearless ones’ (*imperterriti*) who attacked fearlessly (*intrepidi*); and for a time, the ‘unwearied strength’ (*infatigata uirtus*) of the defenders of Albara allowed them to ‘boldly’ (*audacter*) hold off the Christian attackers.⁵⁴⁵

Baldric also retained the *Gesta*’s passage in praise of the Turks’ abilities as warriors, although he changed the emphasis and context. He made the purpose of the passage more explicit, introducing it by saying ‘we do not intend to call the *Turci* unwarlike’ in the context of their defeat at Dorylaeum, for they were ‘powerful men with excessive cunning’ and ‘bold spirit’. Baldric also accepted the *Gesta*’s argument that they had once been Christian, and that they believed themselves to share common ancestry with the Franks. He may even have accepted that they were correct, depending on how the following statement should be understood: ‘if they voluntarily returned to Christianity, then they could rightly boast that they were of the lineage of the *Franci*.’⁵⁴⁶ Baldric may either mean that their claim to be related was invalidated by their apostasy, or that while the Turks and the Franks were never related in the literal sense that the former believed, if they became Christian they would be united in the *familia Christi*; it is unclear which. In summing up his argument, however, he seems indeed to express a measure of sympathy for the Turks: they are ‘clever, wise and warlike’, but ‘this nobility is obscured’ because they are, ‘unfortunately, estranged from God.’⁵⁴⁷ While Baldric explained their defeat in more classical terms, he agreed with the *Gesta*’s assessment that the Turks were worthy of great respect but held back by their lack of Christian faith. In accordance with his claim to suppress his natural bias and affect neutrality between the Christians and their opponents – at least in military terms – Baldric does add to the *Gesta*’s praise of the Turks and (though he does not seem to make a distinction) Muslims generally.⁵⁴⁸

As with the other authors, Baldric generally approves of Muslims who convert to Christianity. He does seem to have had a particular concern

⁵⁴⁴ ‘eorum irrequietudinem laudauerunt’, Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Iherosolimitana*, 24.

⁵⁴⁵ Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Iherosolimitana*, 49, 91.

⁵⁴⁶ ‘Si tamen ad Christianissimum ultronei redirent, tunc demum de Francorum prosapia exortos sese recte gloriarentur.’ Baldric of Bourgueil, 33.

⁵⁴⁷ ‘...indubitanter uiri sunt ingeniosi, callidi et bellicosi; sed, proh dolor, a Deo alienati. Obfuscat igitur ingenuitas illa...’ Baldric of Bourgueil, 33.

⁵⁴⁸ Baldric’s admiration for the military capabilities of Muslims is also discussed by Ní Chléirigh, *The Crusaders and their Enemies*, 116.

with establishing that the conversions he described were sincere and uncoerced. Contrary to Joshua Birk's assertion that contemporary crusade historians other than the *Gesta* author were uncomfortable with conversion, Baldric discusses it frankly with no evasion.⁵⁴⁹ Indeed, he places considerable emphasis on Pirrus's conversion to Christianity as a factor in his decision to betray Antioch to the crusaders. The *Gesta* mentioned his intention to convert almost as an afterthought, focusing more on the personal relationship he developed with Bohemond, as well as the promise of reward and his desire to protect his family as reasons for Pirrus's betrayal of Antioch.⁵⁵⁰ Baldric centres Pirrus's motivation on conversion, and explicitly states that neither fear nor reward played any part in his decision. Baldric does say that Bohemond tried threats and promises of rewards, but these were aimed at persuading Pirrus to convert, not simply to betray Antioch, and the rewards were those which are 'gloriously intended by God for Christians' – as likely as not, Baldric meant spiritual rewards by this. These are also explicitly presented in terms of Bohemond being 'a man of many devices... [who] left nothing unattempted,' not as tactics that worked. Pirrus's actual decision results when 'God inspired him with what he ought to do'; and in his own words he reproved Bohemond:

I disregard any immediate threats to the city and afterwards to me of which you make a pretence. We are not the kind of men who are frightened by your threats. The city as you see is unassailable.⁵⁵¹

Baldric emphasises by repetition how unthreatened Pirrus felt. Continuing to speak through Pirrus, Baldric said he was instead motivated by Christianity, 'to which I seriously aspire'; everything he intended to do,

⁵⁴⁹ Joshua C. Birk, 'The Betrayal of Antioch: Narratives of Conversion and Conquest during the First Crusade', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 41(3) (2011), 463-485, pp 474-5.

⁵⁵⁰ *Gesta Francorum*, 44-7.

⁵⁵¹ 'Hunc Boamundus aliquando ad Christianitem incitabat; aliquando ad ciuitatem reddendam multimodis pollicitationibus suadebat; et, ut uir callens, nichil intemptatum relinquebat. Nunc enim eum pro infortuniis ciuitati imminentibus deterrebat; nunc cum pro premiis copiosis, que a Deo gloriose destinantur Christianitati, alliciebat... Iam etenim Deus ei aspirauerat quid agere deberet; et ut pro uoluntate Boamundo responderet...: "...Casus quoslibet imminentes urbi posthac michi pretendas nolo. Non sumus qui minis uestris deterreamur. Ciuitas enim ut uides inexpugnabilis est".' Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Iherosolimitana*, 53-4.

Pirrus says, 'I impute entirely to your Christianity'.⁵⁵² Baldric thus explicitly and repeatedly states that Pirrus freely and enthusiastically chose to convert to Christianity, inspired by God's intervention. He attributes Pirrus's betrayal of the city entirely to his desire to join the Christians, minimising any influence which threats or rewards had on this decision as well as his decision to convert. As suggested in the chapter on Robert the Monk's *Historia*, a central motivation for making these kinds of changes to the *Gesta Francorum*'s text may have been to avoid any prevent the shame of more sordid arrangements the anonymous author implied from diminishing the glory of the capture of Antioch.⁵⁵³ Ahmed ibn Marwan and the other *castellani* of Antioch who converted after Kerbogha's defeat in the *Gesta Francorum* receive more perfunctory treatment than Pirrus, but Baldric does seem to approve of this turn of events.⁵⁵⁴

4.3 Conclusion

This is the work of a skilled biblical scholar and a distinguished classicist. Baldric did not retain the *Gesta*'s verbal distinction between *Turci* and *Sarraceni*. There are a few vague implications in the text that he was nevertheless aware of two factions of the crusaders' enemies with different leaderships, but almost all of these are retained from the *Gesta* and may be nothing but artefacts of the source. The accumulation of these inconclusive hints does on balance suggest that Baldric intentionally depicted Muslims as falling into two politically distinct camps, but it is not something which he chose to emphasise. As with his source, there is no indication of the deeper religious differences, or in his case of any differences beyond possibly answering to different rulers. In most other ways, Baldric followed the *Gesta*'s depiction of the political structure of Muslim society, referring to the sultan, caliph and various emirs and equating them relatively accurately with western counterparts. He also retained the assumption that Muslims, like westerners, used declarations of personal fealty to organise their society.

He considerably elaborated the *Gesta*'s depiction of the character of Muslims. In some respects he followed his source closely; for the most part

⁵⁵² 'De Christianitate tua, ad quam uehementer suspiro,... loquaris uolo... quicquid agere dispono totum Christianitati uestre imputo.' Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Iherosolimitana*, 54.

⁵⁵³ See above, 3.2.10.

⁵⁵⁴ Baldric of Bourgueil, 84.

he wrote of Muslim wealth and materialism with little significant change from the *Gesta*. While he also did not depart from the *Gesta*'s tendency to depict Muslims as cowardly or stupid when it suited the narrative, and even added to this on occasion, he included much more praise of their military prowess. His elaborations take the form of apparent efforts to depict their way of thinking. He introduced a theme of Muslims being governed overall by pride. In describing the motivation of Kerbogha and his army, Baldric set up a deliberate contrast to his thesis that the crusaders fought for the sake of *caritas*, in order to defend their brothers out of love for them: their enemies, on the other hand, fought to defend their families and possessions because their pride and sense of personal honour would be injured if they did not. Baldric's tendency not to emphasise distinctions between different kinds of Muslims indicates that this was intended to be seen as a universal tendency. Baldric also leaned on his classical learning to construct a non-Christian mindset: he depicted Muslims as convinced that their society was in decline, having entered a 'golden age' (in the sense of one defined by luxury and declining martial vigour, rather than a period of excellence). He also drew on the Ciceronian concept of *anceps fortuna* to depict them as extremely unconfident and doubtful, a doubt which also extended to the power and favour of their gods – a strong contrast to the certainty provided by the Christian faith. This classically-influenced mindset may have stemmed from a desire to order the world according to classical principals (Baldric indicated elsewhere that he shared the opinion he attributed to the Muslims that their society was in decline due to an extended period of peace), an opportunity to show off his erudition, or a genuine belief that a classical model was the best way to interpret the mode of thought of non-Christians. Some combination of two or all of these factors is likely.

A detectable theme in Baldric's work, of which this classically-influenced mindset forms the basis, is the lack of confidence he attributed to Muslims in contrast to Christians. Where the crusaders were certain of God's assistance, Muslims were subject to the vagaries of Mars and *fortuna*, and certain that their society was in decline. This is reflected also in his frequent depictions of Muslims as fearful and cowardly. It is, however, contradicted by the occasions on which he described Muslims as arrogantly confident in their numbers and equipment. Baldric adopted many of these incidents from the *Gesta*, producing a somewhat muddled effect in his depiction of Muslims.

For the most part, Baldric also followed the example of the *Gesta* in the relatively positive statements he made about Islam. Like the *Gesta* author, he approved of Muslims converting, demonstrating that religious difference was the fundamental determinant of Muslim otherness in his view. He gave this greater emphasis, making it the central factor in Pirrus's betrayal of Antioch, and for reasons which are not entirely clear may have gone to some trouble to establish the free and spontaneous nature of the conversions he described. Baldric retained the *Gesta*'s passage in praise of the prowess of the Turks, although he changed the latter's religious interpretation of the reason they were defeated to a classical one. He also built on this, with many additional comments in praise of the Muslims' efforts in battle. This was probably intended to fulfil his aim set out in the prologue to depict the abilities of the Muslims fairly lest it appear that the crusaders had fought an unwarlike enemy and their great achievement would therefore be diminished. On balance, however, Baldric does not seem to have managed this. The occasional words of token praise are given in the context of his retention of the *Gesta*'s depiction of Muslims as stupid and cowardly, and also in the context of somewhat one-sided descriptions of violence. The effects of the crusaders' attacks on Muslims are depicted in much more vivid and graphic detail than vice versa. Despite Baldric's protestations, Muslims do not appear as effective as crusaders – but it is possible that this was the point all along. He may not have been sincere in his claim to neutrality but rather by making the claim he implicitly denied that the crusaders faced an unwarlike enemy, and freed himself to depict them as overwhelmingly successful without making their achievements seem too easy.

Baldric follows the *Gesta* in depicting Muslims as polytheists, overall adding considerably more detail. One detail he removed, however, was the name of Mohammed. There are many possible reasons for this omission, ranging from concern with the appropriateness of giving too much detail about non-Christian beliefs in a work in a genre which contained a large element of moral instruction as part of its purpose to Baldric's having been unable to verify the name externally and distrusting his source. Details which Baldric added included an assertion that they worshipped idols which they had set up in the Temples of God and Solomon; a detail strikingly similar to Fulcher of Chartres and Ralph of Caen's accounts and possibly based on a passage in Josephus. Baldric also drew on his classical education

to add detail to the *Gesta*'s depiction of Muslim beliefs. While his mentions of classical gods should be read as strictly metaphorical, he attempted to convey something of the psychology he assumed was common to non-Christians, depicting Muslims as believing in the decline of their society due to a period of peace and luxury (something he did himself think was true) and as particularly concerned with the vicissitudes of *fortuna* and the capriciousness of their gods in the absence of Christian certainty of God's favour. Baldric's various statements which elaborate on Muslim's beliefs specifically about their gods are less straightforward, and may not have been intended to be entirely consistent. Kerbogha is given one statement implying belief in the Christian God which is simply a continuation of Baldric's use of the conversation between the *atabeg* and his mother to make a point about divine assistance of the crusade. His other statement which indicates Muslims worshipped multiple gods is what should be read as reflecting Baldric's ideas about what Muslims believed. A statement attributed to al-Afdal, however, seems to suggest Muslims worshipped a single god, who was opposed to the single god worshipped by the Christians. This may be reconciled by assuming Baldric was thinking in terms of classical Greco-Roman 'patron' gods on this occasion, but it is also possible that he was applying a model based on the Old Testament (I Kings in particular) in this instance and was unconcerned with presenting a coherent picture of Muslim beliefs.

4.4 Manuscript G

The manuscript tradition of the *Historia Ierosolimitana* contains one particular variant, designated G by Biddlecombe following the RHC editors, which warrants some brief comment here as an appendix to this chapter. Paris, Bibliotheque Nationale, MS Lat. 5513 fols. 1r-67r (hereafter 'G') is a mid-twelfth century copy of Baldric's *Historia* with some minor omissions (most notably, the sermon at Clermont is abbreviated) and a number of extensive additions to the text.⁵⁵⁵ N. L. Paul has shown that many of these concern the exploits of Hugh of Chaumont, the lord of Amboise who joined the crusade, and other local Touraine leaders, indicating that the manuscript was probably produced in the region with the patronage of the contemporary

⁵⁵⁵ For a detailed description of the manuscript, see Biddlecombe, *The Historia Ierosolimitana of Baldric of Bourgueil*, lxxxiv-lxxxv.

seigniorial family of Amboise.⁵⁵⁶ Paul also identified a considerably more hostile attitude to Stephen of Blois, whose family had a long-standing rivalry with the counts of Anjou, the overlords of Amboise.⁵⁵⁷ However, the manuscript also contains a number of additions, mostly in the form of discrete anecdotes, which concern Muslims. While there are not enough additions to add up to a consistent program of revision, there are some which deserve comment. For example, G adds a postscript to the passage in praise of the Turks' abilities as warriors, reasserting the crusaders' superiority:

And because the Turks had thought to terrify and defeat the Frankish race with threats and arrows and diabolical shouting, just as [they had done to] the Saracens, Armenians, Greeks and Syrians, whom they had subjugated and made their tributaries. This will never be, for among us, affairs are managed with the sword, not the voice.⁵⁵⁸

Of particular note is a passage in which an unnamed emir used a false conversion to lure some crusaders into a trap. Having witnessed the conversions of Pirrus and 'the other emir' (probably referring to ibn Marwan), he claimed to own a great deal of land near Armenia which he promised to the crusaders. He led three hundred of Bohemond's knights into Armenia and abandoned them, ambushing them with a large Turkish force when they tried to find their way back. Most were executed but a few were sent as slaves to the sultan, who was disgusted with the treachery and had the slaves escorted to Edessa. This is remarkably similar to the plot which Guibert of Nogent accuses Pirrus of committing, though G is very clear that this particular emir is not Pirrus (G also adds a passage elsewhere which affirms the sincerity of Pirrus's conversion).⁵⁵⁹ Jay Rubenstein has argued convincingly that Guibert and Albert of Aachen both made use of a shared source or sources disseminated in oral form (probably a composed and performed source, as it is unlikely they could have either interviewed the

⁵⁵⁶ Nicholas L. Paul, 'Crusade, memory and regional politics in twelfth-century Amboise', *Journal of Medieval History*, 31:2 (2005), 127-141.

⁵⁵⁷ Ibid, 135-6.

⁵⁵⁸ 'Putauerunt namque Turci gentem Francorum minis et sagittis et diabolico clamore terrere et deuincere, sicut Sarracenos, Hermenios, Graecos et Surianos, quos subiugauerunt et tributarios sibi fecerunt. Quod nunquam erit, nam apud nostros res gladio, non uoce, geritur.' Baldric of Bourgueil, 33, n. J.

⁵⁵⁹ Baldric of Bourgueil, 84 n. s; 86 n. f. Cf above, 5.2.9.

same people or coincidentally heard so many of the same anecdotes).⁵⁶⁰ It seems that a version of a source Guibert heard must also have been encountered by the writer of G. They both also share the detail that Pirrus took the name Bohemond at his baptism.⁵⁶¹

Another intriguing possibility regarding G's sources is that the writer may have had direct access to a copy of the *Gesta Francorum* as well as the *Historia Ierosolimitana*. Two details which Baldric omitted from the *Historia* are replaced in G. The *Gesta* included an admonition from Bohemond to unwary crusaders at the beginning of the siege of Antioch, warning them that the enemy was always searching for opportunities to ambush and capture them. Baldric omitted this, but G attributes the following words to Bohemond: 'O worthless and wretched *gens*, where do you want to go? The enemy keeps watch for you; if they find you without companions and a leader, they will either kill or lead [you] back in captivity.'⁵⁶² The other instance of something from the *Gesta* reappearing in G is reinterpreted by the writer. In G, Kerbogha asks his mother about the beliefs of the Franks, saying: 'I think indeed that they believe in and worship no other god, but Bohemond and Tancred, who feed them, who recently gave them 2000 cows and 3000 pigs, which, as it has been related to me, their poor devoured in a single day like wolves'.⁵⁶³ The writer has changed both the words and the meaning of what the *Gesta* says here, which is that Kerbogha had heard the cows and pigs were consumed by Bohemond and Tancred themselves, but is still recognisably based on the *Gesta*. He seems to have tried to make this question appear more sensible, turning what was probably intended as humour into praise of Bohemond and Tancred's ability to provide for the poor.

⁵⁶⁰ Jay Rubenstein, 'Guibert of Nogent, Albert of Aachen and Fulcher of Chartres: Three Crusade Chronicles Intersect', *Writing the Early Crusades: Text, Transmission and Memory*, ed. Marcus Bull and Damien Kempf, (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2014), 24-37.

⁵⁶¹ Baldric of Bourgueil, 84 n.s; Cf above, 5.2.9, 5.2.11.

⁵⁶² '*O gens uilissima, et miserrima quo uultis abire? Hostes uos excubant, qui si uos sine sociis et duce inuenerint; aut occident aut in captiuitate reducent.*' Baldric of Bourgueil, 42, n. W. Cf *Gesta Francorum*, 33: '*Si autem inimici nostri inuenerint uos errantes, occident uos, quia die noctuque uigilant, ut uos sine ductore segregatos siue solos inueniant, uosque cotidie occidere et in captiuitate ducere laborant.*'

⁵⁶³ '*Puto enim nullum alium eos putare Deum nec colere, nisi Boamundum et Tancredum, qui eos pascunt, qui nuper eis dederunt II milia bouum et III milia porcorum; quos ut relatum est mihi, pauperes eorum, una die, ut lupi deuorant.*' Baldric of Bourgueil, 65, n. I. Cf *Gesta Francorum*, 55-6: '*Non sunt igitur Boamundus et Tancredus Francorum dii, et no eos liberant de inimicis suis? Et quod ipsi manducant in uno quoque prandio duo milia uacas et quatuor milia porcos?*'

5 The *Dei Gesta per Francos* of Guibert of Nogent

5.1 Introduction

Guibert, abbot of Nogent-sous-Coucy (†c. 1125), completed a revision of the *Gesta Francorum* to which the manuscript tradition gives the name *Dei Gesta per Francos* by 1108.⁵⁶⁴ Born to a noble family in Picardy, both his class and his local sympathies are evident throughout the text.⁵⁶⁵ Guibert was an extremely erudite scholar, and his revision was written in a self-consciously convoluted style. This may have resulted in it receiving less attention than it deserves – even among contemporaries it seems to have been unpopular, as Guibert himself seems to have expected.⁵⁶⁶ As with the other revisers, he only claimed to have improved the *Gesta*'s rhetoric. However, he added to certain sections extensively: the first book of the *Dei Gesta Per Francos*, the end of the fourth book and the major part of the seventh and last book, are a mixture of entirely original material and some drawn from other sources to which Guibert had access. These included the first redaction of the work of Fulcher of Chartres and a number of anecdotes drawn either from returning crusaders or, possibly, from one or more composed oral sources now lost. While he adhered relatively closely to the *Gesta Francorum*'s narrative of events aside from these additions, Guibert also made considerable changes to the theological message, emphases and background information of the *Gesta Francorum*. This included extensive changes to the *Gesta*'s depiction of Muslims. The expository material which comprises the first book in particular is well known for radically differentiating his interpretation of Islam from that of the *Gesta* and his contemporaries among the first generation of historians of the First Crusade, but as will be seen there were also other important changes.

⁵⁶⁴ The word order *Gesta Dei per Francos* is also used, as in the title of Levine's translation of Guibert's work, but this thesis will adhere to the version of the name used by Huygens in his edition. Guibert of Nogent, *The Deeds of God through the Franks: A Translation of Guibert de Nogent's Gesta Dei per Francos*, trans. Robert Levine (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 1997); idem, *Dei Gesta per Francos*, ed. R. B. C. Huygens, *Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Medievalis* 127a (Turnhout: Brepols, 1996). Henceforth Huygens' edition will be cited as 'Guibert of Nogent', with the page number of Levine's translation given afterwards in brackets where used. Levine's introduction is cited as 'Guibert of Nogent, trans. Levine'.

⁵⁶⁵ Guibert of Nogent, 12.

⁵⁶⁶ Guibert of Nogent, trans. Levine, 4.

5.1.1 Guibert's Identity and the date of the *Dei Gesta per Francos*

Guibert is highly unusual among crusade authors (and indeed among any of his contemporaries) in the level of information about his life which is available thanks to his autobiographical work, the *Monodiae*. Considerable scholarly attention has been drawn to this work, with much discussion of what it reveals about the state of mind of a (perhaps atypical) medieval man.⁵⁶⁷ And yet, many of the precise details of his life are not known for certain, as they are not mentioned in his autobiography. His date of birth has been narrowed down to between 1053-65. Edmond-René Labande, the most recent editor of the *Monodiae*, believed it was 1055 with a level of certainty about which Levine was tacitly sceptical; Rubenstein argues for c. 1060.⁵⁶⁸ A number of candidates have been suggested for his birthplace, among them Clermont-en-Beauvaisis, Agnetz, Catenoy, Bourgin and Aureville. Neither the date nor the place is mentioned in his autobiography. What is known, however, is that he was the son of a minor aristocratic family (but not which), and joined the monastery of St-Germer-de-Fly around the age of twelve. He was eventually promoted to the abbacy of the small monastery of Nogent in 1104. Any record of his death has been lost, but it is generally assumed to have been in 1125.⁵⁶⁹

The date of composition of the *Dei Gesta per Francos* is somewhat more certain. As Huygens discusses, there is a good deal of internal evidence to suggest a date of initial completion of 1108, before the dedicatory letter to Bishop Lisiard of Soissons was added in 1109. A *terminus ante quem* of 1108 is provided by a passage in Book VI, in which Guibert wrote of two letters from Anselm of Ribemont to Manasses II of Reims († 17 September 1106) 'a man of pious memory, who died almost two years previously'.⁵⁷⁰ Nogent was in the Archbishopric of Reims, so Guibert's information about the death of Manasses (whom he also mentioned affectionately in the *Monodiae*, and whom Huygens considered it very likely that he knew

⁵⁶⁷ Rubenstein presented a summary of the historiography on Guibert in his introduction to his own analysis of Guibert's thought: Jay Rubenstein, *Guibert of Nogent: Portrait of a Medieval Mind* (New York and London, 2002), 2-10.

⁵⁶⁸ Guibert of Nogent, trans. Levine, 2; Guibert of Nogent, *Monodies and On the Relics of Saints*, trans. Joseph McAlhany and Jay Rubenstein (London: Penguin, 2011), x. Rubenstein discusses his reasoning in the endnotes to the introduction, xxx n. 3.

⁵⁶⁹ Guibert of Nogent, trans. Levine, 2.

⁵⁷⁰ Guibert of Nogent, VI.872-883

personally) is probably reliable. Guibert provided other indications of a date of completion for the *Dei Gesta* in 1108: he mentioned the difficulties of Patriarch Ebremar of Jerusalem between 1105-7, but not his eventual displacement in favour of Ghibbelin of Arles (†1112) in 1108. Finally, Guibert mentioned a conversation he had had on the subject of Pope Paschal's visit to France *anno praeterito* (last year): this was in May-June 1107.⁵⁷¹

Jay Rubenstein initially argued that Guibert wrote the *Dei Gesta* with remarkable speed, beginning in 1107 and finishing by the end of 1108.⁵⁷² More recently he has qualified this view, arguing that although Guibert completed the bulk of the *Dei Gesta per Francos* in 1108, he returned to his work and added to it many times over the subsequent years. This being the case, however, it seems that whether by choice or by coincidence, these additions were for the most part restricted to events which occurred before 1108 and as such do not complicate the question of the initial date of completion. In his view, the work was mostly completed in 1107-8, with Guibert discovering the *Historia Hierosolymitana* of Fulcher of Chartres and adding material from it to the end of the *Dei Gesta* very shortly afterwards. He added other anecdotes and details throughout his manuscript, possibly as new quires or bifolios, as he came upon them, at some point including an extensive amount of material Rubenstein believed came from one or more 'performed oral sources' (discussed further below). Several of Guibert's autograph manuscripts for other works survive, and such revision seems to have been typical for him. Rubenstein argues that Guibert's revisions of the *Dei Gesta* came to a definitive end around 1120, when he incorporated two ideas from his polemical literature about relics and debates about the Eucharist which were on his mind at the time.⁵⁷³

⁵⁷¹ Guibert of Nogent, 52, II.42-7. Rubenstein added that Guibert's reference to the imprisonment and loss of title of Robert of Normandy in Book II, which implied that Robert had been in prison for some time, suggests he was writing during 1107 (Robert was imprisoned in September 1106). Rubenstein, *Guibert of Nogent*, 95-6.

⁵⁷² Rubenstein, *Guibert of Nogent*, 96. Rubenstein believed that Guibert completed the *Dei Gesta* (or at least the majority of it, as he would later argue) during a brief period in which the monks of Nogent had driven him out of office. See Guibert of Nogent, *Monodies and On the Relics of Saints*, xi.

⁵⁷³ Jay Rubenstein, 'Guibert of Nogent, Albert of Aachen and Fulcher of Chartres: Three Crusade Chronicles Intersect' in Marcus Bull and Damien Kempf (eds.), *Writing the Early Crusades: Text, Transmission and Memory* (Woodbridge, 2014), 24-37, 24-26, 37.

5.1.2 Guibert's adaptation of the *Gesta Francorum*

Guibert made his opinion of the *Gesta Francorum* clear in his preface and the dedicatory letter to Bishop Lisiard. Of all the revisors, he is perhaps the most scathing. In the letter, he referred to 'the vices, the style that slithers along the ground, of the earlier history.'⁵⁷⁴ In the preface, he described it as 'woven out of excessively simple words, often violating grammatical rules'; a work which 'may often bore the reader with the stale, flat quality of its language.'⁵⁷⁵ It was well enough for the less learned, he thought, but those who better understood the importance of good rhetorical style would 'either laugh or sleep' (a reference to Horace, *Ars Poetica* 105).⁵⁷⁶ Guibert set out his intention to improve its style, according to his own opinions of how such a work should best be written. He seems to have been aware that some might find his style overly complex. He made the somewhat inflammatory declaration (a stark contrast to the more conventional modesty *topoi*, which he also employed elsewhere) that 'if anyone accuses me of writing obscurely, let him fear inflicting on himself the stigma of weak intellect, since I know for certain that no one trained in letters can raise a question about whatever I may have said in the following book.'⁵⁷⁷ He later wrote that, in addition to the spiritual reward of the work, his aim in writing 'is to speak as I would wish someone else, writing the same story, would speak to me. For my mind loves that which is somewhat obscure, and detests a raw, unpolished style.'⁵⁷⁸ Guibert's own style has been criticised by some modern scholars, but also defended. Huygens judged his work to be marred by 'an affected style and pretentious vocabulary' in 1991, but later referred to him as an 'exceptionally well-endowed' stylist and a valuable source in the introduction to his edition of the *Dei Gesta* (Levine notes that Huygens's opinion of Guibert had been elevated by the process of producing the edition, with the RHC editors to blame for some of his former

⁵⁷⁴ '...vitia, immo illud humi serpens eloquium precedentis... Historiae...' Guibert of Nogent, 78 (23).

⁵⁷⁵ 'Erat siquidem eadem Historia, sed verbis contexta plus equo simplicibus et quae multotiens grammaticae naturas excederet lectoremque vapidum insipiditate sermonis sepius exanimare valeret...' Guibert of Nogent, 79 (24).

⁵⁷⁶ '...aut dormant; aut rident...' Guibert of Nogent, 80 (24).

⁵⁷⁷ 'Porro si quis aliquid subobscurum dictum causetur, notam sibi hebitudinis infligere vereatur, cum pro certo noverim quod ex his, quae in subiecto libro dixerim, nemini in litteris exercitato iuste questionem moverim.' Guibert of Nogent, 82 (25).

⁵⁷⁸ 'Talis namque animo meo voluntas adiacet, ut sit magis subobscurorum appetens, rudium vero et impolite dictorum fugitans.' Guibert of Nogent, 200 (90).

criticisms).⁵⁷⁹ Levine refers to the problems of translating 'a deliberately difficult writer', but also notes that he has been defended by such modern scholars as Labande, who praised his '*virtuosité*.' Certainly, Guibert's skill is in no doubt.

Several of Guibert's statements make it clear that he was giving some thought to a potential audience; in addition to those quoted above, on another occasion he invoked the possibility of being attacked by 'those who argue about the proper names of provinces' in reference to his uses of the terminology of the *Gesta Francorum* (this will be discussed further below).⁵⁸⁰ Quite who this audience was is less easy to imagine, however. His work has been seen as a work of propaganda in support of Bohemond's planned expedition against the Byzantine Empire, for which the prince of Antioch sought recruits in France in 1106. This expedition may indeed be the means by which the *Gesta Francorum* made its way to Guibert (it is also argued to have been used in Bohemond's recruitment tour).⁵⁸¹ Given the convoluted style and apparent unpopularity of Guibert's history, it seems it would have made for very ineffective propaganda if this were indeed his intention – but it may be that he aimed it at fellow-intellectuals for their own edification in order to be translated into a more accessible form and used in their preaching.

In his preface, Guibert granted that the contents of the *Gesta* must be accurate, although 'written down by whatever men, even if uneducated, God willed,' because he believed God's close involvement in the outcome of the crusade must extend to ensuring it was recorded truthfully.⁵⁸² His objection to the *Gesta* (unlike some of his objections to Fulcher of Chartres) were purely stylistic. As such, Guibert adhered closely to the narrative of the *Gesta Francorum*. He reproduced the events recounted in the *Gesta Francorum* in his own style, but only infrequently changed the substantive content.⁵⁸³ Nevertheless, in the more pointed changes which he made – including especially many additions, from brief comments to the extensive

⁵⁷⁹ Huygens, *La tradition manuscrite de Guibert de Nogent*, (The Hague, 1991), 20; Guibert of Nogent, ed. Huygens, 16; Guibert of Nogent, trans. Levine, 3.

⁵⁸⁰ '*...qui de propriis regionum nominibus certant...*' Guibert of Nogent, 82 – 3(26)

⁵⁸¹ See A. C. Krey, 'A neglected passage in the *Gesta* and its bearings on the literature of the First Crusade,' in *The Crusades and other historical essays presented to Dana C. Munro*, ed. L. J. Paetow, (New York, 1928), 57-78. Krey's argument is still accepted by some; see for example Flori, *Chroniqueurs et Propagandistes*, 317.

⁵⁸² '*per quos etiam rudes ipse voluerit conscribendam.*' Guibert of Nogent, 79 (24).

⁵⁸³ Guibert of Nogent, ed. Huygens, 14.

new material at the beginning and end of the *Dei Gesta* – he revealed many distinctive attitudes to a range of subjects, not least the definition and character of Islam. He emphasised the direct role of God in the crusade, although as Levine observes, this was not a theme which was missing from the *Gesta Francorum*, so this change was not ‘radical.’⁵⁸⁴ Guibert was dismissive of Germans, prejudiced against the poor and sympathetic to the nobility, and hostile to the Byzantines.⁵⁸⁵ Indeed, he reserved particular criticism for the Byzantines. As well as their practices of allowing priests to marry and selling Christian slaves to gentiles, he harshly criticised them for institutionalising prostitution.⁵⁸⁶ This kind of behaviour left them weak and easily susceptible to the attacks of the Turks, he added. Indeed Guibert’s disdain for the East as a whole was evident: he considered it a hotbed of heretical thought due to the effects of its climate on its inhabitants.⁵⁸⁷ Even beyond his central reclassification of the nature of their beliefs, Guibert expressed strong negative opinions about the nature and character of Muslims – which hardly seems surprising in light of these attitudes.

Guibert also displayed some aspect of his personality in his attitude to the information he imparted. He took pains to ensure the completeness and accuracy of many details in the *Dei Gesta per Francos*, at least as he understood them. He returned to events in the narrative later to include information he had discovered which contradicted or placed in context his earlier writings. This included twice returning to the story of Pirrus’s betrayal of Antioch and adding a new explanation for the rumours of cannibalism which the primary sources otherwise agree really did take place at Ma’arrat-an-Nu’mān (as discussed below). He admitted to having been unable to find an authoritative written source for the life of Mohammed, and excused his use of an unspecified performed oral source which he evidently did not fully trust to be accurate in its details by arguing that the precise

⁵⁸⁴ Guibert of Nogent, trans. Levine, 3.

⁵⁸⁵ On the Byzantines, see Guibert of Nogent, 92-3, 104-5; on Germans, see Guibert of Nogent, 108; on Guibert’s attitude to the rich and the poor see Levine’s analysis in Guibert of Nogent, trans. Levine, 9-11. For a thorough analysis of Guibert’s attitude to the Byzantines, see Léan Ní Chléirigh, ‘Anti-Byzantine Polemic in the *Dei Gesta per Francos* of Guibert, Abbot of Nogent-Sous-Coucy’, *Sailing to Byzantium: Papers from the First and Second Postgraduate Forums in Byzantine Studies*, (Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2009), 53-74; idem, ‘The Impact of the First Crusade on Western opinion towards the Byzantine Empire: The *Dei Gesta per Francos* of Guibert of Nogent and the *Historia Hierosolymitana* of Fulcher of Chartres’, in Conor Kostick, ed. *The Crusades and the Near East*, (Abingdon, 2011), 161-188.

⁵⁸⁶ Guibert of Nogent, 93, 104.

⁵⁸⁷ Guibert of Nogent, 92-4.

events were unimportant because he wished only to establish the character of Mohammed.⁵⁸⁸ He twice lamented his inability to discover the name of the papal legate who accompanied the crusaders, Adhemar of Le Puy, before giving it as *Aimarus* at the end of Book II, noting that he had finally learned it from a returned crusader.⁵⁸⁹ As discussed in detail below, he sought to connect such unfamiliar terms used by his source as *Turcus* and *Corrosanum* to authoritative classical knowledge before including them; he offered an explanation for the *Gesta*'s apparent misuse of 'Babylon' and the origin of the unfamiliar word *Sogdianus*; and he may have omitted the term *Calipha* (Caliph) because he was unable to confirm its meaning. That Guibert was capable of concealing his ignorance when he could not fill in the gaps is confirmed by his small but important change to the *Gesta Francorum*'s description of the grave goods found when some Turkish graves were looted. The anonymous author described money, weapons, clothing and 'other tools the names of which we do not know'; Guibert changed this latter phrase to 'other utensils that I shall refrain from describing', apparently wishing to appear knowledgeable even when he could not have been.⁵⁹⁰ Such evasions are rare, however, compared to the conscientiousness he displayed with regard to other matters.

5.1.3 Guibert's other sources

The *Gesta Francorum* was, of course, not Guibert's only source for the *Dei Gesta per Francos*. Just as he had finished the work, according to Guibert himself, he came across the *Historia Hierosolymitana* of Fulcher of Chartres. If Guibert's criticisms of the *Gesta* were purely stylistic, his scathing criticism of Fulcher also concerned the substance of the work. Not only did Fulcher produce 'swollen, foot-and-a-half-long words (Horace, *Ars Poetica* 97), and [pour] forth the blaring colors of vapid rhetorical schemes', but where the *Gesta* author had been guided to the truth by God, Fulcher's work was 'erroneous (*fallaciter*).'⁵⁹¹ Huygens observes that despite some inaccuracies in his references to Fulcher, it is certain that Guibert did actually see the *Historia*. Expressions he used in relation to Fulcher such as *comperimus*, *dicitur*, *nisi fallor* and more are probably stylistic formulae

⁵⁸⁸ Guibert of Nogent, 94.

⁵⁸⁹ Guibert of Nogent, 83, 117, 131.

⁵⁹⁰ '...alia plurima instrumenta, quae nominare nequimus.' *Gesta Francorum*, 42; '...pluraque alia utensilia, quae exprimere supersedimus.' Guibert of Nogent, 193 (86).

⁵⁹¹ 'Cur enim vir isdem ampullas et sesquipedalia verba proiciat et luridos inanum scematum colores exporrigat...' Guibert of Nogent, 329 (155).

Guibert used to distance himself from Fulcher. Guibert's distancing and criticism suggested to Huygens that he saw Fulcher as a rival and bitterly resented that the latter had access to information Guibert did not know.⁵⁹² It is possible that this played a part in Guibert's formation of his opinion, but possibly more crucial is Guibert's vehement disagreement with Fulcher's scepticism about the validity of the Holy Lance, which was often a contentious issue.⁵⁹³

Guibert included most of the material he drew from Fulcher of Chartres in one part of the text. Scattered throughout the *Dei Gesta*, however, are a number of other details and anecdotes which Guibert got from another source or sources. Some of these, he probably received from returning crusaders – as in the case of the name of Adhemar. Guibert himself claimed to have tested the *Gesta* against the testimony of returning crusaders, and wrote of the additions he made that '*Quae autem addiderim, aut ab his qui videre didicerim aut per me ipsum agnoverim.*'⁵⁹⁴ He distinguished between what he learned (*discere*) from eyewitnesses and what he knew (*agnoscere*) for himself. This distinction probably refers to the extra details and stories of the crusade on the one hand, which Guibert at least wished the reader to believe were from eyewitnesses if they were not in reality; and on the other hand, the expository material he added such as his summary of the history of heresy in the East or his identification of the Turks with the Parthians. Guibert clearly wanted to borrow as much eyewitness authority for his history as he could, probably influenced by Isidore of Seville's definition of *historia*: as Isidore wrote, 'among the ancients, no one would write a history unless he had been present and had seen what was written down.'⁵⁹⁵

On the basis of comparison with Albert of Aachen, Rubenstein has suggested that much of Guibert's additional material came from one or more 'oral, performed sources' rather than from individual returned crusaders – that is, from stories told to larger audiences for entertainment rather than conversations (though he does allow that the performers may have claimed to be veterans of the crusade, which would reconcile this with what Guibert says).⁵⁹⁶ Guibert and Albert share a number of details and anecdotes, but it is

⁵⁹² Guibert of Nogent, 15-16.

⁵⁹³ Guibert of Nogent, 332-3.

⁵⁹⁴ Guibert of Nogent, 82 (25).

⁵⁹⁵ Isidore of Seville, I.xli.1.

⁵⁹⁶ Rubenstein, 'Three Crusade Chronicles Intersect', 37.

highly unlikely that either used the other, or that they shared a lost written source – in Guibert’s case, as Rubenstein observes, it would be quite out of character with his behaviour in the rest of the *Dei Gesta* not to mention (and criticise) a written source he had used. In particular, Guibert is unlikely to have let the work of a German pass unscathed; he made his opinion of the role of the Germans in the crusade plain in Book II, when he recorded his own taunting of an archdeacon from Mainz on this matter.⁵⁹⁷ On the other hand, for them to have come across so many shared details by interviewing different crusaders – or even less likely, somehow by chance interviewing the *same* crusaders – would be far too great of a coincidence to be credible.⁵⁹⁸ There is also new material in the *Dei Gesta* which is not in Albert or Fulcher’s works, and some of these anecdotes or details may have indeed come from returned crusaders. So Guibert explicitly claims of his discovery of the name of Adhemar, for example, which there is no reason to doubt. However, given his declared willingness to resort to performed oral sources for his information about Mohammed, it is very likely that Jay Rubenstein is correct in his argument.⁵⁹⁹

⁵⁹⁷ Guibert of Nogent, 108.

⁵⁹⁸ Rubenstein, ‘Three Crusade Chronicles Intersect’, 35-6. Rubenstein listed the similar details and anecdotes: both noted enthusiasm about a supposedly miraculous goose in 1096; both described the Prince of Edessa adopting Baldwin as his son in a strange public ceremony (Guibert, 163-4; Albert, 168-76); only Albert and Guibert mention a conspiracy against Baldwin after he became count of Edessa (Guibert 164-5; Albert, 356-60); both mention a couple caught in the act of adultery and punished publicly (Guibert, 196; Albert, 334); Both mentioned the extreme poverty of Robert of Flanders on eve of final battle for Antioch, though they demonstrated it in completely different ways. (Albert, 334; Guibert, 236-7). Almost all chroniclers related that Hugh of Vermandois was sent to Constantinople after battle for Antioch and never returned. Guibert and Albert added that Baldwin of Mons accompanied him and Hugh barely survived a Turkish ambush, after which Baldwin never heard from again (Guibert, 243; Albert 340-2); both mentioned the defenders of Jerusalem tried to use Greek fire on the crusaders’ siege towers but the structures had been coated in vinegar to counter this (Guibert, 334; Albert 426); Both mention crusaders trampling one another in their rush to get into the city. Guibert added that the ‘Saracens’ had dug traps into which some crusaders fell; Albert says they fell into wells while pursuing ‘Saracens’ around the city’s cistern. (Guibert, 278-9; Albert, 428-30.) Both stressed the so-called Temple of Solomon was not the one whose destruction Christ foretold but one which had been rebuilt after this had already occurred (Guibert, 283; Albert, 434; both reported Godfrey rescuing one of his followers from a bear (Guibert, 285-6; Albert, 142-4). Both attributed the herd of camels, oxen and sheep captured en-route to Antioch to a trick by the Saracens (Albert, 458; Guibert, 296). Guibert claimed Godfrey of Bouillon was poisoned by Muslims, Albert heavily implied this (Guibert, 317; Albert, 510-12.) Finally, both mentioned the brief career of Gervais of Bazoches, appointed count of Tiberias 1107, and captured and killed in Damascus 1108, with his head taken as a trophy by his killers. See Rubenstein, ‘Three Crusade Chronicles Intersect’, 31-34.

⁵⁹⁹ ‘*Cuius mores vitamque cum nusquam scripta didicerim, quae a quibusdam disertioribus dici vulgo audierim nulli debet esse mirum si dicere velim.*’ Guibert of Nogent, 94.

Guibert also drew many quotations and paraphrases from the Bible and from classical works. The Vulgate is prominent, with a considerable number of borrowings from the books of Kings, Judges and Maccabees. Sallust was the strongest influence on Guibert as a historian, according to Huygens, even if he was only named on a single occasion.⁶⁰⁰ There are also references to the historical works of Suetonius, Titus Livy, Caesar, Justinus's epitome of Trogus Pompeius, Valerius Maximus, Solinus, Jordanes and Fredegar. Poets referenced include Terence, Horace, Lucan, Virgil, Ovid and Statius.⁶⁰¹ Jordanes, Solinus and Justinus are particularly important for the purposes of this thesis, as Guibert cited them as his sources of information connecting the Turks and Khorosan to people and places known in the classical world.

5.2 The Depiction of Muslims in Guibert of Nogent's *Dei Gesta Per Francos*

Guibert is well-known for making perhaps the most fundamental change of any of the revisors to the *Gesta Francorum*'s depiction of Muslims. As will be shown, this depiction drew on stereotypes of heresy (without ever explicitly calling Islam a heresy) and a tradition of travesties of the life of Mohammed which can be shown to have existed, but to which Guibert's exact relationship is obscure. Guibert's changes to the *Gesta* went considerably further than this, however. He elaborated on the distinction which the latter made between the Turks and the Saracens, providing more (albeit incomplete) detail and historical context. He made mistaken connections to classical people and places, and sought wherever possible to add explanations of important new terms. Related to his use of heresy as a model for Islam, he introduced a persistent theme of accusing Muslims of sexual deviance. He, of all the authors considered here, accused Muslims of the most treacherous behaviour. In addition to these new themes in his characterisation of Muslims, he maintained most of the tendencies found in the *Gesta*, often exaggerating them – in particular, he added a great deal of material accusing Muslims of savage treatment of Christians prior to the crusade. He was less inclined to offer praise of Muslim prowess, being somewhat more consistent in his assessment of their abilities, but did not always refrain from complimenting them. Finally, in his work one finds the strongest emphasis on the idea that the crusade had been foretold and

⁶⁰⁰ Guibert of Nogent, 188-9.

⁶⁰¹ Guibert of Nogent, ed. Huygens, 14-15

foreordained, with both an allegorical interpretation of the prophecy of Zechariah and repeated emphasis that Muslims too had seen signs that the crusade was coming. These themes will be discussed in more detail here.

5.2.1 Terminology

Guibert did not make many changes to the terminology of the *Gesta*: for the most part, he used the same terms, often in the same places. In particular, he followed the *Gesta*'s tendency to use *Turci* to refer to inhabitants of regions under Seljuk control and *Saraceni* for those ruled by the Fatimid Caliph, with some overlap around Ma'arrat an-Nu'man, where these regions bordered each other. Saracens appear only as part of large composite forces before the crusade reached Fatimid territories south of Antioch, and the same applies to Turks afterwards.⁶⁰² Saracens are part of the large forces gathered at Dorylaeum and by Kerbogha at Antioch, along with Arabs and Turks in the former case,⁶⁰³ and Turks, Arabs, Persians, *Publicani*, Azimites and *Agulani* in the latter case.⁶⁰⁴ Subsequently, they begin to be mentioned more frequently as the crusade moved on past Ma'arrat an-Nu'man, in which both Turks and Saracens were mentioned.⁶⁰⁵ Turks, for their part, as well as appearing alongside the Saracens at Ma'arrat an-Nu'man, appear in a small force composed only of Turks encountered near the city.⁶⁰⁶ The crusaders fought compound force of Turks, Arabs and Saracens at Tripoli, and a scouting force sent to monitor the siege of Jerusalem by al-Afdal was also composed of Turks, Arabs and Saracens.⁶⁰⁷ In the case of the Turks there is the exception of a Turkish force that Guibert says retained one of the towers of Jerusalem when the Fatimids used the distraction caused by the crusaders to retake the city.⁶⁰⁸ As this suggests, they are very clearly distinguished from the *Sarraceni* who are in overall control of the city. The scattered anecdotes Guibert added in Book VII, which referred to events in the crusade which he had most likely learned about after the earlier parts of his work were written, and to events that

⁶⁰² See above, 2.2.1.

⁶⁰³ Guibert of Nogent, 155.

⁶⁰⁴ Ibid, 208-209.

⁶⁰⁵ Ibid, 245, 251-2.

⁶⁰⁶ Ibid, 258.

⁶⁰⁷ Ibid, 260, 273.

⁶⁰⁸ Guibert of Nogent, 271.

occurred after the end of the *Gesta's* narrative, also follow this pattern.⁶⁰⁹ Unlike Baldric and Robert, Guibert was not only definitely aware of the distinction between Turks and 'Saracens' (in more detail than the *Gesta* itself provided), he also clearly recognised and adopted for himself the *Gesta* author's terms to distinguish them verbally.

Less straightforward is the connection Guibert made between Saracens; the emperor of Babylon; and Assyrians, a term which Guibert added to the *Gesta's* vocabulary for referring to Muslims. That the Saracens were the subjects of the emperor of Babylon (meaning Egypt, as discussed further below), is clear.⁶¹⁰ 'Saracen' and 'Egyptian' are used synonymously.⁶¹¹ Less straightforward is the Guibert's reason for twice referring to these people as Assyrians – an ancient people entirely unrelated to the Egyptians, and who were in fact fierce rivals of the Babylonians.⁶¹² In what sense he deemed this terminology correct (and as will be discussed next, this was a marked concern of his) is unclear. The Assyrians had inhabited the same general region, but to associate them with the Babylonians is inaccurate. This in itself was not uncharacteristic of Guibert, but he usually at least had justifications (albeit sometimes mistaken) for his terms. In this case, it is not clear what he meant. Given that he first used the term in the context of the Turks (whom he believed were the servants of the Persian Empire) conquering the 'Assyrians', he may have intended to evoke a particular interpretation of the Old Testament.⁶¹³ This interpretation, found in early medieval chronicles (notably the *Historiae adversum paganos* of Paulus Orosius, written c. 417-18), held that world history consisted of a

⁶⁰⁹ Guibert referred back to events at Antioch following the capture of Jerusalem, again referring to the inhabitants as Turks (Guibert of Nogent, 284). When he added an account of the Tafurs which recalled earlier events at Ma'arrat an-Nu'man, he again referred to both Turks and Saracens there (311). His short account of the Crusade of 1101, which never reached 'Saracen' lands, mentioned only Turks (313-17). Likewise, when Guibert added further details about the siege of Jerusalem towards the end of the *Dei Gesta*, he referred to the defenders as Saracens (334), and he also referred to Saracens fought at the capture Caesarea, one of the post-crusade incidents which he reported (346-7).

⁶¹⁰ See Guibert of Nogent, 271-2, where he mentioned that Jerusalem was conquered by the emperor of Babylon (*Babilonicus imperator*) and as a result, Saracens rather than Turks were fought there.

⁶¹¹ Guibert of Nogent, 300.

⁶¹² *Imperator itaque Babilonicus eas quas premisimus provincias magno exercitu occuparat, sed temporis processu Turcorum emergente copia, Assiriis evictis amiserat.* Guibert of Nogent, 100.

'Denique Franci, facto ex Sarracenis horribili, precipue ex Ethiopibus, carnificio, ad eorum tentoria iam solitaria revertuntur ac inestimabili spoliolum copia reficiuntur. Argenti dives et auri exinde gaza producit, Assiriae nobilitatis opes ac quaelibet preciosa suppellex habetur...' Guibert of Nogent, 300.

⁶¹³ Guibert of Nogent, 100.

sequence of four world monarchies of which the last was the Roman Empire, which would rule until the end of the world and the Last Judgment. In this theory, derived from the Book of Daniel chapters 2 and 7, the Persians were the world monarchy which preceded the Romans and conquered the world monarchy of the Assyrians.⁶¹⁴ It is not certain that this is what influenced Guibert, however: he drew connections between the Turks and the Persians in a completely separate part of the narrative to this initial mention of Assyrians, and the second time Assyrians come up neither Turks nor Persians were mentioned at all.⁶¹⁵

Guibert significantly altered the context in which some of the terms he took from the *Gesta* appeared. His entirely different interpretation of Islam significantly changes the meaning of the term *paganus*, which he retained from his source. This will be discussed further in the section below on Guibert's interpretation of Muslim beliefs. He also made comments on the *Gesta*'s use of the term *Turci* which warrant discussion here. Guibert made it clear in his introduction that he believed some of the *Gesta Francorum*'s terms to be new, distorted forms of the correct classical terminology, though he conceded to using the new terms for clarity:

...the names of men, provinces, and cities presented me with considerable difficulties. I knew some of the familiar ones were written down incorrectly by this author, and I do not doubt that in recording foreign, and therefore less known, names, errors were also made. For example we inveigh every day against the Turks, and we call Khorasan by its new name; when the old word has been forgotten and has almost disappeared, no use of ancient sources, even if they were available, has been made: I have chosen to use no word unless it were in common use. Had I used Parthians instead of Turks, as some have suggested, Caucasus and not Khorasan, in the pursuit of authenticity, I might have been misunderstood

⁶¹⁴ Anna Dorothee von den Brincken, *Studien zur lateinischen Weltchronistik bis in das Zeitalter Ottos von Freising* (Duesseldorf, 1957), 47-8, 74, 82-5.

⁶¹⁵ Guibert of Nogent, 157, 208.

and laid myself open to the attacks of those who argue about the proper names of provinces.⁶¹⁶

Guibert's thoughts on Khorosan will be discussed further alongside his idea about Babylon in the section of this chapter concerning the political structure of the Muslim world as he understood it. His opinion about the term *Turcus* is revealing. The Parthians were an ancient Middle Eastern people who had inhabited roughly the same region as the homelands of the Seljuk Turks. That and their legendary prowess with bows and arrows, in particular the 'Parthian shot', a tactic of turning around in the saddle to shoot at the enemy while retreating, is likely the reason for the association. Guibert attributed the use of similar tactics to the Turks. He wrote that the crusaders had difficulty adapting to something very much like the 'Parthian shot', as the Turks 'were not accustomed to shoot their arrows except when fleeing from battle.'⁶¹⁷ This connection between the Turks and the Parthians was not uncommon.⁶¹⁸ But while other authors were simply writing allusively, Guibert made it clear that he was not. In his remarks on the history of Islam he repeated the assertion, referring to 'the kingdom of the Parthians, whom we call by the corrupted name "Turks"'.⁶¹⁹ Guibert did adopt the *Gesta's*

⁶¹⁶ 'Porro de nominibus hominum, provinciarum et urbium multa michi est difficultas ingenita: dum enim quaedam, quorum attigerim notionem, male ab illo auctore expressa cognosco, remota quaelibet eoque magis incognita eadem pravitate enuntiata non dubito. Verbi gratia, Turcos cotidiano increpitamus strepitu, Corozaniam quiddam novi nominis vocitamus, ubi, vocabulorum vetustas quoniam pene prorsus oblitterata delituit, antiquitate omni, etiam si ad integrum patuisset, amota nichil nisi quod publice cantitatur dicere libuit: si enim Parthos, ut aliqui sentiunt, non Turcos, Caucasum, non Corozaniam, ponerem, quasi sectando autentica obscurus fierem meque illis, qui de propriis regionum nominibus certant, carpendum exponerem.' Guibert of Nogent, , 82 – 3(26).

⁶¹⁷ 'non soleant ipsas emittere nisi fugaciter pugnando sagittas.' Guibert of Nogent, 159.

⁶¹⁸ Robert the Monk described the use of the 'Parthian shot' by the Turks, and referred to them as 'Parthians' in a separate passage. Robert the Monk, 25 (760), 84 (845). Allusions to Turks as Parthians continued at least into the later twelfth century; a letter of 1169 mentioned a crusader who was killed by illness rather than 'Parthian darts or Syrian swords', W. J. Miller and C. N. L. Brooke (eds) *Letters of John of Salisbury*, ii (Oxford, 1979), p. 632, no. 287. William of Malmesbury (†1143) also shared this perception of a connection, alluding to a relevant work by Lucan. R. M. Thomson identified the pope's contrast between Frankish valour and Turkish cowardice in William's account of Urban II's sermon at Clermont as a reference to Lucan's account of the war between Pompey and the Parthians. In particular, William referenced Lucan's accusation that the Parthians used poisoned arrows, claiming the same of the Turks. R. M. Thomson, 'William of Malmesbury and the Latin Classics Revisited', *Proceedings of the British Academy* 129 (2005), 383-393, 391; William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Regum Anglorum* I, ed. and trans. R. A. B. Mynors, R. M. Thomson and M. Winterbottom, II vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), I.603.

⁶¹⁹ '...Parthorum regnum, quos Turcos corrupto nomine vocitamus...' Guibert of Nogent, 100.

uses of *Turci* in his revision, but he was clear in the passage quoted above that he believed Parthians to be the original, and therefore correct, term. At the very end of the *Dei Gesta per Francos*, Guibert cited the works of Pompeius Trogus and Jordanes as sources of information about the Parthians, if any reader doubted his conclusion.⁶²⁰ Guibert's citation of Pompeius Trogus must refer to Justinus's epitome of the *Philippic History*, as the original work was (and remains) lost. There is a good deal of overlap between Justinus's writings on the Parthians and Guibert's writing on the Turks, however, so Guibert probably simply misattributed his source. The most obvious similarity is the similarity of their military tactics. Justinus wrote of the Parthians:

They fight on horseback, either galloping forward or turning their backs. Often, too, they counterfeit flight, that they may throw their pursuers off their guard against being wounded by their arrows.⁶²¹

Justinus also noted that the Parthians practised polygamy and described them as inclined towards lustfulness (*in libidinem proiecti*), which is consistent with Guibert's depiction of Muslims in general.⁶²² It seems less likely that this influenced Guibert's thinking, however: as will be seen, it is clear that he attributed these supposed characteristics of Muslims to their religion rather than the traditional practices of their people. Justinus ended his account of the history of the Parthians by noting that their success in war against the Medes and the Elymaeans left them with an empire spanning 'from Mount Caucasus to the Euphrates'.⁶²³ As discussed below, Guibert believed that Khorosan, the homeland of the Turks according to the *Gesta*, was actually a new name for Caucasia. Most likely, Guibert's association of the Turks and the Parthians came first, as he is not the only author to make the connection. It thus seems possible that we can see Guibert's train of thought here: having, in his mind, confirmed that the Turks must be the Parthians, an explanation for the unfamiliar homeland attributed to them in

⁶²⁰ Guibert of Nogent, 352.

⁶²¹ 'Pugnant aut procurrentibus equis aut terga dantibus; saepe etiam fugam simulant ut incautiores aduersum uulnera insequentes habeant.' Marcus Junianus Justinus, *Abrégé des Histoires Philippiques de Trogue Pompée*, ed. and trans. Marie-Pierre Arnaud-Lindet, *Corpus Scriptorum Latinorum* (2003), <http://www.forumromanum.org/literature/justin/texte41.html> (accessed 11 May 2016); *Epitome of the Philippic History of Pompeius Trogus*, trans. John Selby Watson (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1853), XLI.2

⁶²² Justinus, *Epitome*, XLI.3

⁶²³ '...a monte Caucaso... usque flumen Euphraten...' Justinus, *Epitome*, XLI.6.

the *Gesta* was suggested by the same source. Guibert may then have gone on to consult other sources to confirm this, finding his answer in Solinus (as discussed below). It is, at least, easy to see how he might have come to feel confident in his errors, as the sources seemed to confirm each other.

Guibert's other cited source on the Parthians, Jordanes, gives further detail which Guibert did not include (asserting that the Parthians descended from deserters from the armies of the Goths who remained in Asia), as well as mentioning their prowess as warriors and their custom of archery.⁶²⁴ What is also striking here is that Jordanes cites Trogus Pompeius for his information about the Parthians. While this is by no means conclusive, it seems again that we have a rare glimpse of Guibert's working process. It suggests that he may well have been led to Justinus by finding and following up the citation by Jordanes. That Guibert did indeed read Justinus and did not simply borrow this citation from Jordanes is confirmed by other references to Justinus he made elsewhere in the text.⁶²⁵

A possible influence on Guibert's general way of thinking about terminology can also be found in Jordanes. Jordanes wrote that the *Venethi*, a race described by classical writers, were in his day known by new names, primarily the *Sclaveni* or the *Antes*. This provided a precedent for Guibert's argument that the Parthians had come to be known as the Turks.⁶²⁶ Guibert's conviction that the Turks were the Parthians going by a new name rather than a new people may also be rooted in a belief that the peoples of the Earth consisted of exactly 72 nations descended from the sons of Noah. This theory is explained in Isidore of Seville's *Etymologiae*, in which he stated that 'of the nations into which the earth is divided, fifteen are from Japhet, thirty-one from Ham, and twenty-seven from Shem, which adds up to seventy-three – or rather, as a proper accounting shows, seventy-two.' Isidore notes at IX.ii.38 that 'afterwards many of [the names of these nations] were changed.'⁶²⁷ Guibert may have sought an ancient people with

⁶²⁴ '...inter omnes pene Asiae nationes soli sagittarii sunt et acerrimi bellatores.' Jordanes, *De Origine Actibusque Getarum*, VI.47-8, <http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/iordanes1.html> (accessed 11 May 2016).

⁶²⁵ Guibert of Nogent, 85, 250.

⁶²⁶ '...Venetharum natio populosa consedit quorum nomina licet nunc per varias familias et loca mutantur, principaliter tamen Sclaveni et Antes nominantur.' Jordanes, *De Origine Actibusque Getarum*, V.34. The Venethi were mentioned in Tacitus, *Annales* 11.23, although it is unlikely that Guibert knew of this.

⁶²⁷ *The Etymologies of Isidore of Seville*, trans. Stephen A. Barney, W. J. Lewis and Charles Short, J. A. Beach and Oliver Berghof (Cambridge, 2006; rpr. 2011), IX.ii.2, 192; IX.ii.38, 194.

which to identify the Turks so as not to breach this limit of 72, choosing the Parthians for the reasons discussed above.

5.2.2 Muslim Beliefs

Guibert's interpretation of Islam is strikingly different from all other contemporary First Crusade histories. This has inevitably attracted scholarly attention, and so this element of Guibert's account has been relatively well-studied. Nevertheless, it is necessary to discuss here to complete the picture of Guibert's depiction of Islam. Guibert added an extensive introduction to his revision of the *Gesta* in the form of Book I. This included a polemical exposition of the various heresies which had come from the East, moving on to the errors of the contemporary Greek Church, and culminating in an account of the life of Mohammed and the foundation of Islam. Guibert therefore presented Islam as a form of Christian heresy rather than some kind of pagan polytheism. This is indicated in no small part by the context in which he first mentions it, but there are a number of other factors which reveal his interpretation of what Islam was. His account of the foundation of Islam begins with the actions of a heretic, and his account of the life of Mohammed echoes the contemporary stereotype of a heresiarch. Likewise, the details he gives about the tenets of Islam are primarily a disparaging assessment of the religion's sexual morality, which was also a stereotypical accusation against heretics. He characterised the religion as a licentious parody of Christianity and its founder as the tool of a bitter, satanically-inspired Christian heretic. Nevertheless, Guibert stopped just short of using the word *haeresis* to describe Islam. The closest word he used was *error*, a related but less specific term.⁶²⁸ Isidore of Seville's discussion of *haeresis* is helpful here: in his descriptions of the various heresies which he knew, he used the term *error* of mistaken beliefs in general, and the term *haeresis* to describe formalised collections of *errores* inspired by particular heresiarchs. As Isidore summed up this section of the *Etymologiae*: 'These are the heresies that have arisen in opposition to the Catholic faith... which, although they disagree with each other, differing among themselves in many errors,

⁶²⁸ Guibert of Nogent, 100 (36), 208 (94). Levine translates *error* as 'heresy' on these occasions, but the distinction is important. Kelly also noted that Guibert did not explicitly refer to Islam as heresy. Kelly, *Charting the Development of Crusading Ideology*, 223.

nevertheless conspire with a common name against the Church of God.’⁶²⁹ Guibert thus seems to have used heresy as a model for interpreting Islam, and to have used stereotypes of heretics and association with the Arian heresy to disparage Islam, but to have been reluctant to fully classify Islam as a heresy. This may perhaps have been because he could not find an authority that named it as a heresy as such.

Most of Guibert’s interpretation of Muslim beliefs can be found in his account of the foundation of Islam. To summarise: a hermit with heterodox views was prevented from becoming Patriarch of Alexandria. The hermit, ‘torn apart by bitter grief... like Arius [the founder of Arianism]... began to think carefully how to take vengeance by spreading the poison of false belief...’⁶³⁰ He was approached by the devil who advised him to seek out an impoverished young man: Mohammed. The hermit arranged an advantageous marriage to a wealthy widow for Mohammed. Their sexual misconduct caused Mohammed to develop epilepsy, but the hermit successfully convinced Mohammed’s wife and followers that his epileptic fits were the result of visions from God. The hermit filled Mohammed ‘with profane teaching drawn by the devil’s piping’, and spread his reputation as a prophet.⁶³¹ Mohammed went on to win followers through faking miracles and by preaching a lax doctrine in which every kind of sexual excess forbidden to Christians was permitted. Eventually, he died an ignominious death when he suffered an epileptic fit and was eaten by pigs.⁶³² As well as the aspersions cast on Muslim teachings, the depiction of Mohammed’s life is itself central to Guibert’s attack on Islam as a religion. As Daniel noted of the wider corpus of Christian accounts of the life of the Prophet, ‘The life of Muhammad was seen as an essential disproof of the Islamic claim to

⁶²⁹ ‘*Haec sunt haereses adversus catholicam fidem exortae... quae dum in se multis erroribus divisae invicem sibi dissentiant, communi tamen nomine adversus Ecclesiam Dei conspirant.*’ Isidore of Seville, VIII.v.70. See also VIII.iii.1; VIII.iv.2; VIII.v.54, 67.

⁶³⁰ ‘*Contemptus igitur cum mesticia dilaceratur atroci, quoniam non potuit ad id quod ambiebat assurgere, ad Arianismum similitudinem meditari secum anxie cepit, quomodo effuso quod conceperat perfidiae veneno ad sui ultionem catholica passim posset documenta pervertere... Hac antiquus hostis apud heremitam suum opportunitate provisa, his miserandum dictis aggreditur: “Si”, inquit, “vis evidens repulsae tuae solatium et multo maius, quam patriarcha valeres, habere magisterium, inter eos qui ad te proxime venient nota diligenter iuvenem tali veste, tali vultus et corporis habitudine, tali etiam nomine...”*’ Guibert of Nogent, 95 (33).

⁶³¹ ‘*Interea per hereticum heremitam ad prophana dogmata homo ille diaboli fistula imbuebatur ipsius quaquaversum preeunte preconio propheta ab universis creditur...*’ Guibert of Nogent, 97 (34).

⁶³² ‘*...accidit semel, dum solus obambulat, ut morbo elisus eodem caderet et inventus dum ipsa passione torquetur a porcis in tantum discerpitur, ut nullae eius preter talos reliquiae invenirentur.*’ Guibert of Nogent, 99 (35).

revelation.’ In attacking Islam’s founder (in his case as the epileptic dupe of a vengeful heretic), Guibert, like many before and after him, emphasised the illegitimacy of Islam. Even the reference to Mohammed’s poverty was a common aspect, and significant: ‘adding the reproach of low birth in a society with a strong sense of the propriety of secular lordship’.⁶³³

Guibert himself claimed to have been unable to find any written sources about Islam. Rather he was recording what he had heard spoken in public: he stated that his information was derived from ‘popular opinion (*plebeia opinio*)’ and what ‘I have heard told in public by some skilful speakers.’⁶³⁴ Unfortunately, it is not clear what Guibert is referring to here – sermons, epic poetry, or other forms of public speech? It might also be the case that he wished to avoid arousing any suspicion of undue interest in heterodox ideas and so suppressed a written source he possessed and affected some measure of nonchalance. No plausible candidates for a written source have been suggested, however. His claim that his source was oral is the only suggestion for which there is any evidence, though it unavoidably leaves a larger mystery (who was saying this, in what context, and when did it enter oral culture?) which may never be entirely solved.⁶³⁵ In any case, whether Guibert’s source was oral or written, it seems to have made no impact on any other contemporary crusade writers. The one other detail which can be gleaned from Guibert’s text is that he does not seem to have been entirely confident in this source: he excused any inaccuracies in his account of Mohammed saying that ‘to discuss whether these things are true or false is useless, since this is only concerned with how great that master was, from whom the glory of such noble misdeeds was spread...’. In any case, Guibert asserted, one could safely accuse Mohammed of anything

⁶³³ Daniel, *Islam and the West*, 100, 106.

⁶³⁴ ‘*Cuius mores vitamque cum nusquam scripta didicerim, quae a quibusdam disertioribus dici vulgo audierim nulli debet esse mirum si dicere velim.*’ Guibert of Nogent, *Dei Gesta per Francos*, 94; idem, *The Deeds of God through the Franks*, trans. Robert Levine, 32.

⁶³⁵ Sermons are definitely a strong possibility. There are some shared ideas in both Guibert’s account and the sermons of Ademar of Chabannes (the association of Islam with Arianism and the theme of Muslim sexual immorality appear, albeit none of Guibert’s other details). Guibert certainly did not hear them (Ademar died in 1034), but they at least demonstrate that Islam had at one point in the not too distant past been the subject of sermons, and its depiction by Ademar was much closer to Guibert’s ideas than those of the other First Crusade authors. See Frassetto, ‘The Image of the Saracen as Heretic in the Sermons of Ademar of Chabannes’, 83, 87, 90.

since his 'evil' (*malignitas*) was so great that it transcended anything that could be said about him.⁶³⁶

However Guibert encountered his information, it forms part of a tradition of polemic accounts of the life of Mohammed which had a long life.⁶³⁷ Guibert's account is particularly similar to three other near-contemporary Western European sources identified by Kangas, though his version is distinct enough from these that no direct link is likely.⁶³⁸ Some of the ideas in these accounts can ultimately be traced back to much earlier eastern Christian responses to Islam, but they all combine elements from more than one such source, and indeed go further in their depictions.⁶³⁹ Morton's suggestion that Guibert compiled his account from all the stories and rumours he could find is sensible, though we should not necessarily assume that Guibert was the one who did the compiling.⁶⁴⁰

On some points, Guibert's account of Muslim doctrine is little more than a direct inversion of Christian practice: as discussed below, Guibert specifically described Islamic doctrine as the inversion of Christian teachings. Indeed Kangas pointed out that the entire account also has the character of a reverse hagiography, with tricks and a humiliating death standing in for miracles and martyrdom.⁶⁴¹ In addition, these accounts resemble the findings of R.I. Moore that the accusation of lax sexual morals formed a part of the stereotypical depiction of marginalised groups within Western Christian society, such as lepers, Jews, and, especially, heretics and

⁶³⁶ 'Frustra plane ab aliquo si falsa an vera sint discutiatur, dum hoc solummodo attendatur quantus ille magister fuerit, de quo tam nobilium facinorum gloria propagatur: securus enim quis de eo male cantat, cuius malignitas quicquid pravi dicitur transcendit et superat.' Guibert of Nogent, 94 (32).

⁶³⁷ This is discussed in detail by Daniel, *Islam and the West*, 100-139.

⁶³⁸ Kangas, 'Inimicus Dei et Sanctae Christianitatis?', 142-7. These sources are the *Vita Mahumeti* of Embrico of Mainz (written c.1033); the *Otia de Machomete* by Gautier of Compiègne (written c.1137-115) and Adelphus's *Vita Machometi* (written c. 1150).

⁶³⁹ Morton provides a summary of these: John of Damascus, writing in the Eighth Century, was the first to suggest Mohammed was influenced by an Arian monk; the tradition that Mohammed was epileptic is found in the *Chronographia* of Theophanes the Confessor (d. 818); the tradition of the trained cow can be found in the Syriac *Legend of Sergius Bahira*, and although it is unclear where the story of Mohammed's consumption by pigs originated, it may derive from Iberian tradition. Morton, *Encountering Islam on the First Crusade*, 212-13. In Tolan's analysis, these later sources tended to go further towards to making Mohammed conform to the heresiarch typology and to make him a 'vivid scoundrel.' Tolan, *Saracens*, 138-9.

⁶⁴⁰ Morton, *Encountering Islam on the First Crusade*, 214.

⁶⁴¹ Sini Kangas, 'Inimicus Dei et Sanctae Christianitatis? Saracens and their Prophet in twelfth-century crusade propaganda and western travesties of Muhammad's life', in Conor Kostick (ed.), *The Crusades and the Near East* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2011), 131 - 160, 142.

heresiarchs.⁶⁴² Distorted as it is, Kangas noted that real Muslim tradition is also just about discernible: one of Mohammed's earliest converts was a Christian hermit named Bahira, his first wife was a wealthy widow, and his consumption by pigs is explicitly given by Guibert as the explanation for Muslims' belief that he ascended bodily to heaven (and their eschewing pork): 'They imagined that he had been taken up into heaven, with only his heels left as a monument for his faithful adherents, who visit them with great veneration, and condemn eating pork, because pigs consumed their lord with their bites.'⁶⁴³

Aside from supposed the loose sexual morals of Muslim doctrine which Guibert emphasised (discussed further below), Guibert included few actual details about Muslim beliefs. He concentrated instead on an account of Mohammed's life and the foundation of Islam. This is most likely due to the nature of the oral source he encountered, which is clearly part of the tradition of *Lives* of Mohammed discussed by Kangas. Guibert did include two very pertinent details at the beginning of the passage, however. According to 'popular opinion' (*plebeia opinio*) a man named Mohammed 'led them away from belief in the Son and in the Holy Spirit. He taught them to acknowledge only the person of the Father as the single, creating God, and he said that Jesus was entirely human.'⁶⁴⁴ Many of the crusade histories referred to Muslims as deniers of Christ (or depicted them rejecting Christ in attributed speech), but none is so specific as to suggest that they believed in the existence of Christ but not his divinity. Rather, these references were probably intended to establish Muslim rejection of *Christianity*, helping to legitimise violence against them. This more specific formulation of Muslim beliefs – not believing in Christ's divinity, or in the Trinity itself – is unique

⁶⁴² Kangas, 'Inimicus Dei et Sanctae Christianitatis?' 158; R. I. Moore, *The Formation of a Persecuting Society: authority and Deviance in Western Europe 950-1250*, (Second edition: Oxford, 2007 (originally published: 1987)), 58, 60-1. See also Michael Frassetto, *The Image of the Saracen as Heretic in the Sermons of Ademar of Chabannes* in David R. Blanks and Michael Frassetto (eds.), *Western Views of Islam in Medieval and Early Modern Europe: Perception of Other* (Basingstoke and London, 1999), pp 83-96, especially 90-6, in which Frassetto compared the depiction of Muslims in the sermons of Ademar of Chabannes to the stereotypical images of persecuted groups Moore discussed.

⁶⁴³ 'Hunc celitus assumptum astruunt et solos talos relictos ad suorum fidelium monimentum, quos etiam infinita veneratione revisunt; porcorum vero esum iusta prorsus ratione contempnunt, qui morsibus eorum dominum consumpserunt', Guibert of Nogent, *Gesta Dei per Francos*, 100 (36); Kangas, 'Inimicus Dei et Sanctae Christianitatis?', 150 – 1.

⁶⁴⁴ '...eos a Filii et Spiritus sancti prorsus credulitate diduxerit, solius Patris personae quasi deo uni et creatori inniti docuerit, Iesum purum hominem dixerit... ut breviter eius dogma concludam...' Guibert of Nogent, 94 (32).

to Guibert among the early First Crusade histories. It is also accurate; assuming it came from the same oral account of Mohammed's life in which echoes of real Muslim tradition are detectable, it is probably the most accurate detail there. This is similar to the Arian heresy, of which Guibert was aware, but he did not make a direct connection—unlike the Byzantine Church's attitude to the Holy Spirit, which he did directly compare to Arianism.⁶⁴⁵ The closest he came was to say that the hermit who inspired 'Mathomus' was driven by bitterness to seek vengeance by spreading false beliefs, 'like Arius.' That both the hermit and Arius were from Alexandria strengthens the connection further, but he does not add any comment. He must have intended to emphasise that Islam was something new in its own right, rather than simply a new form of an old heresy – an impression reinforced by his statement that since none of the Church Fathers had written about Mohammed, he must have lived recently.⁶⁴⁶ While he was not trying to make Islam just a new form of an old heresy, he was nevertheless trying to contaminate it with Arianism in the reader's mind. Guibert's statement also includes the crucial detail that Muslims were monotheists. He even apparently accepts that Muslims worshipped the same God as Christians, albeit in entirely the wrong way. Guibert also later clarified that Muslims did not worship Mohammed as a god, but saw him as 'a just man and a leader, through whom divine laws might be transmitted.'⁶⁴⁷ While this might seem to charitably leave closed one potential avenue for polemic, it is entirely compatible with his classification of Islam as *error* and his clear use of heresy as a model for interpreting Islam: a model which simply called for different polemical tactics. Thus, Guibert's interpretation of Islam arises from a distortion of genuine Muslim tradition to conform to stereotypical ideas of heresy and inversion of Christian behaviour, albeit with certain fundamentally accurate details included. It seems to form part of a tradition separate from the interpretations of all the other First Crusade authors, which had no influence on them, and yet which must have had some currency. It survives in written forms which both predated and appeared after the *Dei Gesta*, and if Guibert can be trusted – as he probably can – it was also being shared in some oral form.

⁶⁴⁵ 'Ex Alexandria Arius... emersit,' Guibert of Nogent, 90; '...si, inquam, ista aut quaelibet alia aut falso aut veraciter obtendi possunt, quid de Spiritu sancto dicturi sunt qui adhuc eum secundum reliquias hereseos Arrianæ minorem Patre et Filio prophana mente contendunt?' 91-2.

⁶⁴⁶ Guibert of Nogent, 94.

⁶⁴⁷ '...non eum deum, ut aliqui estimant, opinantur sed hominem iustum eundemque patronum, per quem leges divinae tradantur.' Guibert of Nogent, 100 (36).

Despite this depiction of Islam as a monotheist religion that is very similar to (if never explicitly referred to as) heresy, Guibert was content to adopt the *Gesta*'s use of the term *paganus* without comment.⁶⁴⁸ The very evident care he took to research such unfamiliar terms as 'Khorosan' and 'Turk', and his expressed preference for what he believed to be the original terms suggests that this was no accident, and indeed it is clear from uses of the term in material that he added that his adoption of the term was deliberate. Guibert was very deliberate in his use of terminology. Norman Daniel wrote of Adam of Lille that he 'generally preferred to use the term *pagan*, but this does not imply that he meant *idolator* to be understood; in fact, it is clear from the body of the text that that is not the case. Credulous of unattractive and unconvincing legends of the life and death of the Prophet, his choice of terms may be a mere expression of dislike.'⁶⁴⁹ This description could easily be applied to Guibert as well, and may plausibly explain his use of the term *paganus*. But, as seen above, Guibert was self-consciously precise in his terminology (or at least tried to be); if he intended 'pagan' to be an expression of dislike then he nonetheless must also have considered it one which satisfactorily expressed the depiction of Muslims he wished to create. It is therefore likely that he considered *paganus* a suitable generic term for non-Christians in general, even monotheists who closely resembled heretics. This may also explain the *Gesta* author's original use of the term, though his depiction of Muslims was closer to a classical definition of 'pagan.'

Outside of this introductory passage, Guibert made little mention of Muslim beliefs, but he did usually alter what was in his source to conform to this alternative model. In the two places the *Gesta* mentioned Muslim gods, Guibert made changes. At the beginning of Kerbogha's letter, he added the following: 'Fathers and lords, I am grateful that the supreme divinity continually provides us with good fortune, and offers us victory everywhere over the enemies of our people...'⁶⁵⁰ This singular deity is echoed later in the letter, at the point in which Kerbogha swore by Mohammed and the gods in the *Gesta*: Guibert changed this to 'the high Thunderer (*Tonantus*)' (in the second case of multiple gods being mentioned by the *Gesta* author, Guibert

⁶⁴⁸ For examples, see Guibert of Nogent, 94, 254, 279, 280, 283, 311.

⁶⁴⁹ Daniel, *Islam and the West*, 214.

⁶⁵⁰ '*Gratulor summae divinitati, patres ac domini, quod tempora nobis gaudiis semper oportuna suppeditat et victorias de hostibus gentium ubique ministrat.*' Guibert of Nogent, 211 (96).

simply omitted this).⁶⁵¹ While ‘the supreme divinity’ could be read as implying the existence of other lesser deities, it is more likely that Guibert simply meant this as a formal way of addressing a single god. Likewise the reference to *Tonantus* seems to invoke Jupiter: *Tonans* was one of his epithets.⁶⁵² However, it was probably intended to give Kerbogha’s letter a bombastic style rather than imply Muslims worshipped the Roman gods. That would directly contradict the material he added at the beginning of his account, and his editing of the *Gesta* here does suggest that the accuracy of its references to Muslim polytheism was on his mind even if this passage appears somewhat ambiguous in isolation.

5.2.3 Violence by Muslims

Guibert added accounts of Muslim violence and cruelty to his version of Urban II’s sermon at Clermont. Guibert had Urban describe how the Muslims extorted tolls from pilgrims, even going so far as to cut open poor pilgrims in the mistaken belief that they had swallowed their money for safe-keeping:

‘...the governors of the gentiles commonly coerce with blows those who are slow to give gifts. What shall we say about those who have taken up the journey, trusting in their naked poverty...? ...the skin of their bones was probed, cut and stripped in search of anything they might have sewed within...they cut their bellies open with swords, opening their inner organs...’⁶⁵³

A notable feature of the *Gesta Francorum*’s treatment of violence is that the graphic nature of the violence depicted becomes much more one-sided after its account of the fate of the People’s Crusade.⁶⁵⁴ The People’s Crusade was easily defeated, but the Princes’ Crusade was depicted as considerably more effective. After this initial burst of violence established their supposed

⁶⁵¹ Guibert of Nogent, 212 (96); Al-Afdal’s speech, which contains the *Gesta*’s second mention of multiple Muslim gods, is turned into indirect speech by Guibert, with any reference to a god or gods omitted. Guibert of Nogent, 298-9 (140).

⁶⁵² See, for example, Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 1.170, 2.466, 11.198.

⁶⁵³ ‘...gentilium prefecti consueverint verberibus truculenter urgere! Quid de his dicturi sumus qui, nichil prorsus habentes, nudae fiducia paupertatis, dum nil preter corpora videntur habere quod perdant, illud iter arripiunt? ...dum callos talorum ne forte quippiam ibi insuerint dissecando ac revellendo rimantur... discissis ventribus intestinorum quorumque involucra distendentes quicquid habet natura secreti horribili concisione aperiunt.’ Guibert of Nogent, 116; (45).

⁶⁵⁴ See above, 2.2.3.

savagery, an imbalance emerged between the *Gesta* author's depiction of the effects of violence by Muslims as compared to the vivid descriptions of the effectiveness of violence committed by participants in the Princes' Crusade. As with the other revisors, Guibert expanded this tendency, adding more historical violence against Eastern Christians and pilgrims to establish Muslim violence firmly in the 'past' with respect to his main narrative, but including fewer examples after the arrival of the main body of the crusader army.⁶⁵⁵ Relative to the other *Gesta* revisers, however, Guibert's depiction of Muslims remained somewhat more formidable, though this often served only to underscore eventual Christian victories. Guibert noted high Christian casualties during the final battle for Antioch, against a Turkish cavalry line that extended for two miles.⁶⁵⁶ In the same battle, he described the Turkish advance:

The enemy, screaming like madmen, rushed to meet them. For it was their custom when they entered battle to make constant, terrible noise with the metal shafts they used as spears, as well as with cymbals and their own horrifying voices, so that horses and men could scarcely check their terror of such a sound.⁶⁵⁷

He was quick to add, however, that this effort at intimidation did not avail them, and they were quickly defeated. Guibert also accused the Turks of taking heads as trophies on three occasions. The first was during the siege of Antioch, when the crusaders themselves displayed the severed heads of some Turkish soldiers before the city to demoralise the inhabitants; possibly feeling a need to defend this practice by accusing the Turks of something similar but worse, Guibert claimed that 'it is, of course, the custom of the Gentiles to keep decapitated heads and to display them as a sign of victory.'⁶⁵⁸ He repeated this accusation when describing the defeat of the 1101 expedition, and again in more detail when describing the fate of Gervais of Bazoches, the Prince of Galilee, who was tied to a tree and shot with arrows before the top of his skull was cut off to be made into a drinking

⁶⁵⁵ See above, 3.2.5, 4.1.8.

⁶⁵⁶ Guibert of Nogent, 239.

⁶⁵⁷ '*E regione etiam hostium multitudo, rabie intoleranda conclamans, et ipsa concurrat. Est autem huiusmodi eorum mos in acie positorum, ut cannis aereis, quibus pro hastilibus utuntur, et cymbalorum tinnitibus terrificisque vocibus infinitos fragores emittant, ut vix equi hominesque a tanti sonitus terrore subsistant.*' Guibert of Nogent, 241 (111).

⁶⁵⁸ '*Est autem ea consuetudo gentilium, ut cesorum capita ad indicium victoriae reservare ac ostentare soleant.*' Guibert of Nogent, 189, (84).

cup for the emir (referred to as *rex*) of Damascus.⁶⁵⁹ However, while Guibert does maintain a more consistent depiction of Muslims as savage and threatening, examples such as these are still relatively infrequent and scattered through the *Dei Gesta*. The impression of an imbalance between how militarily effective Muslims and Christians appeared once the crusaders arrived on the scene was also maintained by Guibert's tendency to add to and exaggerate the graphic violence against Muslims depicted in the *Gesta Francorum*, as will now be discussed.

5.2.4 Violence against Muslims

Guibert exaggerated accounts of violence against Muslims as depicted in the *Gesta*. His treatment of the massacre at Jerusalem is a typical example. He intensified the *Gesta*'s account of the amount of blood at the Temple of Solomon, a frequently revised passage. At first, 'a wave of blood almost covered the ankles of the advancing men.'⁶⁶⁰ This is the same level of blood mentioned by the *Gesta*, but the image of a 'wave of blood' is considerably more graphic. When the crusaders returned, rather than just blood flowing on the floor, 'they inflicted such slaughter on the wretches within the temple that the blood of the innumerable crowd of those who were killed nearly submerged their boots.'⁶⁶¹ Guibert also added the striking detail that the crusaders allowed some victims to live long enough to remove the bodies from the Temple before also killing them.⁶⁶² Guibert similarly intensified the *Gesta*'s description of the battle of Dorylaeum, which included little graphic detail. In Guibert's account, 'we hardly had enough swords to do all the killing. Swords became dull with cutting so many limbs; they cut men down the way reapers cut wheat with a scythe. Here they cut a head, here a nose, here a throat, here a pair of ears; a belly is sliced open; everyone in their path dies. Hands become stupified, arms grow stiff with gore.'⁶⁶³

⁶⁵⁹ Ibid, 316, 350.

⁶⁶⁰ '...tanta extitit humani cruoris effusio, ut procedentium prope talos irrigui sanguinis unda submergeret.' Guibert of Nogent, 279.

⁶⁶¹ '...tanta miseros intra fani ambitum cede dilacerant, ut cruores peremptorum sine numero calceorum pene oras excederent.' Guibert of Nogent, 281 (131). Cf above, 2.2.3.

⁶⁶² Ibid.

⁶⁶³ 'Dampna ferens membris cuiusque retunditur ensis/falce velut segetes, sic resecant homines:/hic caput, hic nares, hic guttura truncat, hic aures,/scinditur alvus huic, obvius omnis obit,/obstupere manus, riguerunt brachia cede.' Guibert of Nogent, 157 (67).

As well as adding and intensifying such descriptions of graphic violence as these, Guibert made a number of explicitly hostile comments in the context of violence against Muslims. At the conclusion of his description of one of the battles outside Antioch (9 February 1098), Guibert declared that 'it was right that on the day before the Christians were to fast they grew fat on what they most desired, the blood of their enemies.'⁶⁶⁴ Later, Guibert wrote that the Armenian women of Antioch watched another battle from the walls of Antioch 'feeding upon the sight; as they watched the Turks perish and submit to calamity they groaned openly, but then turned their faces away and secretly applauded...'⁶⁶⁵ He also claimed that at the final battle for Antioch, the crusaders 'were not carried away by the desire for the booty lying about, but instead preferred to feed only on the blood of the enemies of Christ...'⁶⁶⁶ Possibly related to this increased hostility is his justification of the slaughter in Jerusalem in similar terms to that which pervades Robert the Monk's entire *Historia*.⁶⁶⁷ Guibert declared that by acting through the crusaders, 'God repaid them who had inflicted such pain and death upon the pilgrims – who had suffered for such a long time in that land – by exacting a retribution equal to their hideous crimes.'⁶⁶⁸ The righteousness of this justification was also supported by Guibert's inclusion of such graphically detailed accounts of violence by Muslims against pilgrims and Eastern Christians prior to the crusade, as seen above.

5.2.5 The Structure of Muslim Society

Guibert's account of the fundamental division between the two Muslim powers the crusaders faced was much more detailed than any other

⁶⁶⁴ '...nec id iniuria, ut qua die ante ipsa ieiunia debentur Christianis epulae, ea quam potissimum affectabant, hostium iniquorum saginarentur cede.' Guibert of Nogent, 189 (84). Guibert's reference to fasting is due to the beginning of lent on 9 February 1098, the day after he believed the battle took place (he referred to the battle as taking place five days before the Ides of February, i.e. 8 February). As both Huygens and Levine noted, this battle actually took place on 9 February, but Guibert seems to have thought it occurred the day before.

⁶⁶⁵ 'Mulieres urbis indigenae, christianae quidem, circa muri propugnacula spectaculo huiusmodi pascebantur et dum Turcos perimi totque erumnis addici conspiciunt, a facie ingemunt, sed aversis vultibus Francorum prosperis eventibus latenter applaudunt.' Guibert of Nogent, 192 (86).

⁶⁶⁶ '...nec spoliis hinc inde iacentium cupidine raptabantur, Christi inimicorum solo pasci cruore malentes.' 241 (111).

⁶⁶⁷ See above, 3.1.2, 3.2.5.

⁶⁶⁸ '...deo eis referente vicem, qui tot pro se peregrinantium penas et mortes, quas tanto fuerant tempore ibidem passi, digna nequissimis retributione restituit.' Guibert of Nogent, 283, (132). The idea of the crusade as divine vengeance is discussed in more detail by Throop, *Crusading as an Act of Vengeance, passim*.

of the authors considered here. He wrote that the *imperator Babilonicus* had conquered Syria and the Holy Land, before losing ground to the Turks.⁶⁶⁹ In particular, as alluded to above, he was aware that Jerusalem itself changed hands during the crusade, with the Fatimid Caliphate seizing the opportunity offered by the Seljuk Turks' engagement with the crusaders to take back the city. Guibert used the passage in which he discussed this to add some detail to the statement in his introduction. The emperor of Babylon had sent emissaries to the crusaders at Antioch to determine whether they would be useful allies against the Turks. The *rex Persarum* had taken a great deal of territory from the Babylonian empire. When news reached him of the crusaders' defeat of Kerbogha, however, the 'Babylonian prince (*Babilonicus princeps*)' laid siege to Jerusalem, capturing it by force or capitulation, Guibert did not know which.⁶⁷⁰ A Turkish garrison retained one of the towers, according to Guibert, but remained neutral when the crusaders themselves laid siege to the city in turn. Guibert is the only author to mention this detail, and his source for it is not known. Due to their neutrality, the crusaders 'fought only Saracens' at Jerusalem, a statement that confirms both Guibert's retention of the *Gesta*'s distinction between these two groups by terminology and that he referred to the Saracen people and the Babylonian empire interchangeably.⁶⁷¹

Guibert's understanding of Muslim history as displayed here is simplified: as with his source, Guibert only mentions the Abbasid Caliph, treating the Fatimid Caliphate as if it were an empire. He conflated this 'empire' with the Fatimid Caliphate's predecessors, the Umayyad and Rashidun Caliphates, incorrectly assuming that it extended back to the foundation of Islam.⁶⁷² The Seljuk-Fatimid divide was the most immediately relevant element of Muslim history to the crusaders, however. If the *Gesta* author implied awareness of the division through his use of language, Guibert clearly demonstrated a more detailed, if still flawed, understanding of it.

The *Gesta* author consistently used 'Babylonian' to refer to the Fatimid Caliphate. Guibert followed this usage, but felt it demanded

⁶⁶⁹ '*Imperator itaque Babilonicus eas quas premisimus provincias magno exercitu occuparat, sed temporis processu Turcorum emergente copia, Assiriis evictis amiserat.*' Guibert of Nogent, 100.

⁶⁷⁰ Guibert of Nogent, 271-2 (126-7).

⁶⁷¹ Ibid.

⁶⁷² Guibert of Nogent, 100.

explanation: the Fatimids were based in Egypt, as he clearly knew, which was obviously not the same as the Babylon of which he would have been aware from the Old Testament (if not also from historical works). As with the Turks who were really the Parthians, his explanation was that, ‘as some say (*ut asserunt*)’, Memphis (the capital of ancient Egypt) had come to be known as Babylon due to the mutation of language. He justified this on the basis of comparison with Normandy and Lotharingia, formerly known as *Neustria* and *Austrasia*, respectively.⁶⁷³ Similarly Guibert believed Khorosan to be a corrupted name for Caucasia. At the very end of his account, Guibert cited his source for this, so it is easy to see his thought-process. Having encountered the unfamiliar place-name, Guibert turned to the classical works available to him, finding an explanation in Solinus’s *Wonders*. Solinus said the Caucasus mountain range (clearly what Guibert means by ‘Caucasia’ if this is his source) was known by different names along its length – *Imaus*, *Propanisus*, *Niphates*, *Taurus* and, as it was known by the Parthians, *Choatras*.⁶⁷⁴ Solinus also later said that the Scythians called the Caucasus mountains *Cruocasim*.⁶⁷⁵ Jordanes, whom Guibert cited as one of his sources for the identity of the Parthians, included an almost identical passage, although the name he claimed the Parthians knew the range by, *Castra*, differed slightly.⁶⁷⁶ Any one of these may have struck Guibert as similar enough to the *Gesta* author’s ‘*Corrosanum*’ to explain the origin of the term. Alternatively, if he did not assume there was so direct a connection, these passages at least established that the Caucasus mountains were often known by other names. Guibert thus added detail to the *Gesta* author’s location of Muslim centres of power, although these details were to a greater or lesser extent mistaken.

Guibert followed the *Gesta* in its tendency to assume many institutions of Muslim political organisation were essentially the same as Christian ones, elaborating this in some cases. Like the *Gesta*, Guibert had Shams-ad-Daula offer to perform homage to Kerbogha (*facto tibi hominio*) in exchange for his help recovering Antioch from the crusaders. In turn, after rebuffing Shams-ad-Daula, Kerbogha mentioned the fidelity (*fidelitas*) owed to him by the subordinate to whom he gave command of Antioch’s citadel

⁶⁷³ Guibert of Nogent, 26, 94.

⁶⁷⁴ Gaius Iulius Solinus, *De Mirabilibus Mundi*, ed. Theodore Mommsen (1895), <http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/solinus5.html> (accessed 11 May 2016), XXXVIII.10–12.

⁶⁷⁵ Solinus, *De Mirabilibus Mundi*, XLIX.6.

⁶⁷⁶ Jordanes, *De Origine Actibusque Getarum* VII.55.

(Ahmed ibn Marwan).⁶⁷⁷ Guibert also assumed (admittedly, with relative accuracy) the equivalence of certain Muslim and contemporary Western or classical Roman offices. He interpreted the title 'sultan' as being a title for the 'king of the Persians' derived from the name of a previous ruler, Sogdianus, as the Romans had done with the title Caesar.⁶⁷⁸ Once more we can discern Guibert's thought-processes: Sogdianus was the name of an obscure Persian emperor, who reigned briefly from 424-423 BC. Sogdianus was mentioned in passing by Solinus, with whose work we know Guibert was familiar⁶⁷⁹. He would have learned little but the name Sogdianus if Solinus was his only source, but this seems likely given that any further information about his brief and undistinguished reign would have suggested to Guibert that he was an extremely unlikely candidate to lend his name to all future monarchs. Guibert was most likely simply struck by the similarity of the name to the *Gesta Francorum*'s *Soldanus* and assumed it was what his main source had meant.⁶⁸⁰ After offering this Roman-modelled explanation for the title, Guibert subsequently refers to the sultan exclusively as the 'king of the Persians (*rex Persarum*)', on one occasion having Kerbogha address him more formally as the 'lord and king of the Persians'.⁶⁸¹ Guibert thus seems to have been certain of the equivalence between a sultan and a *rex*. Adapting the *Gesta* to match his interpretation of Islam, he referred to the 'the chief pontiff of their error' (*summum sui erroris pontifex*) adding parenthetically 'for they even have their own pope, in the likeness of ours', and later having Kerbogha address him as 'most blessed pope (*papa beatissimus*)'.⁶⁸² This replaced the *Gesta*'s mention of *caliphae nostro apostolico*, with Guibert here dropping the *Gesta*'s accurate term (caliph) – possibly because he did not manage to find an explanation for it which satisfied him, unlike such terms as *turcus*, *Sogdianus* or *Corrossanum*.⁶⁸³

⁶⁷⁷ Guibert of Nogent, 210.

⁶⁷⁸ '...*regi Persarum, quem veteri "Sogdianum" nomine, ut Romani "Cesares" vocare solent...*' Guibert of Nogent, 208.

⁶⁷⁹ Solinus, *De Mirabilibus Mundi*, XLIX.3.

⁶⁸⁰ *Gesta Francorum*, 59, 66.

⁶⁸¹ Guibert of Nogent, 208, 211, 271.

⁶⁸² '...*a summo sui erroris pontifice – habent enim et papam suum, ad instar nostri...*' Guibert of Nogent, 208; Kerbogha addresses the caliph as *papa beatissimus* on p. 211.

⁶⁸³ See above, 2.2.4.

5.2.6 Muslim Sexual Immorality

Guibert's depiction of Muslims added a number of themes not found to any great extent in the *Gesta Francorum*. The sexual immorality of Muslims is a prevalent theme throughout the *Dei Gesta per Francos*. Although this is occasionally mentioned by other contemporary historians of the First Crusade, Guibert is almost alone in using frequent and extravagant accusations of sexual deviance to disparage Muslims. Only Albert of Aachen made similar use of lust as a polemical accusation, though as will be seen he wrote about it less vividly and only in connection to the rape of Christian women. The licentiousness of Muslims would become a common theme later, but outside of these two authors it was rare for the body of work examined here.⁶⁸⁴

Most of Guibert's accusations appear within the expository material he added to the first book: his account of the birth of Islam, as already alluded to, and his quotation from the supposed letter of Alexios I Komnenos to Count Robert I of Flanders. Guibert's strongest accusations are quoted directly from this letter. Guibert believed this letter to be genuine, and it is clear that he made a deliberate choice as to which part of the letter to extract: as seen in the previous chapter, Robert the Monk was also influenced by the letter, but there is very little overlap in which details they drew from it. The details Guibert borrowed from the letter are considerably more sensational: he describes appalling scenes of rape caused by insatiable sexual appetites, to which Robert the Monk only alluded.⁶⁸⁵ Guibert wrote that when the Turks had conquered the Byzantine Empire's former lands in Asia Minor:

They took virgins and made them public prostitutes, since they were never deterred by shame or feelings for marital fidelity. Mothers were violated in the presence of their daughters, raped over and over again by different men, while their daughters were compelled, not only to watch, but to sing obscene songs and to dance. Then they changed places, and the suffering, which is painful and shameful to speak of, was inflicted upon the daughters,

⁶⁸⁴ See, for example, *Chronicle of the Third Crusade: A Translation of the Itinerarium Peregrinorum et Gesta Regis Ricardi*, trans. Helen Nicholson, (Farnham, 1997), 27. For discussion of this *topos*, see Rana Kabbani, *Europe's Myths of Orient: Devise and Rule* (London, 1988), 6, 14-17.

⁶⁸⁵ See above, 3.2.5.

while the filthy activity was adorned by the obscene songs of the unfortunate mothers.⁶⁸⁶

What was worse in the eyes of the letter-writer (and, tacitly, in Guibert's), was that they did not confine this behaviour to women, but had 'gone beyond the behaviour of beasts (*pecualitas*), breaking all human laws by turning on men. Their lust overflowed to the point that the execrable and profoundly intolerable crime of sodomy, which they committed against men of middle or low station, they also committed against a certain bishop, killing him.'⁶⁸⁷ This was also an accusation that would become more common in later writings on Muslims.⁶⁸⁸

The lust of the Turks was such that it 'befouls with couplings unheard of among beasts, actions to which Christians may not give a name.'⁶⁸⁹ The letter noted that they did this even in spite of the fact that they allowed polygamy, something to which Guibert would also refer elsewhere. This theme of lust was also prominent in Guibert's expository comments on Islam, as mentioned above. 'To sum up his [Mohammed's] teachings,' Guibert wrote, 'having decreed circumcision, he gave them free rein for every kind of shameful behaviour.'⁶⁹⁰ Sexual deviance was, as has been noted, a standard accusation made against heretics, a tradition on which Guibert was clearly drawing even if he did not explicitly describe Islam itself as a heresy. It is also a direct inversion of Christian mores (which probably influenced the traditional accusation against heretics in the first place): this is explicitly stated by Guibert, who characterised Muslim

⁶⁸⁶ 'Virgines enim fidelium deprehensae publicum fieri precipiebantur scortum, cum nusquam pudori deferretur ac honestati coniugum. Matres correptae in conspectu filiarum multipliciter repetitis diversorum coitibus vexabantur, cum filiae assistentes carmina precinere saltando nefaria inter huiusmodi cogerentur. Eadem statim passio, quod dici quidem dolor et pudor est, revolvebatur ad filias, quae etiam feditas obscenis infelicitum matrum cantionibus ornabatur.' Guibert of Nogent, 102 (37).

⁶⁸⁷ '...in masculinum, pecualitate transgressa, solutis humanitatum legibus itur. Unde, ut unius execranda et penitus intolerabili auribus maiestate flagitii illa, quae in mediocres et infirmos defurebat, petulantia panderetur, dicit quendam eos abusione sodomitica interemisse episcopum. Ibid. The non-classical *pecualitas*, which does not appear in either Niermeyer or Lewis and Short, is perhaps Guibert's own neologism. To coin a word does not seem characteristic of Guibert's attitude to terminology as discussed here, however, so it is more likely that the term is simply rare.

⁶⁸⁸ Moore, *The Formation of a Persecuting Society*, 88. Moore referred to Guibert's accusation as an early example of what would become a common charge against Muslims later, but he was concerned here with the persecution of sodomy rather than attitudes to Muslims so did not pursue the matter further.

⁶⁸⁹ Ibid.

⁶⁹⁰ '...ut breviter eius dogma concludam, circumcisione quidem decreta totius eis impudicitiae laxavit habenas.' Guibert of Nogent, 94 (32).

doctrine as based on the abandonment of any aspects of Christian discipline deemed too harsh or difficult. Mohammed 'loosened the reins of every vice for his followers, in order to attract more of them', producing a doctrine that provided a 'license for random copulation' and in which 'all of Christian morality was condemned by a thousand reproofs, and whatever examples of goodness and strength the Gospel offered were called cruel and harsh.'⁶⁹¹

Guibert repeated similar accusations elsewhere in the *Dei Gesta*. Having established that Muslims permitted polygamy, he altered part of the *Gesta*'s letter attributed to Kerbogha, addressed to the Muslim faithful. In the *Gesta*'s version of this letter, Kerbogha encouraged the men to whom the letter was addressed to take pleasure in fathering sons.⁶⁹² This reference to pleasure may have been intended by the anonymous author to suggest improper indulgence, even if reproduction itself was natural and acceptable. Guibert expanded on this, leaving no doubt. In his version, Kerbogha urged them to 'give yourself up to pleasures... lie with multitudes of wives and prostitutes to propagate the race, so that the increasing number of sons may oppose the Christians...'⁶⁹³ In Guibert's version, there is no ambiguity; although the aim was still reproduction, the suggestion of indulging in pleasure with multiple wives and even prostitutes was obviously intended to disparage Muslim morality. The *Gesta* author had not suggested that polygamy or adultery would be involved. Guibert also included a list of the opulent and luxurious trappings Kerbogha's army had brought with them to the siege of Antioch. 'To add to this accumulation of lust,' he wrote, they brought young women 'bearing quivers together with bows, looking like a new form of the ancient Diana.' Despite their arrows, these women 'seemed to have been brought here not to fight, but rather to reproduce.' Guibert probably intended the reader to understand that these women were not the soldiers' wives: in either case his disapproval is abundantly clear. Not only

⁶⁹¹ '...propagatur ubique... indifferenter coeundi nova licentia... tota Christianitatis censura convitiis mille dampnatur et quicquid olim honestatis ac vigoris ex evangeliorum tenore constiterat, crudelis vocatur acerbitas...' Guibert of Nogent, 98 (34).

⁶⁹² *Gesta Francorum*, 52.

⁶⁹³ 'Solito ergo tutius vacate deliciis...multiplicatis coniugum scortorumque ginetiis generi propagando insistite, ut succrescens filiorum numerus christiano.' Guibert of Nogent, 212. Levine translated this as 'wives and concubines', but *scorta* is a stronger word than 'concubine'. *Coniux* could in fact also mean 'concubine' and may indeed have been intended in that sense by Guibert. Guibert of Nogent, trans. Levine, 96.

does he mention their presence in the context of luxury, but his comment that they looked 'like a new form of the ancient Diana' is layered with meaning. Diana, goddess of the hunt, was a virgin in Roman mythology. To a twelfth-century scholar such as Guibert, 'new' carried connotations of error and decline: thus, these women were being contrasted with the virgin Diana, and sexual impropriety is heavily implied. Lest this was too subtle, Guibert compounded this condemnation of these women by claiming that after the battle their new-born babies were found cast aside on the grass in their haste to flee from the Franks: 'more concerned for themselves than for the babies, [they] heartlessly cast them away.'⁶⁹⁴ This unnatural behaviour starkly portrayed Muslim women as Others, and added a further layer to Guibert's choice of Diana as a comparison (rather than Minerva or Vesta, the other two Roman goddesses known for their virginity): Diana was also the goddess of childbirth. The passage might also possibly be an echo of Psalms 126:4, in which children are described as arrows and the Psalmist recommends that men have as many as they can.⁶⁹⁵ These women were brought 'to reproduce', but they subsequently abandoned their children, subverting the message of the Psalm as well as the chaste image of Diana. On a similar occasion, Guibert also added an incident he found in the work of Fulcher of Chartres, in which a prurient note was added to a standard image of Muslim greed. When the newly-established kingdom of Jerusalem captured Caesarea (17 May 1101), which the dead were found to have swallowed their gold for safe-keeping, but also: 'they found pieces of gold in the wombs of the women who had used these areas for purposes other than the ones for which they were intended.'⁶⁹⁶

⁶⁹⁴ *'...ad haec in similitudinem, ut ita dicam, templi ornatae uxores, tum preterea ad libidinis cumulum pharetrae cum arcubus advenere virgines, ut veteris in eis Dianae nova cerneretur species, ut non causa bellandi sed potius sub obtentu putarentur convenisse gestandi. Prelio plane maiori exacto, ab his qui interfuere asseritur quod etiam recens nati infantuli, quos in ipso procintu expeditionis enixae mulieres fuerant, dum pro urgentium Francorum insecutione preproperant seque morarum ac oneris impatientes exoccupant, medio proiectedi repperirentur in gramine, uti eos, dum sibi quam illis plus metuunt, negligenter effuderant.'* Guibert of Nogent, 225 (103).

⁶⁹⁵ *'Sicut sagittae in manu potentis ita filii iuventutis'*, Psalm 126:4. In 126:5, the Psalmist continues, *'beatus vir qui implevit faretram suam ex ipsis...'*

⁶⁹⁶ *'...quae officia eis locis indebita usurparant, auri frustra feminarum puerperia fundunt.'* Guibert of Nogent, 347 (163-4). Guibert made plain what Fulcher had tried to express euphemistically: *'Feminae quoque impudenter intra se bisantios occultabant; quod et nefas erat sic recondendum et multo turpius mihi ad recitandum.'* Fulcher of Chartres, 403-4. This borrowing from Fulcher was not identified by Huygens, but it is clear this was Guibert's source (see his index of citations and allusions, Guibert of Nogent, 414).

For Guibert, this does not seem to have been an exclusively Muslim trait. He was quick to level similar accusations against other groups, seeming to have suspected all people who were not Western Christians of sexual deviance. This is typical of the findings of R.I. Moore regarding polemical depictions of heretics and other marginalised groups, as discussed above. Guibert included a story of Baldwin I's wife, 'descended from the finest gentiles in the land', who was shipwrecked on a 'barbaric' island and captured by its inhabitants on her way to join him. Although she was eventually released and returned to her husband he was 'suspicious, and not unreasonably, of the sexual continence of the heathens (*ethnici*)' and sent her to become a nun instead of accepting her as his wife.⁶⁹⁷ It is not clear whether Guibert thought the islanders were Muslims or not; but in either case it fits the pattern of accusing non-Christians of sexual immorality: as mentioned in the introduction, he had also accused Greek Christians of extremely improper behaviour.

5.2.7 Cowardice

Guibert also followed his source in frequently depicting Muslims as cowardly. Often, this was taken directly from the *Gesta*, but rewritten with more polished rhetoric. On the Muslim forces' defeat at Dorylaeum, Guibert wrote that 'the Arabs, Persians and ferocious Turks soon fled; the savage people showed their backs to the Christians. It was a rout, and the wretched army ran in all directions; the Arabs ran like rabbits...'⁶⁹⁸ His description of the encounter between Kilij Arslan and some Arab reinforcements as the former fled from Dorylaeum, on the other hand, displays no notable differences from his source.⁶⁹⁹ The first encounter between the crusaders and the defenders of Antioch (20 October 1097) resulted in immediate defeat for the Turks: they 'threw away the arms that only moments before had been able to inspire terror. The mass of foot-soldiers fled through their own lines, in their haste and confusion wounding and crushing their own allies. The

⁶⁹⁷ *'Mulier ipsa, ex optimis terrae oriunda gentilibus... in insulam quandam barbaricam flaminum importunitate defertur... Quae cum ad virum venisset, incontinentiam ethnicam rex ipse habens non sine ratione suspectam, a thoro proprio prorsus abstentam, mutato habitu, posuit eam cum monachabus aliis apud beatam matrem dei Virginis matris Annam.'* Guibert of Nogent, 349 (164). Cf *Gesta Francorum*, 20: *'Statim autem uenientibus militibus nostris, Turci et Arabes, et Saraceni et Agulani omnesque barbarae nationes dederunt velociter fugam...'*

⁶⁹⁸ *'Mox abeunt Arabes, Persae Turcique feroces, ante pios populi terga dedere truces./Fit fuga, disperse miserum protenditur agmen,/non secus ac lepores diffugiunt Arabes.'* Guibert of Nogent, 157 (67).

⁶⁹⁹ Guibert of Nogent, 159.

madness of pride now felt humiliation, and the man who anticipated taking pleasure in heaping up destruction upon us was now happy if he could get himself out alive.⁷⁰⁰ An advance party of crusaders led by Raymond Pilet reached an unnamed valley where the inhabitants of a fort initially hoped to avoid conflict by surrendering their livestock, before abandoning the town and fleeing by night.⁷⁰¹ This incident is almost identical to the *Gesta*, but Guibert framed the offer of the livestock as a trick, discussed further below. Raymond Pilet also led a force against Tortosa, and Guibert embellished the *Gesta Francorum*'s description of the events, using similes and biblical references to emphasise the cowardice of the inhabitants of Tortosa. When the crusaders attacked, 'like a swarm of flies, a remarkably large crowd of pagans flocked to the fort...' ⁷⁰² As in the *Gesta*, Raymond laid siege to Tortosa and fooled the inhabitants by lighting many extra campfires that night to make his forces appear larger; this had the desired effect and they abandoned the town. Guibert added: 'Thus they piously fulfilled scripture, which states that "skin for skin, yea, all that a man hath he will give for his life (Job 2:4)," referring to the property and possessions they had abandoned for fear of the crusaders.'⁷⁰³ Guibert also added incidents which occurred after the end of the *Gesta*'s narrative, such as an occasion on which Gervais de Bazoches, the Lord of Tiberias encountered 'a very large number of gentile troops' (*maximas copias gentilitatis*) while accompanied by only two other knights. Nevertheless, they charged them headlong, and the Muslim forces were frightened, assuming a whole army was following, and fled, allowing three men to kill many of them and capture lots of booty.⁷⁰⁴ Overall, however, Guibert did not expand a great deal on the theme of Muslim cowardice, he simply carried it over from his source and elaborated some of the *Gesta*'s descriptions.

5.2.8 Concern with the Material World

Guibert retained the *Gesta*'s tendency to depict Muslims as overly concerned with material things, adding to the text in places. Such materialistic views

⁷⁰⁰ '...quae paulo ante terrere potuerant arma proiciunt, fugit per cuneos turba gregaria, vulnerant et obruunt, dum mixtim properant, socia agmina, pridem superba rabies sentit humilia et quae nostrorum estimabat se gavisuram stagibus, letatur si possit eruere vel cum pudore corpora.' Guibert of Nogent, 169-170 (75).

⁷⁰¹ Guibert of Nogent, 257 (119).

⁷⁰² 'gentilium incredibilis populositas muscarum ad instar influxerat.' Guibert of Nogent, 259 (119-20).

⁷⁰³ '...piii, inquam, Scripturae illius impletores, quia pellem pro pelle et cuncta quae habet homo dabit pro anima sua.' Guibert of Nogent, 259 (119).

⁷⁰⁴ Guibert of Nogent, 348.

are seen in Guibert's paraphrasing of al-Afdal's speech in the *Gesta Francorum*, and his version of Kerbogha's conversation with his mother. Although the latter is rephrased, the meaning of Kerbogha's words is identical: he is confident of victory because 'All the men in their army do not amount even to the number of noble leaders from the cities who are fighting under my command.'⁷⁰⁵ Similarly, Guibert says that al-Afdal, lamenting his defeat, 'thought about the great amount of supplies that he had brought, and the superb, strong, fine-looking young men, the noble arms, the power of his allies, and, I should have said, all the knights.' On top of this, as Guibert noted, they fought from a position of safety in their own land before the gates of a city into which they could retreat if needed. And yet, they had been defeated by the crusaders, who were 'in every way inferior in military might, whose young men had been weakened by long hunger, whose swords were rusty, whose lances were darkened, whose few remaining troops were worn out, all of whose leaders were exhausted by bitter suffering, as they rode on horses racked with every kind of disease.' As in the *Gesta*, he was unable to comprehend this: 'he marveled that these poor wretches, a band of exiles, had conquered the countless soldiers of his own nation, and that the glory of the entire East had been brought down by the least of men.'⁷⁰⁶

Such material concerns were echoed in an obsession with wealth suggested by the common *topos* that the inhabitants of captured cities were found to have swallowed gold for safekeeping. Following the *Gesta*, Guibert alleged that gold was found in the stomachs of Muslims killed at Ma'arrat-an-Nu'man.⁷⁰⁷ He also added an account of the capture of Caesarea in 1101 which mentioned this (and the cruder variation mentioned above).⁷⁰⁸ It is striking that Guibert had also claimed that Muslims mutilated Christian pilgrims in the mistaken belief that they also did this. He made no explicit juxtaposition, however.

⁷⁰⁵ *Plane plures urbium domini michi militant quam ipsi in tota sui exercitus universitate homines exhibere prevaleant...* Guibert of Nogent, 213 (96).

⁷⁰⁶ *'Considerabat nimirum infinitas quas adduxerat copias, lectissimam iuventutem, fortitudine ac specie arma nobilia, commilitonum opes et, ut sic dixerim, cuncta equestria... At Francos intuebatur modis omnibus inferiore militia, profligatam diutina fame iuventam, rubiginosis ensibus, lanceis nigrantibus, exilem destitutis militum viribus armaturam, cunctis qui pre ceteris videbantur insignes acri egestate torpentibus, equis omnimodo squalore fatiscantibus, et ut brevi clausula solvam, pauperrimos omnium, exulum globum, innumerabiles superasse mirabatur indigenas, quin potius per abiectissimos hominum totius Orientis gloriam concidisse.'* Guibert of Nogent, 299 (140).

⁷⁰⁷ Ibid, 254.

⁷⁰⁸ Guibert of Nogent, 347.

5.2.9 Deceitfulness

Guibert introduced a prominent theme of Muslim treachery and deceitfulness, which is not found to anything like the same extent in the works of his contemporaries. This pattern begins with his account of the foundation of Islam, which in Guibert's version of events rested on several lies. As mentioned above, in this distorted account, Mohammed's supposed epileptic fits were passed off as the effects of visions from God.⁷⁰⁹ The spread of his message was supposedly due in part to falsified miracles: in the example Guibert described, Mohammed and his mentor trained a cow to come to the sound of his voice. In order to make his doctrine appear legitimate, he tied his writings to the horns of a cow and concealed it in a tent before gathering a crowd. He then had the cow released to appear at a suitably climactic point in his preaching and run to him carrying the book: 'everyone was amazed, and the book was quickly removed and read to the breathless people, who happily accepted the licence permitted by its foul law' (however it was transmitted to Guibert, this idea was also a feature of early Arabic-speaking Christian polemic. Doubtless the originators of the idea knew they were referring to the Koran here, but Guibert himself may not have understood the context of the story in this much detail).⁷¹⁰ While on this occasion there is clearly also an almost comical element of credulity being attributed to Muslim believers, the pattern of accusing Muslims of deceitfulness and treachery is one which recurs throughout his narrative of the crusade. The first such incident Guibert recorded occurs in the *Gesta* and its other revisions, but forms part of the pattern in Guibert's work. Following the *Gesta*, Guibert claimed that as the Turkish forces fled from their defeat at Dorylaeum, they deceived the inhabitants of the cities and forts they encountered along the way. Pretending to have defeated the crusaders, they demanded entry only to pillage the towns, despoil the churches and abduct Christian children as slaves. Guibert rephrased this passage in his own words, but did not change the factual details or intensify the descriptions.⁷¹¹ A passage to which Guibert made more significant changes was Bohemond's admonition to the crusaders who wandered from the camp at Antioch. In the *Gesta* he warned them that the enemy were 'on watch day and night to catch you' and 'always trying to kill you or lead you into

⁷⁰⁹ Guibert of Nogent, 97.

⁷¹⁰ 'Mirantur omnes, raptim volumen evolvitur, anhelanti turbae exponitur, petulantia turpi lege permissa gaudenter excipitur.' Guibert of Nogent, 98 (34). On the early Arabic-speaking Christian traditions, see Daniel, *Islam and the West*, 15.

⁷¹¹ Guibert of Nogent, 160-1; *Gesta Francorum*, 22-3

captivity,' emphasising their implacable hostility.⁷¹² Guibert changed the nature of the warning, having Bohemond tell the wanderers to 'stop scurrying through the pathless mountains, since you know that your enemies are preparing hidden traps for you in these horrible, desolate places.'⁷¹³ He shifted the emphasis from Muslim hostility to suggest that they were crafty and deceitful, inclined to lay traps and ambushes. Similarly, while the *Gesta* author simply recorded that large flocks of livestock were encountered en route to confront the forces of al-Afdal at Ascalon, Guibert added the explicit claim that 'by the trickery of the Gentiles...they had been placed there as booty to tempt our men.'⁷¹⁴

Guibert included two entirely new accounts which portrayed Muslims in a treacherous light. The first of these was an account of the later fate of Pirrus, the tower guard who betrayed Antioch to the crusaders, as already discussed above. The outline of that story is remarkably similar to one related in the variant manuscript of Baldric of Bourgueil's *Historia* found in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, MS Lat. 5513. As discussed in the chapter on Baldric's *Historia*, this variant added an account of an unknown Muslim (not Pirrus, who is treated more sympathetically by Baldric and the anonymous writer of this variant manuscript) who feigned conversion to Christianity only to lead some Christians into an ambush with the promise of rich rewards in lands he claimed to own. This plan had more success in the version told in MS Lat. 5513, but in Guibert's version many of the Christians got word of the betrayal and managed to escape. In MS Lat. 5513, however, when the unnamed traitor presented his captives as slaves to the sultan, the latter was disgusted by the treachery and released them.⁷¹⁵ Without such an ending, and in the context of his many other accusations, Guibert's account adds further 'evidence' of the treachery of Muslims in general, rather than simply one villainous figure who was disapproved of even by his own people.

Guibert also added an account of the temporary truce that was arranged between the crusaders and the defenders of Antioch, as reported in

⁷¹² *Gesta Francorum*, 33.

⁷¹³ '...desinite discurrere montanorum per avia, cum sciatis hostes vestros incognita vobis horridarum solitudinum fovere latibula.' Guibert of Nogent, 176 (78).

⁷¹⁴ 'Illic fraude gentilium multa sunt animalium exposita milia... ad illiciendos predarum copiis nostros emissa...' Guibert of Nogent, 296 (138). Cf *Gesta Francorum*, 94. Albert of Aachen also believed this to be a trick, possibly having been influenced by a similar oral source. Albert of Aachen, 458, Rubenstein, 'Three Crusade Chronicles Intersect', 33.

⁷¹⁵ Baldric of Bourgueil, 86 note f. See also below, 4.4.

one of Anselm of Ribemont's letters to Archbishop Manasses II of Reims. The truce was also reported by Robert the Monk, as was the manner in which it was broken: Gualo, the constable of the King of France, became unwary and was ambushed and killed.⁷¹⁶ True to form, Guibert interpreted the entire incident as evidence of treachery. Not only was Gualo's death a breach of the truce, but the entire arrangement had been 'a false peace (*fucata pax*)', and the Turks had begun to set ambushes as soon as the crusaders 'became less watchful and too comfortable.'⁷¹⁷

Finally, in one of the anecdotes which Rubenstein argued Guibert and Albert of Aachen learned from a similar oral source, Guibert saw treachery in the death of Godfrey of Bouillon in 1100.⁷¹⁸ Guibert added a brief account of what he believed to be the circumstances of Godfrey's death: 'they say that a certain neighbouring pagan prince sent him gifts dipped, as became clear, in deadly poisons.' Mistakenly thinking their sender was a friend, Godfrey made use of the gifts and suddenly fell ill and died.⁷¹⁹ Guibert did acknowledge that some people rejected this opinion and believed Godfrey died of natural causes, but it was clear which interpretation he favoured. Albert did not make any explicit claim that Godfrey had been poisoned, but his version of events does seem to imply it: Godfrey became ill and died shortly after eating fruit the emir of Shaizar gave him, a detail which there would have been no other reason to include. Susan Edgington compared several accounts of Godfrey's death to Albert's. As well as Guibert's version, she found that Orderic Vitalis also suspected poison, though he blamed the citizens of Jaffa. Less conspiratorial is the anonymous continuator of the Chronicle of Frutolf of Michelsberg, who wrote that rotting corpses, the heat of the summer, and contaminated cisterns (whether deliberately poisoned or polluted by the blood of the dead) led to great pestilence, of which Godfrey was one of the victims. Among Muslim sources, Edgington found only the misinformed Ibn al-Qalansi, who believed

⁷¹⁶ See above, 3.2.5, 3.2.10.

⁷¹⁷ *Dum ergo exercitus minus inter ista sibi nimietate securitatis invigilat, pretensis Turci insidiis quosam ex Francos interimunt.* Guibert of Nogent, 332 (156); see also 'Epistola II Anselmi de Ribodimente ad Manassem archiepiscopus Remorum' in Heinrich Hagenmeyer (ed.), *Die Kreuzzugsbriefe aus den Jahren 1088-1100* (Innsbruck, 1901; rpr Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1973), 156-160, p. 159.

⁷¹⁸ Rubenstein, 'Three Crusade Chronicles Intersect', 34.

⁷¹⁹ *A quodam contiguae gentiliatis principe eidem transmissa feruntur exenia letalibus, ut patuit, venenis infecta, quibus utens improvide, cum eum qui miserat suspicaretur amicum, subita infirmitate decubuit, nec mora exanimatus occubuit.* Guibert of Nogent, 317 (149).

Godfrey was killed by an arrow at the siege of Acre.⁷²⁰ It is possible that both Guibert and Albert were drawn to the suggestion that Godfrey was murdered because it conveniently avoided the risk of his death, which occurred so soon after his election to rule Jerusalem, making it seem as if the crusaders had made a mistake in electing him and God had shown his disapproval. Blaming Muslims protected Godfrey's nascent heroic reputation, which grew and developed over the centuries following the First Crusade. Even if this was one motivation to frame Godfrey's death as the result of Muslim treachery, it nevertheless reinforces Guibert's other accusations of similar instances of their deceitfulness.

5.2.10 Prediction of the Crusade

A common element of most contemporary accounts of the crusade, more notable in some than others, was the idea that the crusade had been foretold by various means (and, hence, that its success was inevitable). This was particularly prominent in the *Dei Gesta per Francos*, as Guibert developed this in detail with an exegesis of Zechariah 12:1-20. Guibert expounded at length, demonstrating how each verse in the passage could be read as referring to the capture of Jerusalem by the crusaders. The crux of this was his analysis of Zechariah 12:3:

“All that lift up Jerusalem will be cut in pieces, and all the kingdoms of the earth will be gathered against her (Zechariah 12:3).” Who are those who lift it up, if not those who, after the times of the nations have ended, lift it up from its own destruction? The Lord says, “Jerusalem will be trodden down by the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled (Zechariah 12:3).” They will be torn apart because no one can say or even imagine how great the labour, the suffering, the misery of

⁷²⁰ Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, ed. and trans. Susan B. Edgington, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2007), 512-13, n. 24; Franz-Josef Schmale and Irene Schmale-Ott (eds), *Frutolfs und Ekkehards Chroniken und die Anonyme Kaiserchronik* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1972), 160; Marjorie Chibnall (ed. and trans.), *The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis*, 6 vols (OMT, 1969-80), V.340; Ibn al-Qalansi, *The Damascus Chronicle of the Crusades*, ed. H. A. R. Gibb (London, 1932), 51; *Frutolfi et Ekkehardi Chronica necnon Anonymi Chronica Imperatorum*, ed. and trans. Franz-Josef Schmale and Irene Schmale-Ott (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1972), 160.

hunger and thirst would be that they endured in the siege... But after Jerusalem has been raised, "All the kingdoms of the earth will be gathered against her", which should not be taken allegorically, but, as the story has just been told, was offered as something visible to heavenly eyes. For what kingdom of the East did not send its men to war...?⁷²¹

Guibert was using here the 'allegorical sense' of Scripture. The success of the crusade had thus been foretold in the Old Testament, as became plain with hindsight. The passage must also have seemed to confirm Guibert's belief that the crusade was the work of God acting through the crusaders. He continued, quoting Zechariah 12:4 and 12:6: 'On that day, God says, I will smite every horse with astonishment, and his rider with madness (Zechariah 12:4)... On that day I will make the governors of Judah like a fiery furnace among the wood, and like a torch of fire in a sheaf; and they shall devour all the people round about, on the right hand and on the left (Zechariah 12:6).' These he interpreted as referring to the battle of Ascalon, as he had learned of it in the *Gesta Francorum*, and the defeat of Muslims by crusaders generally, respectively.⁷²²

These common assertions that the crusade had been foretold – or, indeed, foreordained – emphasised the inevitability of Christian victory. Explicitly in Guibert, but perhaps always implicitly, this was attributed to divine assistance. Guibert, however, took the inevitability of the crusade's success a step further by incorporating it into an eschatological theory.⁷²³ He did *not* connect Muslims themselves directly to Antichrist as might be expected, however. Rather he asserted twice that it was necessary for the

⁷²¹ 'Omnes qui levabunt eam concisione lacerabuntur et colliguntur adversus eam omnia regna terrae (Zechariah 12:3). *Qui sunt qui Iherusalem levant, nisi qui postquam impleta fuerint tempora nationum eam a sua conculcatione sublevant?* Iherusalem, inquit dominus, calcabitur a gentibus, donec impleantur tempora nationum. Hi "concisione lacerantur" quia dic, immo cogitari nullatenus potest quanta famis sitisque miseria, quantis laborum vulnerumque doloribus eos in obsidendo cruciari constiterit... Sed levata Iherusalem "omnia regna terrae adversus eam colliguntur" quod non ut allegoria subintelligendum, sed ut historia noviter relata supernis oculis intuendum proponitur. Quod enim fuit Orientis regnum, de cuius hominibus ad idem non venerint bellum?' Guibert of Nogent, 301-7 (141-2).

⁷²² 'In die illa, dicit dominus, percutiam omnem equum in stupore et ascensorum eius in amentia... In die illo ponam duces Iuda sicut caminum ignis in lignis et sicut facem ignis in feno et devorabunt ad dexteram et ad sinistram omnes populos in circuitu.' Guibert of Nogent, 301-7 (142-3).

⁷²³ For further analysis of this, see Flori, *Chroniqueurs et Propagandistes*, 149-50.

crusade to succeed in restoring Christianity to the region in order for the End of Days to come to pass. As he wrote in the speech he attributed to Urban II at Clermont, the crusade was necessary 'in spite of the nearness of the time of the Antichrist', because

it is clear that the Antichrist makes war neither against Jews, nor against gentiles, but according to the etymology of his name, he will move against Christians. And if the Antichrist comes upon no Christian there, as today there is scarcely any, there will be no one to resist him, or any whom he might justly move among. According to Daniel and Jerome his interpreter, his tent will be fixed on the Mount of Olives, and he will certainly take his seat, as the Apostle teaches, in Jerusalem, "in the temple of God, as though he were God,[II Thess. 2:4]" and, according to the prophet, he will undoubtedly kill three kings pre-eminent for their faith in Christ, that is, the kings of Egypt, of Africa, and of Ethiopia. This cannot happen at all, unless Christianity is established where paganism now rules.⁷²⁴

Guibert did not see the crusade as part of the struggle with Antichrist directly, merely a prerequisite for events to unfold as they had been predicted. As he wrote in his exegesis of Zechariah, 'We have no doubt that God did not undertake this merely to liberate one city, but to scatter the seeds that will grow long and far against the madness of the Antichrist.'⁷²⁵ The crusade was incorporated into eschatology, but only as preliminary preparation. Probably with an eye to narrative plausibility, he does not have Urban II suggest that success was inevitable, rather the pope encouraged his audience to 'Consider, then, that Almighty providence may have destined

⁷²⁴ *'Perspicuum namque est Antichristum non contra Iudeos, non contra gentiles bella facturum, sed iuxta ethimologiam sui nominis Christianos percasurum, et si Antichristus ibidem christianum neminem, sicuti hodie vix aliquis habetur, inveniatur, non erit qui sibi refragetur aut quem iure pervadat: iuxta enim Danielelem et Iheronimum Danielis interpretem fixurus est in Oliveti Monte tentoria, et Iherosolimis in dei templo tanquam sit deus certum est apostolo docente quod sedeatur et iuxta eundem prophetam tres refes, Egypti videlicet, Affricae ac Ethiopiae, haud dubium quin pro christiana fide, primos interficiat. Quid quidem nullatenus fieri poterit, nisi ubi nunc paganismus est Christianitas fiat.'* Guibert of Nogent, 114 (43).

⁷²⁵ Guibert of Nogent, 143.

you for the task of rescuing Jerusalem from such abasement.’⁷²⁶ From Guibert’s position of hindsight, however, it must have seemed clear that this was indeed the case. That success came immediately must have seemed inevitable in hindsight.

Indeed, the victory of the Christians was so inevitable that Guibert depicted it as clear even to Muslims. He included a revised version of the conversation between Kerbogha and his mother which occurs in the *Gesta*. The implications of this conversation for his interpretation of Muslim beliefs was discussed above; in this case what is notable is that Guibert attributed her prophecy exclusively to ‘secret books of a sect of gentiles (*abditae gentilis volumina*)’ and to her own study of astrology.⁷²⁷ As Guibert must surely have been aware, the *Gesta* author could not have witnessed this conversation, and included the passage for the sake of the message it conveyed. To this account derived from his main source, however, Guibert added an account with a similar conclusion, of a ‘Saracen’ encountered by Count Robert I of Flanders on his pilgrimage to Jerusalem in 1086. Although it is unclear how Guibert learned of this, he might quite plausibly have believed that this account was true, and hence that Muslims actually had predicted the success of the crusaders. Guibert prefaced this by asserting that astrology ‘in which Westerners have only the mildest interest’ was more widely practiced in the East, where it originated (his disapproval is palpable). Echoing his earlier account of Kerbogha’s mother based on the *Gesta*, Guibert wrote that in this way the Muslims had ‘received a prophecy that they would be subjugated by the Christian people’, but due to their limited skill they had been unable to determine when.⁷²⁸ On his pilgrimage, Robert I witnessed a large assembly discussing something in the Temple of Solomon. He then encountered a wise old man, ‘who had led a virtuous life by Saracen standards’, who told him that the discussion had been about this prophecy. Astrological signs, supported by ‘a thorough and regular reading of the ancient texts of our faith’ had established that Christians would come and conquer the Muslims, but when they would do so was

⁷²⁶ ‘Cogitate itaque quod vos ad hoc Omnipotens fortasse provideat, quatinus Iherusalem per vos a tanta conculcatione restituat.’ Guibert of Nogent, (44).

⁷²⁷ Guibert of Nogent, 215.

⁷²⁸ ‘...scientia scilicet astrorum, quae apud Occidentales quo tenuior extat et rarior, eo apud Orientales, ubi et originem habuit, continuo uso ac frequenti memoria magis fervere cognoscitur, evidens idem gentiles prognosticum se accepisse testantur, et iam dudum ante infortunia ipsa prescierant quia a christiano populo subgigerentur, sed artis ipsius peritia ad integrum instrui non poterant, quo ista tempore complerentur. Guibert of Nogent, 318-19 (150).

uncertain.⁷²⁹ Guibert noted that the words of this ‘noble man’ corroborated what Kerbogha’s mother had supposedly predicted, and argued that just as she had sought to persuade her son not to attack the Christians on the basis of her prediction, Muslim forces had held back from engaging the Christians when they realised this was the prophecy coming to pass, ‘since they understood that they were not fighting against us, but against God, who was exerting himself and fighting for us.’⁷³⁰ This makes explicit the connection between prophecy and Guibert’s emphasis on divine involvement in the crusade: with the crusade’s success inevitable due to God’s will, it was only natural that it should be predictable by many different means.

5.2.11 Praise of Muslims and Evidence of More Tolerant Attitudes.

Despite its overall hostility and negative characterisation of Muslims, Guibert’s revision of the *Gesta Francorum* does, like its source, contain some praise of Muslims. Guibert made only minor changes to the *Gesta*’s famous passage in praise of the Turks as warriors, but what he did add served to reduce the impression of their prowess somewhat. He attributed the glorious defeat of so many by so few to divine assistance: ‘Here we can clearly see the signs of Christian power; and if we marvel at the inequality of a battle between so few men and so many, we must attribute the results entirely to the aid of Christ.’⁷³¹ Lest any argue with this and say Turks were simply defeated because they were not good fighters, Guibert asserted that this was not the case. The crusaders ‘testified that they could have known of no race comparable to the Turks, either in the liveliness of spirit, or energy in battle.’⁷³² However, he undermined the *Gesta*’s message that the Turks were formidable warriors by also attributing some of

⁷²⁹ ‘Hospitabatur tunc comes isdem apud aliquem gravioris evi et expertioris ingenii vitaeque, quantum ad eos, sanctioris Sarracenum... “Insolita,” inquit, “signa quaedam in ipsis stellarum cursibus recursibusque conspeximus, ex quibus certa admodum coniectura collegimus christianae conditionis has in provincias homines deventuros nosque per prelia assidua et frequentes victorias devincendos... Cui caelesti indicio veterum sectae nostrae oraculorum passim ex quibusque voluminibus statim lectio recensa concinuit...”’ Guibert of Nogent, 319-20 (150).

⁷³⁰ ‘Etsi namque primum multiplicibus nostros preliis urgere visi sunt, sed deum pro eis exerceri et configere sentiunt.’ Guibert of Nogent, 320 (150-1).

⁷³¹ ‘Hic plane, hic experimur virtutis christianae insignia, et dum haec paucorum cum innumeris bella miramur imparia, totum necessario referre mox cogimur ad Christi solius auxilia.’ Guibert of Nogent, 158-9 (68).

⁷³² ‘...Franci, qui se tanto obtulere discrimini, pleno ore fatentur nusquam Turcis illis genus hominum comparabile posse cognosci, adeo argutos animis ac strenuous armis.’ Guibert of Nogent, 158-9 (68).

difficulty the crusaders faced to the to 'novelty (*novitas*)' of the Turks' weapons, particularly their tactic of shooting arrows while retreating. The crusaders' lack of familiarity with their tactics was as much a part of the challenge as any inherent virtue of the Turks.⁷³³ Surprisingly, given the interest in ethnography he displayed elsewhere, Guibert included without comment the *Gesta*'s assertion that the Turks believed they shared ancestors with the Franks.⁷³⁴ Guibert may simply not have felt driven to research this claim (as he evidently did to find the 'correct' classical names for the Turks and Khorosan) because the *Gesta* attributed it to the Turks themselves, a source he may have felt was implicitly untrustworthy and not one which demanded to be refuted.⁷³⁵

Although Guibert reduced the impression of Muslim prowess given by his source here, he did add some praise of his own, some of it quite high. Guibert referred to many Muslim ethnic groups comprising their forces at the battle of Dorylaeum (as did his source). Among them, Guibert added, the Turks, Arabs and Saracens stand out both in numbers and in 'nobility' (*dignitas*). The rest were essentially auxiliary forces from other 'less illustrious (*minus celebribus*)' peoples.⁷³⁶ Praise was probably a secondary aim in this case: the *Gesta* described a compound force made up of many diverse ethnic groups, implying that they were all equally represented. As discussed in the relevant chapter, this was probably just intended to make the army seem particularly large and exotic. Guibert seems to have taken it literally, however, but knowing that most of the ethnic groups described were of little relevance to the history of the First Crusade, he interpreted the *Gesta* as referring to a force primarily comprised of Turks, Arabs and Saracens with auxiliary forces comprised of less important peoples. Nevertheless, it is notable that he used complimentary terms to explain why the Turks, Arabs and Saracens stood out, rather than their numbers alone or

⁷³³ Ibid.

⁷³⁴ See above, 2.2.10.

⁷³⁵ Huygens identified in the *Dei Gesta* a reference to the chronicle of Fredegar. It was suggested in the *Gesta* chapter that the *Torqui* described in this chronicle might have indirectly influenced the *Gesta Francorum* author's thoughts about the relationship between the Turks and the Franks. Nevertheless, Guibert did not comment on this; presumably because he did not encounter the passage, having looked elsewhere for his information about the Turks, or he would likely have thought it necessary to offer a clarification that the Turks were not the *Torqui* even if he himself was convinced of this. The reference, found on page 329 of Huygens' edition of the *De Gesta*, is to Fredegar, *Chronicon* IV.65. See J. M. Wallace-Hadrill, *The Fourth Book of the Chronicle of Fredegar* (London: Nelson, 1960), 53-45.

⁷³⁶ Guibert of Nogent, 66; cf *Gesta Francorum*, 20; above, 2.2.10.

more negative characteristics. Guibert offered much more effusive praise to the defenders of Jerusalem. 'No one can express how courageously Jerusalem was defended by its inhabitants during the siege,' he wrote.⁷³⁷ He went on to describe their formidable defence tactics, including the use of Greek fire, before adding more praise:

But what best showed the vehement commitment of the Saracens was the fact that when one of them was struck by one of our men, the shield of the man who had been struck was snatched up, quicker than speech, by another man, who took up the place from which the first had fallen, so that none of our men could have known that his blows had wounded any of them.⁷³⁸

Guibert added this account later in book VII, having come across these new details after finishing his initial account of the siege. Recording the strength of the opposition the crusaders faced both emphasised their achievement and improved the narrative. Nevertheless, Guibert made a deliberate choice to frame this in terms of the bravery – even nobility – of the defenders of Jerusalem, thus adding a passage which was uncharacteristically laudatory.

In terms of tolerance rather than outright praise of Muslims, Guibert's account is rendered somewhat more hostile overall by his treatment of Pirrus, the tower commander who betrayed Antioch to the crusaders, but does not depart far from the *Gesta Francorum* in other respects. Guibert neither elaborates nor attempts to conceal the treaties and peace agreements reached with local Muslim rulers described in the *Gesta Francorum*.⁷³⁹ Similarly, although he rephrased the *Gesta*'s account of the conversion of Ahmed ibn-Marwan after he surrendered the citadel of Antioch, the substance remained the same and Guibert added no further details.⁷⁴⁰ Guibert's treatment of Pirrus is considerably more hostile than that of the *Gesta* and its other revisors, however. Guibert attributed Pirrus's decision to convert primarily to the promise of reward. This was not a great departure

⁷³⁷ 'Iherosolimorum igitur civitas obsessa exprimi non potest quanta sit civium suorum animositate defensa.' Guibert of Nogent, 334 (157).

⁷³⁸ 'Sed in eo vel maxime Sarracenorum vehemens probatur instantia, quia si quem suorum contigisset ictu a nostris obrui, percussi clipeum dicto citius constabat ab alio rapi et in eodem, unde ille ruerat, loco restitui, ut nostri daretur ad sui exanimationem intelligi neminem eorum iactibus ledi.' Guibert of Nogent, 334 (157-8).

⁷³⁹ See above, 2.2.10.

⁷⁴⁰ Guibert of Nogent, 242.

from the *Gesta Francorum*, but it does contrast strongly with the sincerity of his wish for conversion attributed to Pirrus by Baldric of Bourgueil and Robert the Monk.⁷⁴¹ Similarly, when Guibert encountered the idea that Pirrus was inspired to convert by a vision from God in the work of Fulcher of Chartres (an idea also shared by Robert the Monk), he was extremely dismissive of the possibility. Guibert allowed only that God, ‘who made himself audible to Cain and Hagar, and made an angel visible to an ass’ was capable of such a thing.⁷⁴² However, none of the letters sent from Antioch mentioned any such thing, Guibert claimed. This scepticism probably relates to his belief that Pirrus was motivated by reward, if not also the eventual outcome of the Pirrus story as Guibert told it. This ending to the story, which Guibert added after the conclusion of his narrative of events at Antioch (to avoid disrupting the flow of the narrative) renders his depiction of Pirrus extremely hostile overall. Guibert clearly came across this story later in the process of writing the *Dei Gesta*, probably from an oral source, and added it at the end of his account of the siege of Antioch where it would not break up that narrative. According to Guibert, having been baptised and taken the name Bohemond as his Christian name, he assisted the crusaders in the siege of Jerusalem before returning to Antioch. At that point,

he sent out a messenger to announce that any Christian in the city or in the vicinity of the city might come with him to a far-off land, where he had considerable land, and he offered to make everyone rich. He inspired a large group of people in this hope, and he is said to have led this deceived group off to what he called his own land. When he had reached his own encampments, he betrayed some of the knights who had accompanied him by killing them, and he exiled others... There, having deserted Christianity, he [Pirrus] returned to the filth of his old luxury and gentile way of life (*gentilitas*).⁷⁴³

⁷⁴¹ See above, 3.2.10; 4.1.12.

⁷⁴² Guibert of Nogent, 329-333 (156).

⁷⁴³ ‘*Ubi cum preconium emisisset quatinus quicumque in urbe urbisque vicinia Christianus egeret, secum in patriam remotiorem, ubi multas haberet possessiones, veniret, pollicens quod preclaris muneribus quemque ditaret, hac spe vulgus sibi conflagavit immodicum et in suam, uti dixerat, regionem fertur abducisse deceptum. Qui cum ad sua oppida devenisset, partem militiae sese comitantis hos exilio, illos morti prodidit... Ibi prorsus Christianitate deserta, veteris luxuriae et gentilitatis inquinamenta resumpsit.*’ Guibert of Nogent, 251.

That this is one of the stories Guibert learned from an oral source or sources and added to the *Dei Gesta* later (as discussed in the introduction) is strongly suggested by Guibert's prior treatment of Pirrus. His account of the betrayal of Antioch contained no foreshadowing of this second betrayal. If it was one of the less sympathetic versions of these events, it was not openly hostile, and Guibert even referred to Pirrus as 'the blessed traitor (*felix proditor*)' and 'the good traitor (*proditor bonus*).'⁷⁴⁴ While there is a certain irony inherent in such phrases, Guibert's tone here probably reflects the uncomfortable reality of the crusader's victory being owed to what was undeniably an act of treachery, even if it was one which furthered the will of God. It was ironic that Pirrus brought about good through treachery, as Guibert suggested here, but this attitude of Guibert's does not match Pirrus's eventual actions. It is therefore very likely that Guibert added the account of Pirrus's second betrayal at a later date, and did not think to edit his account of Pirrus's initial choice to side with the crusaders to reflect the later events. Nevertheless, the addition of this account overrides what little sympathy Guibert might have originally shown for Pirrus, and the outcome of the narrative spectacularly undoes one of only two prominent conversions. The *Dei Gesta* thus appears less sanguine about the prospects of successful Muslim conversion, suggesting hostility to the crusade's enemies rooted in something more than religion alone. In adapting the passage in which the *Gesta Francorum* author claimed that the Turks believed they shared common ancestors with the Franks, Guibert also omitted his source's statement that the Turks would have been greater warriors still had they remained Christian.⁷⁴⁵ This, too, may indicate a less optimistic view of conversion, though it is also possible that Guibert simply omitted it because he correctly believed the *Gesta* author was wrong that the Turks had ever been Christian and did not give the passage deeper consideration.

⁷⁴⁴ Guibert of Nogent, 204 (92). The phrase *felix proditor* may be an imitation of the *Exsultet* from the Paschal Vigil mass, referring to the Fall of Man as a *felix culpa* because it allowed for their redemption by Christ: '*O felix culpa quae talem et tantum meruit habere redemptorem.*' While a traitor to his own people for this action, Pirrus's choice had fortunate consequences for the crusaders. For a discussion of the concept of a *felix culpa*, see Gerhart Ladner, *The Idea of Reform: Its impact on Christian thought and action in the age of the Fathers* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1959), 146.

⁷⁴⁵ *Gesta Francorum*, 21.

5.3 Conclusion

Guibert of Nogent is well-known for making sweeping, fundamental changes to the *Gesta Francorum*'s depiction of Muslim beliefs. Guibert presented an interpretation of Islam using heresy as a model, primarily through an account of the life of Mohammed and the foundation of Islam added to the beginning of the work (although the rest of the work is consistent). He never explicitly called Islam a heresy, using instead the less specific term *error*. This implied that Islam fell into some other undefined category of misbelief, but nevertheless the clear use of heresy as a model places his account in a separate tradition to the other contemporary crusade histories' interpretation of Islam as polytheistic paganism. This was a tradition which existed in early Eastern Christian polemic, and would be developed further in the West in later years, but to which it is difficult to directly connect Guibert's work. He claimed, most likely truthfully, to have received his information about Islam from some kind of performed oral source.

His account of the life of Mohammed also clearly drew from the same tradition which influenced several other works, although again it is unlikely that there was a direct connection. This tradition of travesties of the life of Mohammed itself can be seen to have drawn from a number of sources: an inversion of the structure of a typical hagiography, stereotypes of heresiarchs, and, through unknown means of transmission, some actual identifiable Muslim tradition. Likewise through whatever means of transmission, Guibert did receive the accurate impression that Muslims regarded Mohammed as a prophet rather than a god, and that they did not believe in the Trinity (although there is no indication that he encountered any information about how Muslims regarded Christ himself). While Guibert was clearly aware of the similarity of this to Arianism, he did not present Islam as simply a new form of that older heresy. Aside from this, the only further detail Guibert added to his interpretation of Muslim beliefs was the accusation that Islam allowed every kind of sexual deviance and rejected all Christian moral teaching. Guibert followed up this characterisation with several depictions of sexual deviance by Muslims throughout the text. This was a standard accusation levelled at the outsider groups Moore considered in *The Formation of a Persecuting Society*, heretics in particular. In this, too, then, Guibert was drawing on heresy as a model for his depiction of Islam. In his use of this kind of polemic against Muslims, Guibert ranged from such

bald and unsubtle an accusation as his claim that a bishop was sodomised to death by Turks to his densely literary and deeply ironic passage disparaging Muslim women by evoking Diana and Psalms 126:4-5. Guibert also tended on occasion to depict Islam as a dark mirror-version of Christianity, as when he referred to the Abassid caliph as *summum sui erroris pontifex* adding parenthetically ‘for they even have their own pope, in the likeness of ours’.⁷⁴⁶

Despite this fundamental change, Guibert still referred to Muslims as ‘pagans (*pagani*),’ albeit less frequently than his source. He was explicitly precise and careful in his use of other terms, consulting Solinus, Jordanes, and Justinus’s epitome of Trogus Pompeius to find explanations for the unfamiliar terms ‘Turk’ and ‘Khorosan’ (which he asserted were new names for the Parthians and Caucasia, respectively). He also offered explanations for the *Gesta* author’s designation of Egyptians as ‘Babylonians’ and a definition of the term *Sogdianus* (Sultan). While he followed the *Gesta* in all of these usages (under protest in the former two cases), Guibert was clearly very concerned with the accuracy of his terminology. As such, he must have considered the use of the term *paganus* for Muslims justified despite their monotheism and the proximity of their beliefs to Christian heresy. For Guibert, perhaps, the term was broad enough to encompass Islam as he understood it, a breadth of meaning which may also have been behind its usage by the *Gesta* author himself.

With the addition of extra historical material in his account of the foundation of Islam Guibert elaborated on the distinction which the *Gesta* had made between the Turks and the Saracens, providing more detail. Guibert was broadly aware that the Turks were relatively recent arrivals who had had a great deal of military success against the Fatimid Caliphate, including capturing Jerusalem from them. He also knew that the Fatimids had taken the opportunity provided by the distraction of the crusaders to retake Jerusalem, so that when the crusaders arrived they fought Saracens rather than Turks there – he accepted the *Gesta*’s use of terminology to distinguish the Seljuks from the Fatimids. His assertion that the Turks were the servants of the *Rex Persarum* (as he usually referred to the Sultan) may even have had a basis in accurate, albeit outdated, information. He knew less about the Fatimid Caliphate, however, referring to it as the ‘Babylonian

⁷⁴⁶ ‘...habent enim et papam suum, ad instar nostri...’ Guibert of Nogent, 208.

empire' and apparently not realising that they were led by a rival *papa* (he did not adopt the term 'caliph' from his source) nor that it did not itself date all the way back to the foundation of Islam. As with most of his contemporaries, although he was aware of great hostility between the two major Muslim powers, he did not know of the doctrinal roots of this divide.

Guibert also introduced a prominent theme of Muslims resorting to treachery and deceit. While the *Gesta* and its revisers all included one or occasionally more isolated incidents of trickery (most prominently the trick supposedly played by the fleeing Kilij Arslan and his forces on any cities which they passed), Guibert made this a notable element of his depiction of Muslims. He added several incidents such as an apocryphal story about Pirrus betraying a group of crusaders and the accusation that Godfrey of Bouillon had been poisoned, and also reframed some minor incidents from the *Gesta* to suggest Muslim treachery.

In addition to these new themes in his characterisation of Muslims, he maintained most of the tendencies found in the *Gesta*, often exaggerating them – in particular, he added a great deal of material accusing Muslims of savage treatment of Christians prior to the crusade. As with the *Gesta*, however, the depiction of Muslims as savage fell away as the narrative of the crusade itself went on, with the crusaders being depicted as far more effective in battle. This, too, he was inclined to embellish, correspondingly adding to the *Gesta*'s tendency to dehumanise Muslims by its callous attitude to such extreme violence against them. Guibert was less inclined towards praise and tolerance of Muslims. He was somewhat more consistent in his assessment of their abilities, attributing the difficulty of defeating them partly to the mere novelty of their tactics, but he did not always refrain from complimenting them. He neither concealed nor elaborated on the peace agreements mentioned by the *Gesta*, but his treatment of Pirrus suggests less inclination to view Muslims as separated from Christians only by their religion. Finally, in Guibert's work one finds the strongest emphasis on the idea that the crusade had been foretold and foreordained, with both allegorical interpretations of the prophecy of Zechariah and other passages in the Bible, and repeated emphasis that Muslims too had seen signs that the crusade was coming and would be successful.

6 The *Historia Ierosolimitana* of Albert of Aachen

6.1 Introduction

6.1.1 Identity and date

What little we know about the author of the *Historia Iherosolimitana* is all derived from the text itself. Even his name is not entirely certain: the name Albert or Adalbert is found only in one branch of the stemma which cannot with any certainty be dated any earlier than c.1200. That the author lived in or near Aachen is not in any reasonable doubt, however: he displays detailed knowledge of the people and places of the Rhineland as well as a special interest in crusaders from the region (most prominently Godfrey of Bouillon). The provenance of the surviving manuscripts, where known, also suggests origins near Aachen. Records from Aachen are too sparse for the first decades of the twelfth century to be of any help in identifying an Albert who is likely to have been our author. An Adalbert was recorded as witness to a charter in the city in 1138 and an Albert likewise in 1158. Both (if they were not in fact the same person) were canons of St Mary's in Aachen, which Edgington argues was probably the author's own church as it appears in a vision in his text.⁷⁴⁷ These records may be a little too late to refer to our Albert, however, as he was probably born before 1080. There was a church dedicated to St Adalbert in Aachen, so Albert or Adalbert was probably a common name. In the absence of a positive identification, Edgington deems it sensible to accept and use the name Albert – in part, if nothing else, to avoid the inconvenience of another 'Anonymous'. One of the few personal insights Albert did give was his statement in his prologue that he had longed to join the expedition, but was prevented and settled for writing a record of it instead. This suggests he was of an age to join the expedition in 1096: he referred to *impedimenta*, hindrances, rather than being too young. This would indicate a date of birth no later than c. 1080. Edgington argues that the 'serviceable Latin' of the *Historia* is compatible with the monastic education Albert would have received if he was in fact a canon of St Mary's in Aachen.

⁷⁴⁷ Albert of Aachen, xxiii, 448.

There are some internal and external clues for dating the *Historia*. Books I-VII concern the events of the crusade itself (with only five chapters at the end of Book VI concerning events after the departure for the West of those crusaders who did not stay and become settlers). They were probably written soon after the end of the crusade, though only a *terminus post quem* can be firmly established. Book VI contains two pairs of prophetic dreams, in chapters 26 and 27, and 35 and 37. In each case the interpretation of the dream was demonstrated to be correct by a subsequent death: in chapter 37, that of the death of Godfrey of Bouillon in July 1100, and in chapter 27 that of Stabelo the Chamberlain in May 1102.⁷⁴⁸ Thus, book VI was completed at some point after 1102. Nothing in the text of the first six books indicates a later date of completion: there is no hint of the achievements of Baldwin I, or the eventual accession of Baldwin of Bourcq as Baldwin II. It is likely therefore that these six books were completed relatively soon after 1102, with Albert subsequently choosing to continue the narrative as he continued to receive information. Books VII-XII cover the period from 1099, when many crusaders returned home, to 1119, after the death of Baldwin I and the accession of Baldwin II. The work seems unfinished: the final chapter tells of a massacre of 700 pilgrims by Bedouins and Baldwin II's desire to avenge them, but this story is left incomplete. It is possible that Albert's own death was the reason for this, suggesting a date of completion not long after the last events described.⁷⁴⁹ The end of book XII provided a firm date of 1119 for the earliest possible completion of the entire work, with the books relevant to this thesis completed earlier, by around 1102.

6.1.2 Sources

After careful consideration of the extant prose accounts of the First Crusade, Edgington determined that Albert did not know any of them. Given that even Raymond of Aguilers and Fulcher of Chartres are known to have used the *Gesta Francorum* to various extents, this leaves Albert's *Historia* almost uniquely independent of the latter source. Indeed, depending on the precise nature of the relationship between Ralph of Caen and Fulcher of Chartres, Albert's may be the *only* surviving Latin prose account which is entirely independent of the *Gesta Francorum*.⁷⁵⁰ It was once believed that a 'lost Lotharingian chronicle' provided a source for Albert, but no extrinsic

⁷⁴⁸ Albert of Aachen, 436-8; 448-50.

⁷⁴⁹ Albert of Aachen, xxv.

⁷⁵⁰ See below, 7.1, 7.2.1, 10.1.2.

trace of such a source survives. Additionally, this lost source was only suggested for the events of 1095-9. Albert continued his account down to 1119, with varying levels of detail and apparent accuracy. More than one lost source, as Edgington notes, is even less likely. Far more likely is that Albert was telling the truth when he himself claimed that he compiled the work *ex auditu et relatione*; that is, from oral sources. Albert referred to oral sources repeatedly throughout the work, noting at the beginning of Book III that his work was composed *ex veridica eorum relatione qui et participes fuerunt eiusdem tribulationis*.⁷⁵¹ At other times, he used phrases such as *ut aiunt qui affuerunt* or *ut aiunt quibus tota massa innotuit*.⁷⁵² As Edgington argued, there is no reason to doubt that Albert was truthful about his sources.

There is a demonstrable but complex relationship between Albert and some poetic sources, mainly the *Chanson d'Antioche*. The three recorded *chansons* of the cycle (*Antioche*, *Chanson des Chétifs* and the *Chanson de Jérusalem*) are preserved only in a reworked form the last quarter of the twelfth century, and their original wording is lost. It is therefore not possible to say with absolute certainty whether Albert's work was an influence on the composition (or reworking) of the *Chanson d'Antioche*, or whether Albert drew on the *chanson* in its original oral form. It would also be difficult to explain why some scenes were included and others omitted if one author had used the other directly.⁷⁵³ Edgington concludes that the most probable case is that both Albert and the composer of the *Chanson* used the same or similar early poetic material which originated in the crusader camps. Ní Chléirigh also found similarities between Albert's depiction of the Turks and their depiction in the later *chanson* tradition. Some details are similar, such as the martial characteristics of the *Turci*; the picturesque scenes of *oratio recta* such as Kilij Arslan's supposed embassy to the sultan; and the *superbia* of the Turks, especially Kerbogha.⁷⁵⁴

Recently, Jay Rubenstein has drawn attention to a number of similarities between Guibert of Nogent and Albert of Aachen. There are roughly fifteen or sixteen parallels, ranging from minor but distinctive

⁷⁵¹ Albert of Aachen, 138.

⁷⁵² Albert of Aachen, 300, 432.

⁷⁵³ Susan Edgington, 'Albert of Aachen and the Chansons de Geste' in John France and William G. Zajac (eds), *The Crusades and their Sources: Essays Presented to Bernard Hamilton* (Farnham: Ashgate, 1998), 23-38, 27-8.

⁷⁵⁴ Ní Chléirigh, *The Crusaders and their Enemies*, 241-2. See also Meredith Jones, 'The Conventional Saracen', 204-5.

shared details to longer anecdotes.⁷⁵⁵ Rubenstein does not consider it likely that either Albert or Guibert used each other's work – in particular it would be uncharacteristic of Guibert to have used Albert's *Historia* without identifying and criticising it. This same objection would apply to the possibility of Guibert having also used the supposed lost Lotharingian source, even if such a source had been used by Albert. In the absence of a written source to explain these correspondences, Albert and Guibert must have heard similar oral reports. It stretches plausibility that they might both have interrogated the same witnesses or heard so many similar stories from different returning crusaders, however. The most likely reason for the similarities, then, is the use by Guibert and Albert of another performed oral source (or sources).⁷⁵⁶ It is possible that these sources were variations of the *Chanson d'Antioche* itself in its contemporary oral form(s), but just as it is not possible to determine whether Albert or that lost form of the *Antioche* has primacy, it is equally impossible to know whether these details shared with Guibert might have been part of a version of the *chanson* other than the one which was recorded. It is clear that Albert and Guibert would have heard similar but different versions of this source or sources: both mention the decapitation of Gervais of Bazoches, for example, but give different gruesome fates to his head.⁷⁵⁷

6.1.3 Characteristics

Edgington qualified her observations about Albert's identity and the date of composition and sources of the *Historia* as being dependent on the assumption of a single author. However, as she demonstrated, an examination of the writing style leaves little doubt that this is the case. The syntax and grammar of the work are consistent throughout. Albert's attitudes to his subject matter are a more subjective proposition, but Edgington argues that they too seem consistent: he displays a slightly prurient attitude to women, and his biblical and classical allusions show no significant variation throughout. Ní Chléirigh also found that the use of terminology for the various Eastern and Western Christian and Muslim groups was consistent

⁷⁵⁵ These similarities are listed above in the footnotes to 5.1.3.

⁷⁵⁶ Jay Rubenstein, 'Guibert of Nogent, Albert of Aachen and Fulcher of Chartres: Three Crusade Chronicles Intersect' in Marcus Bull and Damien Kempf (eds.), *Writing the Early Crusades: Text, Transmission and Memory*, (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2014), 24-37, 35-6.

⁷⁵⁷ Guibert of Nogent, 350; Albert of Aachen, 770. Guibert reported his skull was made into a drinking cup, Albert that his scalp was used to decorate a spear.

throughout the work.⁷⁵⁸ The main discernible difference in Albert's work is between the incorporation of legendary, *chanson*-like material in the first six books and the 'more sober' narrative of books VII-XII. This probably reflects the material available, however: epic poems on the First Crusade circulated in the early twelfth century, but there is no evidence for any concerning the reign of Baldwin I. As Edgington observes, 'settlement is more prosaic than crusade.'⁷⁵⁹ Indeed, although they will not be the focus of analysis here, it is worth mentioning that Albert's *Historia* becomes less detailed in general in the latter six books. This too is probably due to the availability of material, with much fewer witnesses available for the settlement period compared to the huge numbers of returning crusaders.

Albert's writing style is straightforward and accessible, with few allusions, which may indicate that he envisaged a broad audience.⁷⁶⁰ This is not conclusive, however, and a further complicating factor in attempting to make a judgment about Albert's expected audience is his reliance on oral sources which would likely have included lay informants and almost certainly did include early epic verse accounts. It is therefore difficult to be sure whether any other aspects of Albert's narrative which might be argued to be appealing to laypeople are due to his intentions rather than to the nature of his sources.

A number of distinct attitudes are detectable in Albert's *Historia*. It has 'long been held as a truism', in Edgington's words, that the work is a panegyric of Godfrey of Bouillon, but this is overstated.⁷⁶¹ Albert shows an interest in Godfrey and the house of Bouillon, but Edgington argues that this is no more than should be expected given that all the evidence suggests Albert lived in Godfrey's homeland and would have gained much of his information from returning followers of Godfrey and his brothers. As Ní Chléirigh points out, the fact that Albert continued the account long after Godfrey's death alone should dispel the notion that the *Historia* was solely a panegyric of the author's erstwhile duke. Flori came to the same conclusion on the basis of a quantitative analysis of the sources for the First Crusade which examined the frequency with which Godfrey was actually mentioned by Albert.⁷⁶² The

⁷⁵⁸ Ní Chléirigh, *The Crusaders and their Enemies*, 199.

⁷⁵⁹ Albert of Aachen, xxix.

⁷⁶⁰ On Albert's style, see Albert of Aachen, xxxvi. Edgington herself notes here that it is difficult to gauge what kind of audience Albert envisaged.

⁷⁶¹ Albert of Aachen, xxxi.

⁷⁶² Flori, *Chroniqueurs et Propagandistes*, 319.

Historia does emphasise the role of Godfrey and the Lotharingians more than other sources, paying more attention than others to various contingents from the Western Empire including parts of the People's Crusade; the journey of Godfrey's army to Constantinople; and the fortunes of Baldwin in Armenia. This may have been driven by a desire to emphasise imperial participation or simply a by-product of the sources available to Albert – or very possibly both.⁷⁶³

In keeping with his attitude to Muslims, as will be seen, Albert was comparatively tolerant of Byzantines and Jews. Albert displayed a 'notable lack of prejudice' towards the former.⁷⁶⁴ He refrained from negative descriptions of Emperor Alexios I Comnenos, frequently bestowing very positive epithets on him instead, such as *magnificus*, *nominatissimus* and *Christianissimus*.⁷⁶⁵ Albert noted the emperor's generosity and support to Walter Sinehabere and Peter the Hermit, and his hospitality to the crusade's leaders. Even when Godfrey's troops fought with the emperor's, Albert was clear that there was blame on both sides and depicted Alexios as magnanimous in resolving the dispute.⁷⁶⁶ Albert also displayed 'remarkable' sympathy with the Rhineland Jews attacked by bands of German crusaders on the way to the East.⁷⁶⁷ He emphasised that the forced conversions demanded had no value and condemned their attackers. He is unique in this criticism, and according to Edgington, his 'sense of outrage can only be matched by the Hebrew writers'.⁷⁶⁸ This tolerance is reflected in Albert's attitude to Muslims. As Edgington argues, in light of these attitudes his tolerance of Muslims seems to come not from distance from events (though the same could hardly be said of the equally-distant *Gesta* revisers), but from a general tendency to be more tolerant towards non-Christians than his contemporaries.⁷⁶⁹

6.1.4 Attitude towards Muslims

Edgington is the only editor of a crusade historian to give consideration to the author's attitude to Muslims in her introduction. She found his attitude to be 'remarkably impartial'; an assessment shared by

⁷⁶³ Ní Chléirigh, *The Crusaders and their Enemies*, 203.

⁷⁶⁴ Albert of Aachen, xxxiii.

⁷⁶⁵ Albert of Aachen, 28, 30.

⁷⁶⁶ Albert of Aachen, xxxiii, 76-8.

⁷⁶⁷ Albert of Aachen, xxxv.

⁷⁶⁸ Albert of Aachen, xxxvi.

⁷⁶⁹ Albert of Aachen, xxxv-vi.

Flori who described Albert's attitude as distinguished by '*une plus grande humanité, une certaine compassion et un fanatisme moins prononcé*.'⁷⁷⁰ This study finds that while this is not an unfair assessment overall, nuance is needed. Albert's account in fact included a great many hostile assertions about Muslims. He depicted Muslims as savagely violent, lustful and arrogant. He usually displayed the same indifference as his contemporaries towards Muslim victims of graphically-described violence committed by the crusaders. Nevertheless, this is to some extent balanced by evidence of a greater degree of tolerance for Muslims. Albert mentioned far more alliances and peace agreements with Muslims than any of his contemporaries, including Fulcher of Chartres and Ralph of Caen whose accounts continued into the period of settlement when most such arrangements were made. He gave a great deal of attention in particular to Muslim leaders who kept their agreements even despite difficult circumstances. He also included praise of Muslim prowess in war, and of individual Muslim figures. 'Nuanced' is perhaps the best descriptor for Albert himself. Part of this nuanced view of Muslims stems from an apparent willingness to view some Muslims as individuals who can display noble characteristics, while still holding hostile views of Muslims collectively. On occasion, however, he even seems to display sympathy for Muslims in general, not only outstanding individuals.

Albert did not at any point provide a systematic introduction to Muslims for his reader, but he provided a considerable amount of information scattered throughout his narrative. This information varied in its accuracy and level of detail. He distinguished between the Seljuks and the Fatimids, consistently referring to them as *Turci* and *Saraceni* but also demonstrating awareness of longstanding hostility between them. He included some details of the political structure of the Turks (as he assumed it functioned), though less of the Fatimids. Albert displayed some understanding of Islam in that he didn't accuse Muslims of idolatry, as Edgington noted, but made little else of his conception of Islam clear. He referred to them as both monotheist and polytheist, perhaps not intending to be consistent. He did not mention the Prophet Mohammed, though his repeated attribution of the name *Mahumeth* to individual Muslims may reflect some awareness of his identity. He attributed a reliance on soothsayers and magicians to Muslims, in terms which may have been freighted with both biblical and classical significance, as well as possibly

⁷⁷⁰ Albert of Aachen, xxxv; Flori, *Chroniqueurs et Propagandistes*, 293.

suggesting idolatry and association with demons. Edgington described Albert's style as simple, with few biblical or classical references and straightforward prose: this is true overall, but a number of the references which Albert did make are important for his depiction of Muslims.⁷⁷¹

⁷⁷¹ Albert of Aachen, xxxvi.

6.2 Muslims in Albert of Aachen

6.2.1 Terminology

Albert's usage of terminology was examined in detail by Ní Chléirigh. As Edgington herself noted, he consistently distinguished between *Turci* and *Saraceni*.⁷⁷² *Turci* applied almost without exception to the Seljuk Turks of the Sultanates of Rûm and Baghdad and their satellites. The term *Saraceni* referred to the inhabitants of Syria and Palestine subject to the Fatimid Caliph, whom Albert adhered to the tendency of his contemporaries in referring to as the *rex Babylonie*. *Saraceni* and *Babyloni* were essentially synonymous. Albert was clearly aware of that the *Turci* and *Saraceni* were separate and hostile – his distinction is not simply in his terminology.⁷⁷³ Ní Chléirigh found that Albert used the phrase *Turci et Saraceni* or *Turci, Saraceni et Arabes* as shorthand for Islam on a few occasions: neither term was used collectively for all Muslims on its own.⁷⁷⁴ Albert referred also to the *Arabes*, correctly using the term to mean Arabs in Ní Chléirigh's analysis. Albert's *Arabes* often fought on horseback: Arab light cavalry was often used in Fatimid armies, so this may be an accurate reflection of the forces the crusaders faced.⁷⁷⁵ The *Azoparth* were the same as the *Aethiopes* described in some other sources: the term was used to denote black African soldiers in the Fatimid armies.⁷⁷⁶ Other national terms like the *Idumei quos moderni vocant Bidumos* (i.e. the Bedouins) appear less frequently and seem to have been used accurately. The most common term Albert used synonymously with all the national terms to refer to all Muslims was *gentiles*.⁷⁷⁷ The term was often used in juxtaposition with *Christiani*. This usage also mirrored Albert's uses of biblical terms and allusions likening the crusaders to the Israelites, casting Muslims as 'the perennial enemy'.⁷⁷⁸ Other theological terms used included *barbari* and *infideles*, the latter of which corresponded to the use of *fideles* for Christians. This too cast Islam as the enemy, especially when juxtaposed in battle seems such as when the *agmina fidelium et infidelium* mixed together in skirmishes at Antioch.⁷⁷⁹

⁷⁷² Albert of Aachen xxxv.

⁷⁷³ Ní Chléirigh, *The Crusaders and their Enemies*, 234-6, 244-5.

⁷⁷⁴ *Ibid*, 244, 248.

⁷⁷⁵ *Ibid*, 248.

⁷⁷⁶ *Ibid*, 251.

⁷⁷⁷ *Ibid*, 252-3.

⁷⁷⁸ *Ibid*, 256.

⁷⁷⁹ *Ibid*, 257; Albert of Aachen, 194, 244

6.2.2 Muslim beliefs

Albert did not include any information about the identity of Mohammed, and may not have known of him. He did, however, refer to two different Muslim people named *Mahumeth*: the son of Omar of Azaz, given as a hostage to Godfrey of Bouillon, and a brother of Duqaq of Damascus who took military service with Baldwin I. He also at one point referred to a Christian convert named Walter Mahumeth.⁷⁸⁰ While it is possible that he encountered only the name *Mahumeth* and did not at all appreciate its significance, it seems more likely that he would have had some understanding but chose not to mention it. He did not at any point devote attention to a specific explanation of the nature of Islam, right or wrong, rather what he thought the beliefs of the enemy were must be pieced together from passing mentions. Albert did not include many statements providing details about Muslim beliefs as he understood them. Albert mentioned that books were found in the captured camp of Kerbogha at Antioch. These books, containing ‘the sacrilegious rites of the Saracens, Turks and all the other races’ (as well as the ‘wicked charms’ of *arioli* and *aruspices*, which will be discussed further below), were mentioned only once, but they do indicate that Albert thought of Islam as a highly literate religion.⁷⁸¹ It is not unlikely that books, especially copies of the Koran, were discovered in Kerbogha’s camp and that this was accurately reported to Albert by his informant. As with the *Gesta Francorum*’s discussion of Muslim books, however, this should not necessarily be taken to reflect accurate knowledge of the Koran. There is too little detail to read anything deeper from this. Albert may have based this depiction of Islam on an accurate impression of Islam conveyed by his source, but he may just as easily have based it on an inversion of Christianity (implicitly contrasting the *sacrilegi ritus* contained in these *codices* with the holy writings of Scripture and the Church Fathers). It is also possible that he was influenced by some degree of familiarity with classical Roman religion or even Judaism, both also highly literate religions.

Albert’s reference to *aruspices* and *arioli*, whose ‘wicked charms’ (*nefanda carmina*) the books found in Kerbogha’s camp contained was not

⁷⁸⁰ *Mahumeth* of Azaz: Albert of Aachen, 348-1 *et passim*; *Mahumeth* of Damascus: Albert of Aachen, 706; Walter Mahumeth: 748, 816.

⁷⁸¹ ‘*Codices uero innumerabiles in eisdem castris gentilium reppererunt, in quibus sacrilegi ritus Sarracenorum, Turcorum, quarumque gentium inscripti erant, et nefanda carmina ariolum et aruspicum cum characteribus execrabilibus.*’ Albert of Aachen, 336.

isolated; he had previously referred to the Sultan consulting his *magi, arioli et aruspices*.⁷⁸² The phrase *magi, arioli et aruspices* in particular is a reference to Daniel 2:27-8, in which Daniel admonishes Nebuchadnezzar that his *sapientes, magi, arioli et aruspices* cannot reveal anything to him, and that God alone has the knowledge he seeks.⁷⁸³ Albert was foreshadowing the defeat of Kerbogha's army and adding some dramatic irony to his narrative: unlike Kerbogha's mother in the *Gesta* family, the magicians and soothsayers predicted victory. The reader, if they did not already, would soon know better. The reference to a passage in which Nebuchadnezzar is wrong to rely on magicians and soothsayers rather than on God also subtly suggests that Muslims are religiously misguided and have misplaced their faith. This is not a surprising message for Albert to have imparted, but it is one which he suggested particularly subtly.

The terms themselves may have been intended to further suggest unchristian practices by Muslims – indeed, this may have been part of the reason Albert felt the reference to Daniel was appropriate. *Ariolus* and *haruspex* were classical Latin terms, indicating diviners whose predictions played important roles in Roman life. Whether the terms would have strongly implied a connection to Roman paganism to Albert is less certain. They were closely associated with each other in Isidore of Seville's *Etymologiae*, and the latter term was connected to Rome: according to Isidore the art of *aruspicina* was first discovered by the Etruscans, whose books the Romans translated (compare also Albert's *codices*, although Isidore referred to *libri* here).⁷⁸⁴ There is also some similarity between Albert's description of the books and Isidore's definition of *arioli* as those who 'utter abominable prayers (*nefarias preces*) around the "altars of idols" (*ara idolorum*)'. Isidore's '*nefarias preces*' is not identical to Albert's '*nefanda carmina*' but they can be translated synonymously. This falls short of confirming a direct influence, but is suggestive. In either case, Isidore's connection of these terms to ancient Rome does indicate that this connection is likely to have occurred to Albert, and thus that his intention was to attribute paganistic tendencies to

⁷⁸² Albert of Aachen, 258.

⁷⁸³ 'Et respondens Daniel coram rege, ait: *Mysterium, quod rex interrogat, sapientes, magi, arioli et aruspices nequeunt indicare regi: Sed est Deus in caelo revelans mysteria, qui indicavit tibi, rex Nabuchodonsor, quae ventura sunt in novissimis temporibus...*' Daniel 2:27-8. Edgington's edition cites Deuteronomy 2:27 here rather than Daniel, but this is an error, possibly the result of a misprint. Albert of Aachen, 259 n. 17.

⁷⁸⁴ Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiae* VIII.ix.34-5; trans Barney et al. 183. *Arioli* and *Haruspices* appear one after another at VIII.ix.16-17.

Muslims. Even if they did not indicate a direct connection to Rome, Isidore's definitions do suggest that these words were freighted with meaning for Albert. While Albert did not directly accuse Muslims of idolatry, Isidore's definition of *ariolus* centred on their worship of idols. They also offered 'pernicious sacrifices' and received the answers of 'demons'.⁷⁸⁵ It is possible that Albert had this definition in mind, using the term to attribute idolatrous and demonic practices to the Muslims. Although Isidore's definition of *haruspex* is less loaded, in introducing this chapter (*De Magis*) he mentioned the invention of *aruspicium* through the invocation of evil angels (*angeli mali*).⁷⁸⁶ These terms, including *magi*, are thus likely to have held considerable polemic force in Albert's mind, suggesting evil influence and folly (Isidore referred to *haec vanitas magicarum artium*, 'this foolery of magic arts') as well as possibly indicating some more specific ideas about Muslim religious practice influenced by knowledge of Roman paganism.⁷⁸⁷

Further complicating the question of whether Albert might have been partially influenced by a classical model, however, he did not make it at all clear whether he believed Muslims to be polytheists or not. In the passage in which Kilij Arslan brought news of the crusaders to Kerbogha and the sultan, and appealed for their assistance on behalf of Yaghi Siyhan, Kerbogha swore by a single god that he would defeat the Christians.⁷⁸⁸ In the immediately following chapter, however, the *rex Corruzana* consulted the *magi, arioli et aruspices deorum suorum*, wishing to know if Kerbogha would be victorious (in contrast to the predictions of Kerbogha's mother in the *Gesta* family, they falsely predicted victory).⁷⁸⁹ Appearing in such close proximity, it is unlikely that this is the result of two of Albert's sources contradicting each other – if he even had an external source for this passage. It would have been entirely compatible with the genre of *historia* for this conversation to have been Albert's own invention, as indeed is demonstrated by the appearance of an equivalent passage at this point in the narrative of *Gesta Francorum* and the accounts of its more learned revisers. A short number of chapters later, Kerbogha, outraged by Baldwin of Boulogne's defiance of his armies when he attempted to restore Turkish rule in Edessa on the way to Antioch, swore again *in deo suo* that he would not abandon the

⁷⁸⁵ Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiae*, VIII.ix.16; trans. Barney et al., 182.

⁷⁸⁶ Isidore, *Etymologiae* VIII.ix.3; trans Barney et al, 181.

⁷⁸⁷ Ibid.

⁷⁸⁸ '...quos in deo meo iuro, sic delebo ut omnis hoc eorum posteritas doleat.', Albert of Aachen, 258.

⁷⁸⁹ Albert of Aachen, 258. Cf *Gesta Francorum*, 53-6.

siege (although this is precisely what he did).⁷⁹⁰ This occurred again when Peter the Hermit was sent as an ambassador to Kerbogha's army and proposed a contest of champions to decide the fate of Antioch. This contest would be secured by hostages on each side and an oath sworn, *tu in deo tuo, ipsi in deo suo*.⁷⁹¹ The weight of numbers thus suggests Albert believed Muslims were monotheists, but he does not seem to have made a point to be clear and consistent in this regard. The close proximity of Albert's single reference to multiple gods and his first reference to a singular god does not suggest that this was accidental, and yet barring a belief that Kerbogha and the sultan adhered to different religions (for which there is no further evidence, and for which it is difficult to suggest a reason), it seems that this must have been the case.

Albert included a number of other scattered details. He noted that both the *Turci* and the *Sarraceni* treated the 'Temple of the Lord' (which was in fact the Dome of the Rock, a place of worship constructed by and for Muslims on the site where the Temple had once stood) with reverence when they each had control of Jerusalem. Throughout their occupation, the Turks had preserved the 'Temple' and performed in it 'the rites of their mistaken religion' (*ritus sui erroris*).⁷⁹² When the Fatimid vizier al-Afdal (whom Albert here confused with the *rex Babilonie*) captured Jerusalem from the Turks in 1098, Albert wrote that the *rex* 'approached the Temple of the Lord with utmost reverence and humility in accordance with the ritual of the gentiles'.⁷⁹³ Nothing Albert wrote indicated any awareness that this was actually a place of worship the Muslims had built. He noted that the *rex Babilonie* also performed the observances of the *religio gentilis* at the Holy Sepulchre without disturbing the Christian worshippers there.⁷⁹⁴ Similarly, there is no indication that Albert intended to suggest the importance of Christ within Islam here (or was even aware of it). He only observed a tendency to revere and a desire to worship within buildings which he thought of as Christian churches. On another occasion Albert suggested the practice of clerical marriage and perhaps polygamy among Muslims, though his wording is somewhat ambiguous. He wrote that the 'priest' (*sacerdos*) of Caesarea was taken prisoner when the city was captured (1101), and

⁷⁹⁰ Albert of Aachen, 264-6.

⁷⁹¹ Albert of Aachen, 318.

⁷⁹² Albert of Aachen, 434.

⁷⁹³ '...*rex Ierusalem ingressus templum Domini iuxta ritum gentilium summa reuerentia et humilitate subii...*' Albert of Aachen, 444

⁷⁹⁴ Ibid.

presented to King Baldwin I to be ransomed along with his 'women' (*mulieres eius*).⁷⁹⁵ This may have referred to other female dependents such as family members or servants, however. Albert also included evidence of the effects of Muslim iconoclasm. He reported that the statues of Jesus and the saints in Antioch had been 'covered over with cement and blinded as if they were living people' by the Turks.⁷⁹⁶ This is quite likely to be an accurate detail reported to Albert, though he gave no indication of having known that this would have been done due to Islamic doctrine regarding the depiction of human forms.

6.2.3 Violence by Muslims.

Albert began his *Historia* with an account of the suffering of eastern Christians and pilgrims at the hands of the Turkish rulers of Jerusalem. This account was not among his most vivid, rather its importance lies in the fact that in doing so he framed the crusade in the context of a response to wrongdoing by Muslims, similarly to Robert the Monk. Indeed, Albert did explicitly mention revenge in this context, though it would not become as prominent a theme throughout his *Historia* as in Robert's case.⁷⁹⁷ Peter the Hermit, instigator of the crusade in Albert's version of events, had made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem some years before the beginning of the journey and saw 'some unlawful and wicked things... and he suffered them with a grieving heart, and groaned in spirit, calling on God himself as avenger of the wrongs he had seen.'⁷⁹⁸ These 'unlawful and wicked things' were specified in a conversation between Peter and the patriarch of Jerusalem. The holy places were being defiled, the offerings of the faithful stolen, churches used as stables, Christians beaten up and pilgrims 'robbed' by excessive fees and subject to violent acts by 'infidels'.⁷⁹⁹ This was tolerated, the Patriarch told Peter, because 'either we have to ransom our life by constant payments, or it will be cut short by fatal executions, and we expect the dangers to be greater from one day to the next unless there should be aid

⁷⁹⁵ Albert of Aachen, 566.

⁷⁹⁶ '...imaginem uero Domini nostri Iesu Christi et figuras sanctorum quas in modum uiuentis persone excecatas et cemento obductas obscurauerunt...' Albert of Aachen, 338.

⁷⁹⁷ See above, 3.1.2, 3.2.5.

⁷⁹⁸ '...uisa quedam illicita et nefanda tristi animo accepit, et infremuit spiritu; ipsum Deum uindictam super uisis iniuriis appellat.' Albert of Aachen, 4.

⁷⁹⁹ '...pateretur gentiles et impios sancta inquinare et ab hiis fidelium oblationes asportari requirit, ecclesia uti pro stabulis, Christianos colaphizari, peregrinos sanctos iniusta mercede spoliari et multis oppressionibus ab hiis angustari.' Albert of Aachen, 4.

from the Christians...'⁸⁰⁰ Peter thus resolved to convey this message to the leaders of the Christian West, 'for the love of God and for your liberation, and for the cleansing of the holy places.'⁸⁰¹ This aim for the crusade was immediately reinforced, with Peter receiving a vision of Christ in the next chapter, who commanded him to do just this, in much the same terms.⁸⁰² This is the reason for the Crusade, then: Albert did not emphasise the role of God as much as Robert the Monk and emphasised coming to the rescue of Eastern Christians more than avenging them, but there is a trace of Robert's focus on vengeance in justifying the crusade. In this context, much of what follows serves to reinforce this message.

Edgington characterised Albert as 'remarkably impartial' towards Muslims, but his account does contain a considerable degree of hostile depictions of Muslims. As Ní Chléirigh noted, one way in which this manifested itself was the assertion that Muslims – often specifically Turks – behaved cruelly and savagely. Sometimes these were simply statements, as when Albert referred to Turks 'cruelly' (*crudeliter*) attacking the People's Crusade, resulting in a 'most cruel slaughter' (*crudelissime necis*).⁸⁰³ He also used the term *carnifex*, meaning butcher or killer, on several occasions (*crudelissimi carnifices* in one instance).⁸⁰⁴ However, Albert also included many vivid depictions of slaughters perpetrated by Muslims, as well as torture and the mutilation of corpses. In contrast to the tendency in the *Gesta* family, these depictions become more detailed and vivid with the advent of the Princes' Crusade. This was perhaps due to Albert consciously or unconsciously choosing to prioritise the dramatic effect for the narrative rather than emphasising the effectiveness of the crusaders against their enemies, as the *Gesta* author and his revisers tended to do.

When Kiliç Arslan's forces attacked Peter's camp, they 'found those who were there, the feeble and the crippled, clerics, monks, aged women,

⁸⁰⁰ '*Vita enim nostra aut assiduus redimetur tributis, aut mortiferis deputabitur suppliciis, et maiora speramus de die in diem affore pericula, nisi Christianorum affuerint auxilia...*' Albert of Aachen, 4.

⁸⁰¹ '*Qua de causa ob Dei gratiam et uestram liberationem, et sanctorum emundationem...*' Albert of Aachen, 4.

⁸⁰² '*...calumnias et iniurias populo nostro et loco sancto illatas reserabis, et suscitabis corda fidelium ad purganda loca sancta Ierusalem et ad restauranda officia sanctorum.*' Albert of Aachen, 6.

⁸⁰³ Albert of Aachen, 34, 36. For other references to Muslims as *crudelis*, see pp 40, 118, 120, 130, 206, 212, 288, 298, 602, 610, 620.

⁸⁰⁴ Albert of Aachen, 222, 288, 488, 880.

children at the breast, and put them all to the sword, regardless of age.⁸⁰⁵ In contrast, Albert provided a much more vivid image of a form of psychological warfare engaged in by the defenders of Nicaea when the Princes' Crusade laid siege to the city in 1097. When a soldier from the army of Count Robert of Normandy was killed beneath the walls of Nicaea, the defenders

threw down from that abominable tower a chain which had on it very sharp and grasping iron claws of ingenious artifice and workmanship, like hooks, which caught in the rings of the dead soldier's hauberk, and held, and it was pulled up over the walls with the dead body. Then, when they had got hold of the soldier's body, although it was dead they hanged it in a noose of rope against the walls, so that they could offend the Christians by this inhuman conduct. When after this long display he was thrown down naked from the walls they [the Christians] took him up with honour...⁸⁰⁶

(Fulcher of Chartres reported that this was a frequent practice whenever a crusader died within reach of the walls, though he did not mention the display of the bodies, rather that the corpses were stripped and robbed of anything in their possession then thrown naked from the walls. Given Fulcher was present at this stage of the crusade, it is likely that something like this actually occurred.)⁸⁰⁷

Such incidents of extreme violence committed by Muslims continue consistently throughout Albert's account, although the level of vivid imagery varies from case to case. Albert described a number of massacres by Muslims. At Dorylaeum, Kilij Arslan's forces caught Bohemond and his contingent of crusaders off guard, and broke through to attack the non-

⁸⁰⁵ '...quosquos repererunt languidos ac debiles, clericos, monachos, mulieres grandeuas, pueros sugentes, omnem uero etatem gladio extinxerunt.' Albert of Aachen, 37.

⁸⁰⁶ 'Turci ergo uidentes uirum immobilem iam obisse, ab ipsa nefanda turre catenam proiciunt, unguis ferreos acutissimos et rapacissimos ex fabрили ingenio et opere habentem quasi hamos, que anulos lorice extincti militis infixi arripiens, ac retinens, cum cadauere mortuo intra menia leuatur. Dehinc corpus militis apprehensum, licet extinctum in laqueo funis ad menia suspenderunt, ut Christianos per hanc inhumanitatem amplius offenderent. Offensi uero et tristes, uniuersi lamentabantur confratrem tam crudeli nece et uili tractatu perisse. Quem post hanc diutinam illusionem nudum a menibus proiectum, honorifice susceptum...' Albert of Aachen, 120.

⁸⁰⁷ Fulcher of Chartres, 40.

combatants in the camp. Albert reported an intense battle in which 'The Turks, with their prince Suleyman, were growing stronger and stronger, they burst into the camp in strength, striking with arrows from their horn bows, killing pilgrim foot soldiers, girls, women, infants, and old people, sparing no one on grounds of age.'⁸⁰⁸ A smaller-scale but more graphically-described massacre occurred outside the walls of Tarsus. Three hundred of Tancred's men were camped outside the city, which had been captured by Baldwin of Boulogne. The garrison had held out, saying they would surrender only to Godfrey of Bouillon and his larger forces, but their nerve failed and they fled the city by night. As they left, however, they launched a surprise attack against Tancred's sleeping men, slaughtering most if not all of them. In the morning the crusaders and the Christians of Tarsus discovered them 'all beheaded by the weapons of the Turks, and the meadows made hideous and overflowing with their blood.'⁸⁰⁹ Albert emphasising the ferocity of the Turkish attackers who ambushed a Christian foraging party during the siege of Antioch: 'they fell upon them with fierce cries, shooting arrows through head and side and bowels, tearing all of them to pieces as wolves do to sheep...'⁸¹⁰ Several other foraging parties at Antioch suffered similar fates; one was left with 'very many of the Christians' bodies thrown to the ground with their heads cut off'; another was subjected to a 'horrible slaughter' (*atroci nece consumentes*). During the crusade of 1101, a similar foraging party of a thousand footsoldiers was surrounded in a valley by *crudeles Turci*. Unable to attack the crusaders due to the difficult terrain, the Turks set fire to the dry plants and the entire company was burned alive.⁸¹¹ Earlier, Albert had recorded the fate of Svend, son of the king of Denmark, who had attempted to travel through Anatolia to join the rest of the Princes' Crusade in 1098. Edgington notes in her edition that while this story was 'romantic' and sometimes considered fictional, 'Svend' has been identified as one of the sons of Sven II Estridson (1047-c.1074) and it is accepted that a son of his did go on crusade, so it probably had some basis. His party was ambushed by Kilij Arslan's forces, who killed him and his fiancée Florina of

⁸⁰⁸ 'Turci cum principe Solimanno magis ac magis inualescentes, fortiter irrumpunt in castra, sagittis et corneo arcu ferientes, mortificantes pedites peregrinos, puellas, mulieres, paruulos ac senes, nulli parcentes etati.' Albert of Aachen, 130.

⁸⁰⁹ 'Mane dehinc facto, Christiani qui infra urbem erant somno exurgentes et ad menia tendentes scire et uidere si adhuc moram in pratis Christiani confratres haberent, uiderunt uniuersos armis Turcorum detruncatos, et sanguine illorum prata fedata nimium redundare.' Albert of Aachen, 156.

⁸¹⁰ 'Quos ferociter inclamantes aggrediuntur, sagitta perforantes trans caput et latus ac uiscera, uniuersos ut lupi oues laniantes...'

⁸¹¹ Albert of Aachen, 602.

Burgundy and engaged in an 'immense slaughter' (*cede immanissima*) of his forces.⁸¹² Even more cruelly, and more vividly described, the same Turkish soldiers then proceeded to Philomelium where some sick pilgrims travelling with Svend had been recuperating. 'They found needy and fever-stricken pilgrims bathing in the waters to cure their weak bodies, and they pierced them with arrows, turning all the water bloody. And they forced others, who hid their heads beneath the water to avoid the blows they struck, to suffocate in cruel death by drowning.'⁸¹³

In addition to these large-scale massacres, Albert also included a smaller number of accounts of individuals or smaller groups of people subjected to horrific violence or torture. During Godfrey of Bouillon's short reign, Arsuf was compelled to pay tribute and given hostages as a sign of good will. Later, when they refused to pay or release the hostages, Godfrey besieged the city. Despairing of their chances of defending themselves, the inhabitants took Gerard of Avesnes, one of the hostages and tied him to a ship's mast, 'stretching his hands and feet with ropes in the manner of a crucifix.' In addition to this incident Albert reported, torture was also something the crusaders expected to receive at the hands of their enemy, suggesting that this was a common practice. Albert noted that the Christians had expected that Gerard would already have been tortured to death.⁸¹⁴ Similarly, Robert of Flanders and 500 of his men fiercely defended a fortress built to block the Turks from using one of the bridges at Antioch to launch

⁸¹² Albert of Aachen, 222-4. The *Annalista Saxo* recorded that a brother of the king of Denmark (as a younger son of Sven II would have been by 1098) travelled to the east in the company of two bishops (see MGH SS VI.730) Florina is not recorded elsewhere. If she does correspond to a real figure she would have been the daughter of Eudes I of Burgundy. However, J.M. Jensen suggested instead that the tale might be a garbled record of the fate of the bishop of Funen (*Fiona*), one of the two the *Annalista Saxo* mentioned. See Albert of Aachen, 222-4 nn 103, 105.

⁸¹³ *'Turci igitur milites Solimanni gaudentes suo uictrici euentu et cede Christianorum immanissima, ad lacus calidorum fontium qui ibidem iuxta Finimis fumabant, celeriter aduolant. Qui mendicos et febricitantes peregrinos in hiis ad curandum debile corpus reperientes, sagitta transfixerunt, totam undam sanguineam reddentes. Aliosque sub unda caput ab ictu ferientis abscondentes seuo fine dimersionis suffocari cogeant.'* Albert of Aachen, 224.

⁸¹⁴ *'...malum naualem procere altitudinis, qui in media urbe iacebat, funibus et catenis astrictum in altum leuauere. In quo unum de obsidibus ducis, Gerardum predictum ortum de genere Hainaucorum de presidio Auennis, militem egregium, in modum crucifixi affixerunt, manus et pedes illius funibus extendentes. Quem iam diu penis consumptum a carnificibus Christiani arbitrabantur.'*

attacks on their besiegers, 'knowing that they would suffer cruel tortures if they were defeated and subjected to their power.'⁸¹⁵

Albert also mentioned two incidents in which the bodies of Christians who had been killed were subjected to desecration, sometimes quite imaginatively. In addition to the hook and chain contraption at Nicaea discussed above, Albert wrote that Roger of Barneville was killed in an ambush by an advance party from Kerbogha's army at Antioch. His head was cut off and born back to Kerbogha's army on a spear as a sign of their victory. Albert referred to those who did this as 'most cruel murdering Turks' (*Turci crudelissimi carnifices*), expressing clear disapproval and offering this incident as evidence of the savagery of the enemy.⁸¹⁶ This is despite the fact that, as will be seen below, Albert recorded without criticism that the crusaders had done this to hundreds of Turks at a battle against one of the relief forces which had tried to lift the siege of Antioch. Much later, in a version of a similar story that also reached Guibert of Nogent, a certain knight named Gervase of Bazoches was captured and executed in 1108. Soboas, 'one of the most powerful of the Turks' (either an invented or a thoroughly garbled name), ordered his head to be cut off. Struck by Gervase's long white hair, he had his scalp taken off and dried and attached it to his spear, 'as a token and memorial of the victory and to stir up the grief of the Christians.'⁸¹⁷

6.2.4 Sexual Violence

A particular subset of Albert's depictions of Muslims as savage is his frequent accusations of sexual violence against women. This conveyed essentially the same message about the savagery of Muslim character as the above depictions of violence, but it also added the perception of Muslims (especially Turks) as being subject to uncontrollable lust. Albert accused Muslims of rape – both directly and by implication – much more often than any of his contemporaries. After Nicaea surrendered, many Christian

⁸¹⁵ '...scientes se crudelibus penis consumi si uicti eorum ditioni subderentur...' Albert of Aachen, 298.

⁸¹⁶ Albert of Aachen, 288.

⁸¹⁷ 'Soboas, unus ex prepotentibus Turcorum, caput illius iussit amputari, cutem uero capitis, cum crinibus eius albis et floridis et multo tempore intonsis, abstrahi et siccari, eo quod miri essent decoris, ut in signum et memoriam uictorie, ad suscitandum dolorem Christianorum semper in hasta sublimi tollerentur.' Albert of Aachen, 770. Guibert reported that Gervase's head was turned into a drinking cup for the emir of Damascus. Guibert of Nogent, 350.

prisoners were returned. This included a nun who had been captured during the People's Crusade, who said she had been 'taken in a vile and detestable union by a certain Turk and others.' She was given penance for this 'unlawful liaison' (*illicite copulationis*), but this was 'made less burdensome because she had endured this hideous defilement by wicked and villainous men under duress and unwillingly.'⁸¹⁸ As mentioned above, Albert accused the Turkish rulers of Tarsus of mutilating the women of the city if they 'did not find them willing to be defiled.'⁸¹⁹ Similarly, the Armenians of Artah (*Artesia*) attacked their Turkish rulers and threw open the city gates to Robert of Flanders, having remembered 'the injustices which they had borne from those same Turks for a long time,' which included first and foremost 'the rape of their wives and daughters.'⁸²⁰ In an anecdote that functions like something of a morality tale, Albert told of the Archdeacon Adalbero of Metz and 'a certain woman of great birth and beauty' who were captured by a force of Turks while playing dice in a 'pleasure garden full of apple trees'.⁸²¹ Adalbero was beheaded and his head taken as a trophy, whereas the woman was taken alive and unhurt into the city, where 'they tormented her all night with the unchaste intercourse of their excessive lust.' Finally she was led to the ramparts and executed after she had been 'abused with this abominable and most wicked coition'. Her head and the head of Adalbero were thrown into the plains before the walls with a mangonel.⁸²² Finally, Albert repeated such accusations when he gave his account of the Crusade of 1101. After a punishing battle with the Turks in Paphlagonia, panic spread

⁸¹⁸ '...a feda et abhominabili cuiusdam Turci et ceterorum commixtione habuisse conquesta est... alleuiata penitentia, eo quod ui et nolens ab impiis et sceleratis hominibus hanc fedam pertulerit oppressionem.' Albert of Aachen, 126.

⁸¹⁹ 'Accusabant enim eosdem Turcos plurime illustres matrone ciuitatis, ostendentes eis aures et nares quas eis detruncauerant, eo quod stupri sui eas consentaneas inuenire nequiuerint.' Albert of Aachen, 158.

⁸²⁰ 'Verum ciues Armenici quos idem Turci longa seruitute depresserant, secum in eisdem munitionibus reminiscences iniuriam suarum quas ab eisdem Turcis diu pertulerant, in raptione uxorū et filiarum...' Albert of Aachen, 182-4.

⁸²¹ '...alearum ludo pariter recreari et occupari, cum matrona quadam que magne erat ingenuitatis et formositatis, in uiridario pomiferis arboribus plenissimo...' Albert identified Archdeacon Adalbero of Metz as a son of Count Conrad I of Luxembourg (†1086) and a relative of Emperor Henry III (†1056). Edgington adds that he was the nephew of Bishop Adalbero of Metz (†1072). Albert could not have known the details of his fate, but it is possible that Adalbero was abducted or killed in some compromising circumstances such as he described. Albert of Aachen, 208-210; see also 208 n. 98.

⁸²² '...matronam uero uiuam et intactam armis rapientes traxerunt in urbem, per totam noctem immoderate libidinis sue incesto concubitu eam uexantes, nihil in ea humanitatis exhibentes. Tandem tam abhominabili et sceleratissima commixtione plurimorum abusam ad menia deducētes, capitali sententia peremerunt. Cuius caput continuo manganellis suis imponentes, una cum capite archidiaconi procul a muris in mediis proiecerunt campos.' Albert of Aachen, 210.

and the leaders of the army abandoned their camp that night. The Turkish forces, led by an alliance of Kilij Arslan and Danishmend Ghazi, discovered this and captured the camp.⁸²³ Of the women in the camp, 'Some were violated in turn by unlawful and wicked coupling, and after great persecution were beheaded.' Others were taken as slaves, although as Albert described them as ones who 'pleased the Turks' eyes by their cheerful appearance and handsome looks', it is likely that he meant it to be understood that a similar fate awaited them.⁸²⁴ As Ní Chléirigh noted, sexual motives were also often implied when Albert recorded the capture of Latin prisoners by Turks, such as when Kilij Arslan's army took prisoners during the People's Crusade and when Kerbogha demanded the Christians hand over the unbearded men and virgins among them.⁸²⁵

Albert emphasised lust and lack of chastity on several of these occasions, using words such as *incestus*, *lasciuia* and *libido*.⁸²⁶ On other occasions he emphasised that the beautiful appearances of the women concerned was the motivation, as seen with the women in 1101 and also the nun, whose Turkish husband was 'inflamed by passion' (*exarserat*) for her *inestimabile pulchritudo*.⁸²⁷ This understanding of rape as an act of lust explains how Albert might have thought, as he did, that the nun would return to her husband despite how she had been treated because of her own lust (*libido suas*).⁸²⁸ On other occasions Albert used terms such as *iniuria*, *nefaria*, *illicita* and *uexatio*, emphasising the criminality and brutality of the acts. Indeed he used both *libido* and *uexatio* on one occasion.⁸²⁹ Both savagery and lust were equally relevant for Albert. Still, he is the only author among his contemporaries other than Guibert of Nogent to accuse Muslims of lustfulness to anything like this degree.

As is often the case with Albert, however, his attitude displays some nuance here. As well as these terrible incidents, he also gave attention to the widow of a crusader whom he believed married Omar of 'Azaz and was

⁸²³ Albert also mentioned the unidentified *Karageth* and Ridwan of Aleppo, who was not personally present but who had supplied troops. See Conor Kostick, *The Siege of Jerusalem: Crusade and Conquest in 1099* (London: Continuum, 2009), 158.

⁸²⁴ '*Alie illicita et feda commixtione uicissim uexate, et post plurimam uexationem decollate sunt, alie hilari uultu et decora facie oculis eorum placentes in barbaras, ut diximus, nationes transmise sunt.*' Albert of Aachen, 610.

⁸²⁵ Albert of Aachen, 36, 318; Ní Chléirigh, *The Crusaders and their Enemies*, 238.

⁸²⁶ Albert of Aachen, 126, 210.

⁸²⁷ Albert of Aachen, 126.

⁸²⁸ Albert of Aachen, 128.

⁸²⁹ Albert of Aachen, 184, 210, 612.

treated well by him, convincing him to ally with the crusaders (this story of how it came about was legendary, but the alliance with Omar was real, as discussed below). Albert also wrote that young women in Bohemond's camp at Dorylaeum began in desperation to dress themselves up and offer themselves to the Turks when the camp was overrun. On this occasion, however, rather than playing on the theme of Turkish lust Albert suggests that their hope was to inspire mercy: they did this so that 'roused and appeased by love of their beautiful appearance, the Turks might learn to pity their prisoners.'⁸³⁰

6.2.5 Violence against Muslims

Considerably more remarkable than Albert's depiction of violence by Muslims, which consistently depicted them as savage, was his apparent attitude to violence against Muslims. Most of his contemporaries displayed a callous, if not actually celebratory, attitude to this violence. This implicitly dehumanised the enemy. This is frequently the case with Albert too, adding a note of hostility unrecognised by Edgington's assessment of his attitude to Muslims. On certain occasions, however, Albert displayed a more nuanced attitude in this regard in particular, especially concerning the massacre that occurred when Jerusalem was stormed.

Albert did include a number of extremely violent incidents without any indications of disapproval. Two hundred of the Turks 'from humble households and performing lowly service' (*de humili familia et clientela*) who were left behind in Tarsus were beheaded when Baldwin stormed the tower in which they had taken refuge.⁸³¹ Albert wrote that the 'Bridge Battle', a battle with the Turkish defenders of Antioch that took place partly on the Iron Bridge over the Orontes, continued 'until the whole river was changed by the blood of the killed.'⁸³² Although the phrasing is distinct, this is strikingly similar to the *Gesta Francorum*. It may simply be that oral reports similar to what the *Gesta* author recorded were circulating, though the influence – possibly indirect – of classical sources as mentioned in the *Gesta* chapter should not be discounted.⁸³³ Another case of shared imagery

⁸³⁰ '...ut saltem amore honestarum formarum accensi et placati, discant captiuis misereri.' Albert of Aachen, 131.

⁸³¹ Albert of Aachen, 156.

⁸³² '...donec sanguine occisorum totus immutatur fluuius.' Albert of Aachen, 244.

⁸³³ Cf *Gesta Francorum*, 40; Vergil, *Aeneid*, 6.86-7.

occurs in Albert's account of the battle of Ascalon in 1099. Some of the fleeing Egyptians 'hurried to climb palm trees, and some the branches of olives or figs,' hoping to hide from the crusaders. But footsoldiers shot arrows at them, 'and like birds struck by a flying bolt they fell dead to earth.'⁸³⁴ This attempt to hide in trees was also recorded by the *Gesta* author, and the bird imagery is also found in both Peter Tudebode and Robert the Monk's accounts.⁸³⁵ In this case, if not also the case of the Orontes running red with blood, it seems likely that there is some indirect connection between the *Gesta* and Albert – perhaps the same campsite retellings of these battles influencing the anonymous author and finding their way to Albert's oral sources.

Many of Albert's descriptions of violence bear no close resemblance to the *Gesta*, however, or at least no closer than would be expected from a retelling of the same events. A wholesale slaughter took place when Antioch was finally stormed:

They spared none of the gentile kind on grounds of age or sex until the earth was covered with blood and the corpses of the slaughtered, many of them also the killed and lifeless bodies of Christians, Gauls as well as Greeks, Syrians and Armenians mixed together. No wonder, since there had still been darkness over the earth, with the light scarcely discernible, and they were entirely unaware whom they should spare or whom they should strike, for very many Turks and Saracens, fearing for their lives, deceived the pilgrims with speech and tokens of Christian faith, and so they lost their lives in the common massacre.⁸³⁶

⁸³⁴ '...arbores palmarum, alii ramos oliuarum aut ficorum conscendere properabant, ut saltem ramorum et foliorum densitate latere et liberari possent. Sed pedites Christiani nimium propinqui miseros uisos in arboribus ac patefactos subito sagitta transfigebant, et quasi aues uolatili telo percussas, ab ipsi arborum ramis moribundos humi procumbere...' Albert of Aachen, 468.

⁸³⁵ *Gesta Francorum*, 96; Tudebode, 115; Robert the Monk, 105 (876).

⁸³⁶ 'Nulli etati parcebant, aut sexui de genere gentilium, dum terra sanguine et cadauere occisorum operta est, pluribus etiam cesis et exanimis corporibus Christianorum tam Gallorum quam Grecorum, Syrorum et Armenicorum admixtis. Nec mirum, cum uix luce agnita adhuc super terram essent tenebre, et quibus parcerent aut quos ferirent penitus ignorarent, nam uoce et signo Christiane professionis Turci et Sarraceni timore mortis plurimi acclamantes peregrinos fallebant, et ideo communi strage uitam amittebant.' Albert of Aachen, 282-4.

Despite this high rate of ‘collateral damage’ inflicted on the Eastern Christian population, Albert expressed no disapproval of this massacre, though he did offer the excuse of darkness and tried to shift some of the blame to the Turks for disguising themselves.⁸³⁷ Albert adopted a similarly neutral tone when describing the capture of Kerbogha’s camp after the final battle for Antioch: ‘Of all the women, young boys, and the many infants still being suckled whom they found in the camp, some were slaughtered, others trampled by the feet of horses, and they filled the plains with wretched and mangled remains, destitute of help from their own gentile peoples who were running away from the battle.’⁸³⁸ Albert used a similar tone with other incidents.⁸³⁹ On one occasion, Albert’s phrasing suggests outright approval. At the first battle of Ramla (7 September 1101), when the tide of battle turned decisively in favour of Baldwin I and his forces, they inflicted on the enemy ‘an unheard-of slaughter and killing by the power of Lord Jesus Christ and the Holy Cross.’⁸⁴⁰ This is a reference to the presence in battle of the relic of the True Cross; earlier an eminent emir had tried to kill the bishop carrying it but ‘was prevented by divine vengeance and struck down.’⁸⁴¹ In this case, Albert is clear divine assistance, and by extension approval, was behind this massacre.

Albert also included a number of incidents of demonstrative killings of individual Muslims, or the defilement of corpses and their use as a form of psychological warfare. This introduces an element of hypocrisy to his accounts of Muslims engaging in similar behaviour, which he described in disapproving terms as seen above. In particular, Albert mentioned severed

⁸³⁷ Interestingly, Guibert of Nogent says almost the opposite of this: in his account, the Papal Legate Adhemar of Le Puy had decreed that all the Christians should shave and wear a cross prominently so that they would not confuse each other with the bearded Turks. Guibert of Nogent, 205.

⁸³⁸ ‘*Mulieres, pueri teneri et adhuc plurimi lactentes, quotquot in castris reperti sunt, alii trucidati, alii equorum pedibus conculcati, misero et lacero cadauere campos impleuerunt, destituti auxiliis suorum gentilium de bello terga uertentium.*’ Albert of Aachen, 336.

⁸³⁹ For example, in 1103, when Edessa was besieged, the citizens attacked the besiegers and massacred them until ‘the plains were covered with dead bodies and streams of blood’: ‘*Quos adhuc hesterno uino sepultos et incautos usquequaque in ore gladii percusserunt, dum corporibus extinctis et sanguineis rituis presentes campi inundarent.*’ Albert of Aachen, 698. Having encountered and defeated another Muslim force besieging Jaffa on his return from the first battle of Ramla, Baldwin removed his armour and clothing and found them ‘entirely saturated up to the neck with the blood and gore of the enemy’: ‘*Vbi reuera et proculdubio lorica ferrea et ueste ostrea exutus est, que tota in ceruicibus tabe et sanguine hostium inebriata fuisse ibidem uisa est.*’ Albert of Aachen, 584.

⁸⁴⁰ ‘...in uirtute Domini Iesu Christi et sancte crucis inauditam illorum stragem et occisionem facientes...’ Albert of Aachen, 580.

⁸⁴¹ ‘*Sed diuina ultione et percussione preuentus....*’ Albert of Aachen, 580.

heads being taken as trophies or displayed to terrorise the enemy on several occasions, despite describing Muslims as *crudelissimi carnifices* for this exact behaviour. After defeating the relief force Kilij Arslan led in an attempt to raise the siege of Nicaea, the crusaders took the heads of the slain as trophies. Later, they used catapults to throw them into the city to frighten (*ad terrendos*) the defenders, and then gathered a thousand and sent them to the emperor in Constantinople who 'rejoiced very greatly in this triumph of the faithful'.⁸⁴² The catapulting of heads into Nicaea is also reported in several other accounts, and probably actually occurred. Similarly, after the crusaders defeated a relief force sent to raise the siege of Antioch on 9 February 1098 (known as the Lake Battle), the victors cut off the heads of the dead enemy and brought them back to the camp tied to their saddles. Albert reported that the Fatimid ambassadors who had made contact with the crusaders during the siege were also at the battle, and took some Turkish heads as trophies. The crusaders later threw some of these heads into Antioch and put others on stakes in view of any who looked out from the walls.⁸⁴³ Later, when Godfrey of Bouillon laid siege to Arsuf in 1100, a group of Christian knights managed to successfully ambush a small Fatimid relief force and took the heads of three horsemen back to Jerusalem as trophies.⁸⁴⁴

Albert also described demonstrative acts of killing, carried out for similar reasons to the heads displayed on stakes and thrown over walls. On one occasion at Antioch, both of these things occurred: Tancred launched a surprise attack on a group of Turkish soldiers that was trying to bait the crusaders out from the walls into an ambush. He drove them off, capturing six and executing them in front of the walls in revenge for the killing of Roger of Barneville in an attack similar to the one they had attempted. He then took their heads back into the city as 'evidence of victory' (*in testimonium uictorie*).⁸⁴⁵ While these executions were aimed at satisfying the crusaders' desire for vengeance, most such acts aimed to terrorise the enemy. Earlier, before the capture of Antioch, a young Turk of noble family was captured in battle and the crusaders sought to ransom him to his family for one of the towers of Antioch which they controlled. Albert wrote that Yaghi Siyhan discovered and prevented this, so the young man was dragged before

⁸⁴² '*...plurimam in hoc triumpho fidelium exhilarescit...*' Albert of Aachen, 108.

⁸⁴³ Albert of Aachen, 236-8.

⁸⁴⁴ Albert of Aachen, 500.

⁸⁴⁵ Albert of Aachen, 296.

the city walls and beheaded. By this point he was 'wretched and scarcely breathing on account of torture', having been held captive for a little under a month.⁸⁴⁶ A certain 'Saracen' captured outside Antioch, despite apparently impressing his captors as a 'wise, noble and vigorous man', refused all efforts to persuade him to convert. As such he was taken to where he could be seen from the Tower of David (Jerusalem's primary fortification) and beheaded by Baldwin's squire 'to frighten the guards'.⁸⁴⁷ Finally, in an incident similar to one reported by Peter Tudebode, an Egyptian messenger sent to bring word of al-Afdal's approach with reinforcements to the defenders of Jerusalem was intercepted. After confessing this to the crusaders, his hands and feet were bound together and placed in a mangonel (*mangene*) to be thrown over the walls. He proved too heavy, however, and died of a broken neck and other injuries when he landed on sharp stones near the walls.⁸⁴⁸

While Albert wrote impartially or even with some indications of approval in these cases, in other cases his attitude requires more careful consideration to work out. On two occasions Albert referred to the crusaders' actions as cruel, in similar terms to those he frequently used of Muslims. This is not a clear statement of disapproval in context, however. On the first occasion, Tancred captured Mamistra and 'wore down by cruel slaughter the arrogance of the Turks which had ruled supreme'.⁸⁴⁹ While Albert referred to a *crudelis strages* here, this is juxtaposed with the *superbia Turcorum*, suggesting that the slaughter was justified even if it was cruel. On the latter occasion, at a battle at Antioch the crusaders 'inflicted a cruel slaughter (*cruenta cedes*) on the Turks in revenge for their colleagues killed returning from [an earlier expedition to] the port of St Symeon'.⁸⁵⁰

⁸⁴⁶ '.....post longam fatigationem et diuersos illi illatos cruciatus, fere sub unius mensis spacio uexatum in aspectu omnium Turcorum ante urbis menia trahentis, misellum et uix palpitantem pre tormentis amputato collo peremerunt.' Albert of Aachen, 226-8

⁸⁴⁷ 'Videntes autem Christiani principes quia uir prudens, nobilis et strenuus idem esset Sarracenus, de uita et moribus eius sepius inquirentes ac disputantes, ad Christianitatis fidem eum uocare conabantur. Sed omnibus modis huic professioni abrenunciatis, ante Turrim David productus ad terrendos arcis custodes in aspectu omnium ab armigero Baldwini decollatus est.' Albert of Aachen, 410.

⁸⁴⁸ Albert of Aachen, 422. In Tudebode's account, the victim was a spy sent to investigate the crusaders' siege engines, so that his death took on a cruel irony. Tudebode also specified that he was bound hand and foot, attributing the shortfall of his shot to his bonds breaking in mid-air.

⁸⁴⁹ 'humi muros illius in breui deiecit, portas et uectes ferreos diruit, Turcorum superbiam que in hac dominabatur crudeli strage attriuit.' Albert of Aachen, 160.

⁸⁵⁰ 'Cruenta cede in Turcos seuiunt in ultione sociorum attritorum et a portu Symeonis redeuntium.' Albert of Aachen, 238.

Again, while *cruenta* could also carry the meaning of ‘bloodthirsty’ or ‘savage’, which would suggest excessive slaughter, Albert’s disapproval seems unlikely in light of this occurring specifically as vengeance for a previous Muslim attack.⁸⁵¹ On a later occasion, however, Albert seems to demonstrate a willingness to write from the perspective of the enemy, if not to express his own disapproval. In February of 1100, Godfrey launched a surprise attack on citizens of Arsuf who were working the vineyards and fields outside the city. ‘[D]estroying them with savage wounds, they left over five hundred half-dead on the battlefield, their noses cut off, or hands or feet,’ Albert wrote, a striking image of which his use of the term ‘savage’ (*seuus*) might suggest disapproval. He also noted that Arsuf was ‘shaken by grief’ and wrote to the *rex Babylonie* with ‘such cruel news’ (*tam crudelis fame*). While this suggests disapproval, Albert seems here to be writing from the perspective of the people of Arsuf. This is significant in itself, however, suggesting a degree of empathy if not sympathy.

In addition to vengeance for the attack on the St Symeon expedition, Albert offered justifications for violence against Muslims on several occasions. In most cases this took the form of accusing Muslims of worse crimes in the past. The massacre of Muslims in Tarsus discussed above, which was partially in response to the Turkish massacre of a group of Tancred’s men, was also carried out by the Christians of Tarsus in revenge for their mistreatment by the Turks, in particular the mutilation of women who refused their advances. The young Turkish hostage executed before the walls of Antioch was mistreated and executed not only because the ransom agreement failed but because Greek Christians recognised him and told the crusaders he had killed ‘over a thousand Christians with his own hands.’⁸⁵² As we have seen, Albert also blamed both the dark and the attempts of Turks to disguise themselves as Christian for the killing of Armenians and Syrians when Antioch was captured. As discussed further below, he also absolved Godfrey of responsibility for the sack of Acre which he blamed on the avarice of the Pisans and Genovese; and offered a pragmatic justification for the extreme massacre that took place in Jerusalem.

On one occasion Albert did express unambiguous disapproval of the slaughter of Muslims, but the circumstances in this case were unique. Acre

⁸⁵¹ Charlton T. Lewis and Charles Short, ‘Cruenta’ in *A Latin Dictionary*, (Oxford: Clarendon, 1987 (first published 1879)).

⁸⁵² ‘*Et precipue ex accusatione Grecorum fidelium occisus est, qui referebant hunc plus mille Christianorum propriis manibus mortificasse.*’ Albert of Aachen, 228.

was besieged with the help of Pisan and Genovese forces who had travelled to the East. The city surrendered, on condition that the citizens could leave with their belongings and a safe conduct. The Pisans and Genovese, however, were 'overcome with blind greed' at the sight of the riches of the people of Acre. They broke into the city, slaughtering and looting. French crusaders, witnessing this, 'burned with the flames of avarice and were likewise forgetful of their oath' and killed 'about four thousand' citizens as they joined in the plundering of the city. Albert's disapproval was firmly centred on the breaking of their oaths by the respective national groups of crusaders, and contrasted with the behaviour of Godfrey of Bouillon and his followers. Albert noted that 'the king was violently angry about the injustice done to him by the Pisans and Genovese'; showing more concern for the disrespect shown to Godfrey's leadership and the potential damage to his reputation than for the victims of the sack.⁸⁵³

What is considerably less straightforward to interpret than these incidents is Albert's attitude to the massacre that occurred when Jerusalem was captured. Once the crusaders captured the walls, they turned on the citizens and pursued them as they sought protection in the 'palace of Solomon'.⁸⁵⁴ They 'kept up a very great (*nimia*) slaughter of the gentiles' in Edgington's translation, but *nimis* was more commonly used to mean 'excessive', a meaning which seems likely in the context of some of Albert's other statements, as we shall see.⁸⁵⁵ Albert went on to describe the massacre that took place in the Al-Aqsa Mosque in strikingly similar terms to the *Gesta* family. He wrote that 'there was such great bloodshed that streams even flowed out across the very floor of the royal court, and the stream of blood was ankle-deep.' Such bloodshed is, to say the least, biologically improbable, but as discussed in the *Gesta* chapter Thomas Madden's

⁸⁵³ 'Pisani quidem et Genuenses, uidentes eos cum omni suppellectili egredi, et gazas illorum inauditas effferri, auaricia uehementi excecati, fidemque et pactum quod rege pepigerant obliti, subito per mediam urbem irruentes, ciues occiderunt, aurum, argentum, ostra diuersi generis et plurima preciosa rapientes. Populos uero Gallie, qui ab arido urbem cum rege intrauerat, uidens Pisanos per urbem discurrere, ciues occidere, thesauros inauditos diripere, pariter et ipsi auaricie flammis estuantes et, iusiurandi obliti, circiter quatuor milia ciuium in ore gladii percusserunt, gazas, uestes et pecora, omnes diuitias illorum incomputabiles diripientes. Hac iniusta seditione ad extremum sedata, rex uehementer indignatus est de illata sibi iniuria a Pisanis et Genuensibus propter iusiurandum...' Albert of Aachen, 674.

⁸⁵⁴ By 'the palace of King Solomon' (*palatium regis Salomonis*), Albert was referring to the entire Temple Mount, site of the Al-Aqsa Mosque where the *Gesta* family situated a particularly violent massacre in strikingly similar terms to Albert. Albert of Aachen, 428 n.27.

⁸⁵⁵ '...in nimia gentilium occisione perseuerant.' Albert of Aachen, 428.

suggestion that the extreme circumstances of a massacre in such an enclosed space would have made such a deep impression on observers that exaggeration is not surprising.⁸⁵⁶ More notable here is Albert's reference to the crusaders causing this bloodshed by 'striking down the Saracens with cruel death' (*crudeli funere sternerentes*). As seen above Albert does not seem always to have intended to suggest a value judgment in his use of the word *crudelis*, but it begins to seem likely in this context as the negative adjectives he applied to this slaughter pile up. After the *nimis et cruenta cedes Sarracenorum* that took place in the 'palace', the crusaders turned on the *gentiles* in the city at large.⁸⁵⁷ In a modern context, it is difficult to understand how Albert might have approved of the actions he described next:

they were piercing through with the sword's point women who had fled into the turreted palaces and dwellings; seizing by the soles of their feet from their mothers' laps or their cradles infants who were still suckling and dashing them against the walls or the lintels of the doors and breaking their necks; they were slaughtering some with weapons, or striking them down with stones; they were sparing absolutely no gentile of any age or kind.⁸⁵⁸

Indeed, it is very likely, though not absolutely certain, that Albert did not approve. The killing of babies in this way was a common image in Biblical prophecies. Elisha wept to Hazael, soon to be the king of Syria, because 'I know the evil that you will do to the people of Israel... you will slay their young men with the sword and dash in pieces their little ones' (*parvulos eorum elides*), among other atrocities (Hazael replied 'is thy servant a dog,

⁸⁵⁶ '*Quorum adeo sanguinis facta est effusio, ut etiam riui per ipsa pauimenta regie aule defluerent, et usque ad talos fusus cruor accresceret.*' Albert of Aachen, 430. Although this is similar to a combination of the *Gesta Francorum*'s two descriptions of this massacre, it is verbally almost completely distinct. The *Gesta* author wrote: '*ibique talis occisio fuit, ut nostri in sanguine illorum pedes usque ad cauillas mitterent... sanguis illorum per totum templum flueret...*' (*Gesta Francorum*, 90-1). The only correspondences are the words *sanguis*, *pedes* and (*de*)*fluere*, which do not suggest a direct link.

⁸⁵⁷ Albert of Aachen, 430-2.

⁸⁵⁸ '*Mulieres que in turritis palatiis et soliis confugerant mucrone confodientes, infantes adhuc sugentes per plantam pedis e sinu matris aut cunabulis arreptos muris aut liminibus ostiorum fractis ceruicibus allidentes, alios armis trucidantes, aut lapidibus obruentes, nulli prorsus etati aut generi gentilium parcentes.*' Albert of Aachen, 432.

that he would do such a thing?’).⁸⁵⁹ Hosea prophesied that when Samaria fell to the Assyrians, ‘their infants shall be dashed in pieces’ (*Parvuli eorum elidantur*).⁸⁶⁰ Isaiah prophesied that God would send the Medes to punish the Babylonians and ‘their children also shall be dashed to pieces before their eyes’ (*infantes eorum adlident in oculis eorum*).⁸⁶¹ Similarly, indeed perhaps influenced by Isaiah, the psalmist blessed a hoped-for enemy of Babylon in Psalm 137: ‘Blessed shall he be who takes your little ones and dashes them against the rock’ (*adlidet parvulos tuos ad petram*).⁸⁶² Only the first case includes an unambiguous contrast between the heroic victims (the people of Israel) and the evil perpetrator, Hazeel. Samaria had turned away from God and brought this fate upon itself, though the Assyrians themselves were usually unambiguously villainous. In the case of Isaiah and Psalm 137, the victim is Babylon, the persecutor of Israel. In all cases, however, this is presented as a horrific act of violence, and not as the act of heroes such as one would expect Albert to present the crusaders. It is possible, especially given his use of the term *rex Babylonie* for the ruler from whom Jerusalem was in the process of being liberated, that Albert intended to cast the crusaders in the role of the Medes in Isaiah’s prophecy or the wished-for enemy of Babylon in Psalm 137. This is an unusual comparison and does not follow Albert’s usual tendency to associate the crusaders with the Israelites.⁸⁶³ However, Albert’s use of the terms *infantes* and *allidere* more closely matches Isaiah than Hosea and II Kings, which use *parvuli* and *elidere* (Psalm 137 uses *parvuli* and *allidere*). It is possible that Albert sought simply to borrow the horrifying image, perhaps recalling its usage elsewhere but taking the wording from Isaiah, rather than suggesting that the crusaders were echoing (or even fulfilling) prophecy by acting as the Medes did against the Babylonians.

Albert’s account of Jerusalem continued, however, suggesting disapproval in other ways. While Tancred looted the Dome of the Rock, others pursued citizens fleeing for the safety of the tower of David or were simply awestruck at the sight of the city, and ‘all the common crowd’ (*uniuersum uulgus*) were ‘inflicting a massacre with excessive cruelty on the Saracens’ (*cede nimis crudelitate*), Godfrey did not take part in any of these activities. As noted above, Edgington argues that the *Historia*

⁸⁵⁹ II Kings 8:12-13.

⁸⁶⁰ Hosea 13:16/14:1 (Vulgate numbering)

⁸⁶¹ Isaiah 13:16

⁸⁶² Psalms 137:9/136:9 (Vulgate numbering)

⁸⁶³ Ní Chléirigh, *The Crusaders and their Enemies*, 233.

Ierosolimitana's reputation as a panegyric of Godfrey is exaggerated. Nevertheless, Albert did clearly display some interest and admiration for his local duke. Even without this additional context, the juxtaposition here is clear: Tancred's avarice and the cruelty of the *uulgus* against the piety of Godfrey, who 'soon abstained from all slaughter'. Albert attributed a thorough performance of piety to Godfrey. The duke, 'keeping only three of his men with him... took off his hauberk and linen clothes, went out of the walls with bare feet and made a humble procession around the outside of the city, then... he presented himself at the Sepulchre... keeping up steadfastly tears, prayers, and divine praises, and giving thanks to God because he had earned the sight of that which had always been his greatest desire.' In this passage, not only did Albert attribute the slaughter (which he again called excessively cruel) to the *uulgus* rather than their betters, but he offered a preferable model of behaviour in Godfrey's humble piety and prayer. The next day, Albert wrote, some three hundred Saracens who had taken refuge on the roof of the Temple of Solomon pleaded to receive Tancred's banner as a symbol of being under his protection. This did not work, however, and they were killed anyway. Albert referred to them as *miselli*, 'poor wretches', possibly suggesting sympathy. Tancred was incensed, but was convinced that this slaughter was necessary to ensure the crusaders' safety should the *rex Babilonie* send reinforcements (a point which will be discussed further below).

Having convinced themselves that it was unsafe to leave any Muslims alive in the city, Albert reported that the crusaders engaged in another wholesale slaughter of the citizens. This longer passage is worth quoting in full:

everyone seized weapons and surged forth for a wretched massacre of all the crowd of gentiles which was still left, bringing some out from fetters and beheading them, slaughtering others who were found throughout the city streets and districts, whom they had previously spared for the sake of money or human pity; they were beheading or striking down with stones girls, women, noble ladies, even pregnant women, and very young children, paying attention to no one's age. By contrast, girls, women, ladies, tormented by fear of imminent death, and horror-struck by the violent slaughter, were embracing the

Christians in their midst even as they were raving and venting their rage on the throats of both sexes, in the hope of saving their lives. Some were wound about the Christians' feet, begging them with piteous weeping and wailing for their lives and safety. When children of five or three years old saw the cruel fate of their mothers and fathers, of one accord they intensified the weeping and wretched clamour. But they were making these signals for pity and mercy in vain. For the Christians gave over their whole hearts to the slaughter, so that not a suckling little male child or female, not even an infant of one year would escape alive the hand of the murderer. And so the streets of the whole city of Jerusalem are reported to have been so strewn and covered with the dead bodies of men and women and the mangled limbs of infants, that not only in the streets, houses, and palaces, but even in places of desert solitude numbers of slain were to be found.⁸⁶⁴

While one must be careful to avoid looking at this passage with modern biases (Albert is essentially describing war crimes), Albert's disapproval of this massacre is clear. He repeatedly emphasised the killing of defenceless innocents, including children, infants and even pregnant women, with horrifying images such as the severed limbs of children laying in the streets. That children as young as three witnessed the deaths of their parents before being killed themselves was a detail that Albert could simply have glossed over if he had not wished to engage his readers' sympathies, as indeed is

⁸⁶⁴ *'Hoc accepto consilio, tertia luce post uictoriam egressa est sententia a maioribus, et ecce uniuersi arma rapiunt, et miserabili cede in omne uulgus gentilium quod adhuc residuum erat exurgunt, alios producentes a uinculis et decollantes, alios per uicos et plateas ciuitatis inuentos trucidantes, quibus antea causa pecunie aut humana pietate pepercerunt; puellas uero, mulieres, matronas nobiles, et foetas, cum pueris tenellis detruncantes aut lapidibus obruentes, in nullis aliquam etatem considerantes. Econtra puelle, mulieres, matrone, metu momentanee mortis angustiate, et horrore grauissime necis concusse, Christianos in iugulum utriusque sexus bachantes ac seuiantes, medios pro liberanda uita amplexabantur. Quedam pedibus eorum aduoluebantur, de uita et salute sua illos nimium miserando fletu et eiulatu sollicitantes. Pueri uero quinquennii aut triennii matrum patrumque crudelem casum intuentes, una fletum et miserum clamorem multiplicabant. Sed frustra hec pietatis et misericordie signa fiebant. Nam Christiani neci sic totum animum laxauerant, ut non sugens masculus aut femina nedum infans unius anni uiuens manum percussoris euaderet. Vnde platea totius urbis Ierusalem corporibus extinctis uirorum ac mulierum ac laceris menbris infantium adeo strate et operte fuisse referuntur, ut non solum in uicis, soliis et palaciis, sed etiam in locis deserte solitudinis copia occisorum reperiretur.'* Albert of Aachen, 440-2.

most of this passage. Even his language suggests moral judgments, repeatedly mentioning the pity and mercy that was lacking though it had been displayed formerly, describing the victims as ‘tormented’ and ‘horror-struck’, their deaths as ‘cruel’ and their killers as ‘murderers’ (*percussores*). After a digression following this passage, Albert resumed his narrative by writing ‘when this pitiable slaughter (*miseranda strage*) of Saracens was finished...’ suggesting sympathy for the victims one final time. While Albert explicitly gave a pragmatic justification for this slaughter – with which he gave no sign of disagreeing – his deliberate choice to describe it in such affecting detail must indicate his disapproval. At no point did he directly criticise the crusaders for their behaviour in Jerusalem, but his repeated assertions that they were too cruel as well as his detailed descriptions of their actions strongly suggest he did not approve.

And yet in spite of this, Albert clearly indicated that he believed the massacre had divine approval. After a digression on the recent history of Jerusalem, Albert returned to the ‘present’ in the narrative saying that Christian pilgrims were now admitted to the city ‘once the Saracens had been cruelly killed with the help of the Heavenly King, as you have heard.’ Divine assistance obviously implies divine approval.⁸⁶⁵ If, as is likely, Albert thought this was the case but was appalled by the cruelty of the slaughter (even here he referred to it as *crudeliter peremptis*), that may explain the ambiguity of his account. The slaughter was horrifying, cruel, and seemed to him excessive, but it was justified both by God’s will and the practical necessity of defence. In this light, the model of the Medes and the Babylonians suggested by Albert’s probable reference to Isaiah does make some sense: just as God harshly punished the Babylonians using the Medes as his instrument (particularly so in Isaiah’s prophecy), it was divinely-willed and necessary that the crusaders do the same to the ‘Babylonians’

⁸⁶⁵ A contrasting example is found in Albert’s discussion of the massacre of Jews in Mainz. Archbishop Ruthard II of Mainz tried to offer the Jews of Mainz protection in his own home, but a certain Count Emicho and his followers stormed the archbishop’s palace and killed about seven hundred, including women and children, ‘whatever their age and sex’. Albert described this as *cede tam crudeliter peracta* (Albert of Aachen, 52). Later, Emicho’s contingent of crusaders incurred the wrath of King Coloman of Hungary and were forced to flee and abandon their expedition, which Albert attributed to God punishing them for their sins. Chief among these, that they had ‘punished the exiled Jews (who are admittedly hostile to Christ) with a great massacre, rather from greed for their money than for divine justice. (...*exules Iudeos licet Christo contrarios, pecunie auaricia magis quam pro iusticia Dei graui cede mactauerant*).’ He criticised them for their greed rather than their cruelty, but nevertheless this is a clear example of Albert writing about violence which he felt was *not* divinely approved, and the resulting punishment. Albert of Aachen, 58.

holding Jerusalem. There were models which would have fit the crusaders better, such as Baldric of Bourgueil's comparison of Muslims to Amalekites, whom God commanded the Children of Israel to destroy utterly.⁸⁶⁶ Like most authors, however, Albert used the term *Babylonii* for the Fatimids; he may thus have felt the Biblical reference fit the enemy well enough, even if not the crusaders.⁸⁶⁷ Albert seems to have regretted the massacre, and that regret clearly stemmed from a great deal more sympathy for its victims than is displayed by any of his contemporaries. Nevertheless, ultimately he did not question its necessity.

6.2.6 Structure of Society

Albert included some details showing he had an understanding of the political structure of Muslim society that was very incomplete, but accurate in places. As indicated above, Albert like most of his contemporaries distinguished between Turks and 'Saracens', that is between the Seljuk Turks and the subjects of the Fatimid Caliphate. Albert's depiction of the two groups went beyond a simple distinction of terminology, however. He was aware of the 'very severe discord and hatred (*grauissima... discordia et odium*)' which had existed between the *rex Babilonie* and the Turks long before the arrival of the crusaders.⁸⁶⁸ This hostility was such that the Fatimids sent ambassadors to the crusaders at Antioch and made an alliance. Although most of the narrative sources note the presence of Fatimid ambassadors at Antioch, Albert is the only one who reports an actual alliance was made (though it was subsequently broken, as discussed below).⁸⁶⁹ Albert reported a message from the *rex Babilonie* supposedly delivered by these ambassadors in which he described the Turks as 'a race foreign to me and dangerous to my kingdom'.⁸⁷⁰ This statement indicates that Albert considered at least one dimension of the distinction between Turks and Saracens to be an ethnic/racial one. Similarly, in his account of the ambush of Baldwin of Boulogne on his way to Jerusalem to be crowned king in 1100, Albert noted that the Turkish attackers were unwilling to continue the fight into the night, 'lest we should suddenly be

⁸⁶⁶ See above, 4.2.2.

⁸⁶⁷ Albert frequently used the term *Babylonii* for the Fatimids. He also associated the Turks with the Babylonians on one occasion seen above, with another Biblical reference: when the *rex Persarum* consulted *magi, arioli et aruspices*, he was cast in the role of Nebuchadnezzar II of Babylon in the Book of Daniel.

⁸⁶⁸ Albert of Aachen, 230.

⁸⁶⁹ *Ibid.*

⁸⁷⁰ '*Turci gens extera mihi et regno meo...*' *ibid.*

surrounded and killed by the Saracens, who have always hated us.’⁸⁷¹ A more obscure statement he made later could be read as indicating awareness of the religious dimension, but his meaning is not entirely clear. Albert, like his contemporaries, confused the Dome of the Rock with the Temple of Solomon which had one stood on the same site (Albert did realise the Temple had been destroyed, but assumed it had been rebuilt by Christians). He noted the special reverence which the Turks held for the ‘Temple’, adding much ornamentation and ‘leaving it empty of all the rest of the gentiles who were shut out during the observation of their ceremonies’.⁸⁷² Albert may have thought this was done because of doctrinal differences, recognising to some extent the religious division between the Sunni Turks and Shia Fatimids.⁸⁷³ It is not entirely clear what he thought, however, and he may also have interpreted this information as further evidence of their racial animosity.

In Albert’s version of the message from the *rex Babylonie* he wrote that the Turks had frequently invaded Fatimid lands and occupied Jerusalem, which the *rex* saw as rightly subject to him.⁸⁷⁴ Albert later included a detailed account of the recent history of Jerusalem. He was aware that comparatively recently captured Jerusalem from the Fatimids (‘some little time before’, *paulo ante hanc*), though he had mistakenly believed that they had retaken it by the time that the *rex Babylonie* sent his message. Between the capture of Nicaea and the beginning of the siege of Antioch, Albert wrote, the *rex Babylonie* personally attacked Jerusalem with siege engines and defeated the Turks (Jerusalem was taken by al-Afdal rather than the young caliph personally, and later than Albert thought, but this was otherwise reasonably accurate). The Turks, under *Socomannus* (Suqman ibn Artuq) retreated to Damascus.⁸⁷⁵ Albert seems on this occasion to have suggested that the *rex Babylonie* was a ruler who treated the Christians more gently than the Turks, observing that having taken the city he performed the rituals of his religion at the ‘Temple of the Lord’ and the Holy Sepulchre, ‘going through all things peacefully and not turning any of the Christians

⁸⁷¹ ‘...ne a Sarracenis, qui nos semper odio habuerunt, subito circumuenti occidamur ...’ Albert of Aachen, 534.

⁸⁷² ‘...soli omnibus ceteris gentilibus exclusis in illo suarum cerimoniarum obseruatione uacantes.’ Albert of Aachen, 434.

⁸⁷³ This is suggested by Ní Chléirigh, although she acknowledges that there is no further evidence Albert may have recognised doctrinal differences. *The Crusaders and their Enemies*, 255.

⁸⁷⁴ Albert of Aachen, 230.

⁸⁷⁵ Albert of Aachen, 442-4.

away'.⁸⁷⁶ He also referred to Jerusalem having been delivered from the 'hands' (*manus*) of the *rex* Babylonie and the 'yoke' (*iugum*) of the Turks.⁸⁷⁷ This would have been somewhat accurate, if it was what Albert meant to suggest. Earlier, however, he had accused both the Turks and the Saracens of exercising 'very great tyranny by slaughter' and driving Christian worshippers out of all the churches of Jerusalem except the Holy Sepulchre and the small church of St Mary of the Latins, which they allowed Christians to use because their chapters paid a share of the offerings of the faithful as tribute. It is not certain, therefore, that he intended to indicate a difference of policy between the Turks and the 'Saracens' as occupiers of Jerusalem. Overall, however, Albert's account of the Seljuk-Fatimid rivalry over Jerusalem was relatively accurate.

Albert probably assumed the Turks operated a feudal system of government, as the *Gesta* family also tended to do, and believed it was more united and centralised than it was. In a speech attributed to Adhemar of le Puy, Albert mentioned four (fictitious) emirs who had been summoned to Antioch by Yaghi Siyhan. 'King' (*rex*) Yaghi Siyhan was 'head and lord' (*caput et dominus*) of these emirs; and the emirs, among thirty states that 'submitted as tributaries' (*tributarie suberant*) to Yaghi-Siyhan, held their states 'in benefice by gift and favour' (*dono et gratia... in beneficio tenent*) of the ruler of Antioch.⁸⁷⁸ In Kilij Arslan's speech to the sultan (i.e. Berkjaruq ibn Malikshah, Seljuk sultan of Baghdad), Albert attributed to the him a reference to Nicaea having been 'granted to us by your assistance and forces and from your gift and favour', suggesting that Kilij Arslan and Berkjaruq had conquered Nicaea together and that it had been granted by the latter to the former in some sort of feudal arrangement.⁸⁷⁹

He believed that all of the Turks were subject to the sultan, having either failed to recognise or received inaccurate information about the dissolution of the Seljuk Empire that had followed the death of Malik-Shah I in 1095. There is no indication that any of his contemporaries better understood the situation, but Albert included some details that clearly

⁸⁷⁶ '...*rex Ierusalem ingressus templum Domini iuxta ritum gentilium summa reuerentia et humilitate subiit, dein templum dominici sepulcri cum omni habitu religionis gentilis introiuit, omnia pacifice perlustrans, et nullum Christianorum a fide et ordine sui ritus auertens.*' Albert of Aachen, 444.

⁸⁷⁷ Albert of Aachen, 440.

⁸⁷⁸ Albert of Aachen, 196.

⁸⁷⁹ 'Niceam...*quam auxilio et uiribus tuis ex tui dono et gratia nobis collatam...*' Albert of Aachen, 250.

showed he was misinformed. He defined the sultan as *rex Corrozana et Baldach*, the king of Khorosan and Baghdad.⁸⁸⁰ The significance of the use of the term Khorosan in crusade accounts was discussed more fully in the *Gesta Francorum* chapter, but it is notable that the term also reached Albert. His mention of Baghdad is an additional piece of information which he must have encountered, though he did not indicate specific knowledge that Baghdad was Berkyaruq's capital as opposed to another wider region such as Khorosan. Albert mistakenly believed that Kilij Arslan had taken refuge in Antioch after fleeing from the crusaders, and then went to Khorosan as Yaghi Siyhan's emissary to seek the help of the sultan when the siege of Antioch began. Albert referred to the 'royal' (*sceptrigerus*) sultan as 'the chief and prince of the Turks' (*caput et princeps Turcorum*).⁸⁸¹ Kilij Arslan gave a speech to the 'great prince and sultan' who was 'wielding the sceptre over all kings and princes in the eastern region.'⁸⁸² As noted above, Albert believed Kilij Arslan held Nicaea as a fief from Berkyaruq. Nicaea had in fact been conquered from the Byzantines by Berkyaruq's father Malik-Shah, and taken over by Kilij Arslan in the power vacuum that followed Malik-Shah's death, and Kilij Arslan himself claimed the title of Sultan of Rûm. In the same speech, Albert repeated the assertion that Yaghi-Siyhan 'holds the city [i.e. Antioch] and lands by your gift.'⁸⁸³ This was closer to the truth: Yaghi-Siyhan had been appointed by Malik-Shah, although he had up until that point divided his loyalties between Berkyaruq's nephews and rivals Ridwan of Aleppo and Duqaq of Damascus, who were seeking to maintain their independence.⁸⁸⁴

Albert's depiction of 'Saracen' politics was, as with his contemporaries, considerably less detailed. He recognised that al-Afdal was not the *rex Babylonie* but rather his second-in-command, though he knew

⁸⁸⁰ Albert of Aachen, 688.

⁸⁸¹ Albert of Aachen, 248.

⁸⁸² '*...principem magnum et sceptrigerum soltanum super omnes reges et principes orientalis plage...*' Albert of Aachen, 250.

⁸⁸³ '*...tibi subiectum et amicum et tuo munere urbem et terras tenentem...*' Albert of Aachen, 252.

⁸⁸⁴ Albert's mistaken assumption that all the Turks were loyal to Berkyaruq was also reflected in his later account of Bohemond's captivity and ransom by Danishmend Ghazi. Albert believed that Kilij Arslan, having failed to secure a share of the ransom, reported Danishmend's actions to the sultan, and sent him a letter urging him to arrange for Bohemond to be recaptured or he would 'never be able to regain the king's favour and escape the armies and wrath of the Turks.' '*Alioquin scias te numquam regis gratiam posse recuperare et effugere manus et indignationem Turcorum.*' Albert of Aachen 688.

him by a fictitious or thoroughly garbled name (*Meraius*).⁸⁸⁵ Nevertheless, he confused the two, attributing al-Afdal's capture of Jerusalem to the *rex*.⁸⁸⁶ Like the *Gesta*, Albert associated the Egyptian Fatimids with Babylon.⁸⁸⁷ As discussed in the *Gesta* chapter their reasons for doing so are unclear, though the association of Babylon with persecution of the Children of Israel and with the antichrist may at the very least have influenced this.⁸⁸⁸ In Albert's case this seems particularly plausible, as on one occasion he seems to draw a parallel between the Crusaders and the Medes on the one hand, and the Fatimids and the actual Babylonians of the Bible on the other, as seen above.

6.2.7 Character Traits of Muslims: Arrogance

Aside from the extensive evidence he gave to suggest that Muslims were cruel, violent, and lustful, Albert did not include as many statements reflecting on negative aspects of Muslim character as most of his contemporaries. The primary negative character trait Albert attributed to Muslims in addition to the savagery and lust discussed above was arrogance, often explicitly accusing them of *superbia*.⁸⁸⁹ This was especially true of his depiction of the Turks. Many of the leaders who appeared in the first part of Albert's narrative, who generally received more characterisation, were depicted as arrogant. Albert also included statements suggesting this of Muslims in general, however, such as referring to the 'arrogance of the Turks which had ruled supreme' at Mamistra.⁸⁹⁰ Kilij Arslan, though he was also praised as will be discussed below, was introduced with a bombastic and arrogant statement. He was absent from Nicaea when the crusaders began their siege of the city, but sent a message to the defenders promising a relief force. The messengers were to tell them not to fear the crusaders, 'who are exhausted by their long journey and have come into exile here, and will be reckoned as fools, whom Suleyman [i.e. Kilij Arslan] will carry off to the same punishment and martyrdom as he did previously the armies of

⁸⁸⁵ See for example Albert of Aachen, 454, where he refers to Meraius as *secundus a rege Babylonie*.

⁸⁸⁶ Albert of Aachen, 444.

⁸⁸⁷ Albert of Aachen, 230, 444, 418-22, 426, 454-6, 464, 468-70, 470-2, 498-502, 542, 762-4, 790, 800, 802, 804-6. Albert's use of *Babylonia/Babylonii* is analysed by Ní Chléirigh, *The Crusaders and their Enemies*, 247-8.

⁸⁸⁸ See above, 2.2.1, 2.2.4.

⁸⁸⁹ The *superbia* of the Turks is also discussed by Ní Chléirigh, *The Crusaders and their Enemies*, 240.

⁸⁹⁰ '...Turcorum superbiam que in hac dominabatur...' Albert of Aachen, 160.

Peter.⁸⁹¹ This overconfident statement was, as usual, soon undermined. The Seljuk sultan Berkyaruq (the *rex de Corruzana*) was also arrogant. Seeing the distress of Kilij Arslan and the rest of Yaghi-Siyhan's embassy requesting his assistance, he asked *in superbia magna* what had distressed them.⁸⁹² He was told of the crusaders by Kilij Arslan but he 'heard the man's words and complaints with laughter and mirth; he listened frivolously, for he confessed that he did not in the least believe that these injuries could have been inflicted on the Turks by people from any region of the world.'⁸⁹³ Albert's reference to the sultan speaking *in superbia magna* is reminiscent of the presentation of Antiochus IV Epiphanes in I Maccabees 1:23-25, in which the Seleucid emperor despoiled the temple in Jerusalem *cum superbia* and spoke with *superbia magna*. Kerbogha must have earned a strong reputation for arrogance among the crusaders; he is consistently depicted as arrogant in all of the narrative accounts. Albert referred to him as 'arrogant Kerbogha' (*Corbahan superbus*),⁸⁹⁴ as 'a stubborn man and full of arrogant ferocity', who 'in a spirit of arrogance' claimed to have killed a hundred thousand Christians when assisting Kilij Arslan in defeating the People's Crusade.⁸⁹⁵ Having heard Kilij Arslan's response, 'arrogant Kerbogha' then 'opened his lips to further pride and boasting', saying that he would test the strength of the Christians and destroy them within six months.⁸⁹⁶ Kerbogha was 'such a fierce and proud man' (*tam ferocissimo et superbo*) that only Peter the Hermit had the courage to speak to him as the ambassador of the crusaders.⁸⁹⁷ When the *magi*, *arioli* and *aruspices* of the king of Khorosan predicted that he would be victorious, Kerbogha ordered smiths all over the region to make fetters and chains to lead the captured pilgrims into slavery.⁸⁹⁸ These items were subsequently found when the crusaders

⁸⁹¹ '...nil formidinis uobis ab hiis circumsedentibus incutiat, qui longinquo fatigati itinere, et huc in exilio progressi, pro stultis computabuntur, quos simili pena et martyrio ut Petri agmina ante hos dies tractabit, et in proximo uobis succurrere in manu robusta et in milibus infinitis paratus est.' Albert of Aachen, 102.

⁸⁹² Albert of Aachen, 252.

⁸⁹³ 'In risu et deliramento uerba et querimonias huius rex de Corruzana accepit, leuiter in aures misit, nam minime has calumnias ab illa plaga mundi posse Turcis inferri credere se fatetur...' Albert of Aachen, 252.

⁸⁹⁴ Albert of Aachen, 330.

⁸⁹⁵ 'Corbahan... uir contumax et plenus superba feritate, uirtutes Christianorum paruipendens, in hec uerba spiritu superbie erupit...' Albert of Aachen, 254. Albert was, of course, entirely incorrect here, and had not even suggested that Kerbogha was involved in his own previous account of the People's Crusade.

⁸⁹⁶ 'Corbahan superbus... amplius in elationem et iactantiam os suum sic aperuit...' Albert of Aachen, 258.

⁸⁹⁷ Albert of Aachen, 316.

⁸⁹⁸ Ibid.

captured his camp.⁸⁹⁹ Of course, Kerbogha had cause to be arrogant in Albert's account: all the princes and peoples assembled to form his army 'honoured him as if he were a god, and they listened to him as master and teacher in all things.'⁹⁰⁰ As Albert reported, Kerbogha diverted his army to try to retake Edessa from Baldwin of Boulogne on the way to Antioch, but was forced to abandon this siege. Albert took this opportunity to undermine his arrogance, writing that Kerbogha was 'indignant at his [Baldwin's] audacity and vowed by his god that he would never leave off the siege around Edessa but would summon his army and invade it at once and take Baldwin prisoner.'⁹⁰¹ Nevertheless, he soon broke off the siege and proceeded to Antioch. In response to the embassy of Peter the Hermit, Kerbogha said 'nothing except in arrogance and confidence in his multitude.'⁹⁰² Placing too much trust in their weight of numbers was an occasional Turkish trait in Albert's account. They laid siege to group of crusaders in Artah *in copiis suis confidentes*. Despite hearing of the approach of the rest of the crusade, their 'very many thousands made them overconfident'.⁹⁰³

6.2.8 Alliances and Peace Agreements.

As we have seen, Albert displayed more hostility towards Muslims than Edgington recognised. However, this was to a large extent balanced by considerably more evidence of tolerance and (at times) admiration than is found in the works of his contemporaries. In previous chapters, evidence of approval or acceptance of alliances and peace treaties; praise of Muslims;

⁸⁹⁹ Albert of Aachen, 336.

⁹⁰⁰ '*Quem uniuersi principes et nationes que conuenerant, ac si deum uenerabantur, et in omnibus magistrum ac preceptorem audiebant.*' Albert of Aachen, 264.

⁹⁰¹ '*Corbahan uero Baldwinum hoc aduersum se presumpisse cum presens fuerit, nedum absens, uehementer ammiratur. Et indignatus super eius audacia obsidionem circa Rohas numquam se pretermittre in deo suo iurat, sed ammonitu exercitu suo hanc in momento irrumpere, Baldwinum captiuum abducere.*' Albert of Aachen, 264-6.

⁹⁰² '*...nihil nisi in superbia et fiducia multitudinis sue locutum fuisse asserit.*' Albert of Aachen, 320.

⁹⁰³ '*...freti nimium in tot suis predictus milibus.*' Albert of Aachen, 186. Later figures tended to be depicted less vividly, but did on occasion display arrogance. Danishmend Ghazi, having captured Bohemond on his way to defend Melitene in 1100, told the Christian ruler of that city *in superbia magna* not to hope for assistance from Baldwin I, whom he would soon capture as well. The *superbia et fortitudo* of al-Afdal's forces was on display at the first battle of Ramla in September 1101, a somewhat rarer accusation of Fatimid arrogance – unlike in the *Gesta* Family, there was no display of frustrated arrogance from the vizier following his defeat at Ascalon in 1099. See Albert of Aachen, 524, 580.

and evidence of approval of conversion have usually been treated together in one section. In Albert's work there is so much of this evidence that separate sections are warranted for ease of reading. This is especially true of agreements and alliances between Christian and Muslim leaders. Albert included more examples of peace treaties and active alliances than any other author. While he did not always make statements indicating active approval, nor did he ever suggest disapproval of these arrangements – and his detailed treatment of how the crusaders and their allies usually kept faith with one another does indeed suggest that he approved.

The earliest alliance Albert mentioned is not corroborated by any of his contemporaries writing in Latin. Although they all referred to discussions with emissaries from the Fatimid caliph at the siege of Antioch, Albert is the only author to claim that anything resulted from these talks. Nevertheless, Albert was convinced that an alliance was formed, on quite favourable terms: the *rex Babylonie*, having ejected the Turks from Jerusalem (this did not actually happen until August 1098), offered to restore it to the Christians and discuss converting to Christianity.⁹⁰⁴ The emissaries were later escorted to the port of St Symeon and sent back 'safely by ship in good faith (*bona fide saluos nauigio remiserunt*).'⁹⁰⁵ These very generous terms are not entirely implausible; as Conor Kostick has noted a rumour persisted in the Islamic world for some time afterwards that the crusaders had been invited to come and seize Jerusalem by the Fatimids, who hoped to set up a buffer state between them and the Seljuks.⁹⁰⁶ The agreement Albert believed was made would have fit such a policy, though it was certainly not true. It is clearly the case that the Fatimids initially saw the crusaders as potential allies, however and it may be the case that rumours arising from their negotiations circulated among the crusaders and in the Muslim world. This major departure from the other Latin accounts did not impact Albert's narrative in the end, however, as in his opinion the *rex Babylonie* simply broke their agreement. Albert initially seems to have attributed some thinly-veiled blame to Count Raymond of Toulouse. He wrote that the *rex Babylonie* violated the treaty and denied the crusaders access to Jerusalem

⁹⁰⁴ Albert of Aachen, 236.

⁹⁰⁵ Albert of Aachen, 238.

⁹⁰⁶ Conor Kostick, *The Siege of Jerusalem: Crusade and Conquest in 1099* (London: Continuum, 2009), 53; Ibn al-Athir, *al-Kamil f'il-Ta'rikh*, trans. D.S. Richards (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), 2 vols, I.13-14. Writing c. 1212, long after the crusaders own aims had become clear, Ibn al-Athir doubted this story, but noted that some believed it.

‘having no just cause against them, except that Count Raymond had seized the town of Tortosa and besieged the fortress of Arqa for many days.’⁹⁰⁷ This seems an entirely just cause to break the alliance, despite Albert’s statement to the contrary. That he intended to implicate Raymond is suggested by the fact that he mentioned these actions here at all; it would have been easy to avoid the implication by simply omitting this clause. Later, however, he reinforced his criticism of the *rex Babylonie*. Albert wrote that the *rex* had sent legates to the crusaders after capturing Jerusalem fearing that the Turks in Damascus posed a threat to his conquest. He promised Jerusalem to them, but he ‘lied in all things and spoke deceitfully’, and tried to defend the city from them.⁹⁰⁸ That Albert seems to have entertained the possibility of the crusaders sharing some blame themselves would be consistent with the attitude he often displayed elsewhere, in which he emphasised occasions on which Christians and Muslims kept faith with one another and even seems to have criticised one Christian who broke faith with a Muslim even though it benefitted his coreligionists, as shall be seen.

Albert also referred to a number of unspecified diplomatic engagements centred on a certain Roger of Barneville. Roger was involved in two incidents Albert reported, the first a surprise counterattack against a Turkish raid at Antioch which the crusaders discovered was being planned, and the second his death in an ambush by an advance party of Kerbogha’s army. On both occasions Albert mentioned he was a trusted go-between for arranging truces or the exchange of prisoners. He ‘had gained such renown among those same Turks as a remarkable and famous soldier’ that he was ‘frequently’ employed as a mediator in any negotiations, Albert noted on the first occasion.⁹⁰⁹ He repeated this assertion the second time and added a specific mention of arranging truces.⁹¹⁰ One such truce did occur during the siege of Antioch, as reported by Robert the Monk and Guibert of Nogent; it is thus highly plausible that Roger of Barneville was indeed involved in negotiating it.⁹¹¹ Albert’s assertion that ‘frequent’ contact was made, especially over the matter of exchanging prisoners of war, is also quite

⁹⁰⁷ ‘...nihil cause aduersus eos habens, preter quod comes Reimundus Tortosam ciuitatem apprehendit et presidium Archas plurimis diebus obsedit.’ Albert of Aachen, 402.

⁹⁰⁸ ‘Sed omnia mentitus et in dolo locutus est...’ Albert of Aachen, 444.

⁹⁰⁹ ‘...apud eosdem Turcos notissimus et famosus laudem adeo obtinuit, ut sepius inter Christianos et ipsos de omni conuentione utrimque captiuorum et cuiusque rei negotio internuncius audiretur.’ Albert of Aachen, 234

⁹¹⁰ Albert of Aachen, 290.

⁹¹¹ See above, 3.2.5, 3.2.10; 5.2.9.

credible. That diplomacy was so common is not mentioned by any of the other authors, though it is possible that they simply did not consider this low-level contact notable rather than deliberately obscuring it – Albert himself only mentions it in connection with praising Roger.

The first longer term alliance to occur between the crusaders and a local Muslim power was only recorded by Albert and Raymond of Aguilers among this first generation of Latin historians. This was the alliance between Godfrey of Bouillon and Omar, the emir of Azaz. Some of the details Albert gives are also corroborated by Kemal al-Din. His claim that it was mediated by Omar's Christian wife, however, is not corroborated, and she may be his invention or the invention of his source. Albert described the formation of this alliance very positively. It also proved robust; Mohammed, Omar's son, was given to Godfrey as a hostage and treated very well. Around the time of the sieges of Tortosa, Ma'arrat an-Numan and Arqa, however, Mohammed fell ill and died. Albert reported that Godfrey treated his body according to 'the gentile custom', claiming that he 'was grieving at his death no less than if it had been his brother Baldwin's.' Omar 'graciously accepted the duke's apologies', having been assured by the guardians he had sent with his son that Godfrey had acted in good faith, and 'did not in the least change from the loyalty he promised.' Much later, Ridwan of Aleppo would prove to be similarly steadfast in his adherence to a truce with the crusaders, though it also cost him his son who had been taken hostage by other Turks who demanded his assistance.

Tripoli made a peace treaty with the crusaders, as in the accounts of Albert's contemporaries. At some unspecified point between the capture of Jerusalem and the battle of Ascalon, Ramla also 'entered a peace and treaty' with Godfrey, and its unnamed 'prefect' was with the crusader army as it approached Ascalon. He warned them that great herds of domestic animals they encountered along the way had been driven there as a trick by the *Babylonii*, to distract any Christians who were keener on plunder than defence. He gave this information because he was 'faithful in purpose although he was a gentile.'⁹¹² Albert later alluded to the fact that this prefect was 'going to fight on the side of the most Christian duke and catholic

⁹¹² '*Sed quidam nobilissimus ex Sarracenis quondam urbis Ramnetis prefectus, qui pacem et foedus superate Ierusalem cum duce iniit, nunc in auxilium ipsius ducis licet gentilis fideli intentione adueniens, dolositates Babyloniorum enucleat...*' Albert of Aachen, 458.

people against his own race and brothers.⁹¹³ Although he requested permission to convert at this point, Albert was not certain whether or not he was baptised before or after the battle, and continued to refer to him as a gentile.⁹¹⁴ Later, during Godfrey of Bouillon's brief reign over Jerusalem, Albert mentioned peaceful relations and trade with Ascalon, Caesarea and Acre. Godfrey's rebuilding of Jaffa's defences threatened the former three cities, so they sent an embassy offering tribute in exchange for peace. 'Friendship began to grow from day to day,' from that point on, Albert wrote, although this suggestion of friendliness was somewhat undercut by his statement that this peace was brought about because 'fear of the most Christian duke was instilled in all the lands and regions of the gentiles.'⁹¹⁵ Nevertheless, peaceful relations endured to the extent that Christians from Jerusalem and Muslims from Ascalon freely travelled to each other's cities to trade. The emir of Ascalon even released the above-mentioned Gerard of Avesnes, who had been presumed dead after his mock-crucifixion at Arsuf.⁹¹⁶ Ascalon, Caesarea and Acre, as well as Tyre, renewed their truces under Baldwin I, though they later appealed to the *rex Babylonie* to help them or they would submit entirely. Meanwhile, diplomatic ties were opened with Damascus and Baldwin ransomed some Damascene prisoners of war to a legation from the city.⁹¹⁷

Albert continued to record alliances and peace agreements long into the settlement period, which there is not space to discuss in detail here.⁹¹⁸ One later example of a Muslim keeping faith is worth contrasting with Albert's depiction of a Christian who did not. A force led by Ahmadil, Il-Ghazi and Suqman advanced on Antioch in 1111. Along the way they asked Ridwan of Aleppo to take in their families and baggage, but he refused because of a truce with Tancred. He gave his son as a hostage swearing not to help Tancred either, but they then renewed their demands, threatening to kill his son. He remained steadfast, and his son was killed.⁹¹⁹ By contrast, Albert seemed to (at least mildly) disapprove of a Christian soldier who broke his

⁹¹³ '...causa Christianissimi ducis et catholici populi contra gentem et confratres suos pugnatus...' Albert of Aachen, 460.

⁹¹⁴ Ibid.

⁹¹⁵ 'Hoc pacto nimirum pax facta et firmata est quin abhinc amicitia fieri cepit de die in diem, precipue inter ducem et ammiraldum ciuitatis Ascalonis... incubuit enim timor Christianissimi ducis in uniuersas terras et regiones gentilium.' Albert of Aachen, 504.

⁹¹⁶ Albert of Aachen, 504-6.

⁹¹⁷ Albert of Aachen, 560.

⁹¹⁸ See Albert of Aachen, 680-688, 706, 738, 752-4, 852-854.

⁹¹⁹ Albert of Aachen, 812.

word to Muslims. Tyre rebelled against Baldwin I later the same year and allied with Damascus. Expecting a siege, they charged a certain Reinfrid with escorting their treasury to Damascus for safekeeping. Reinfrid instead reported this to Baldwin, who managed to ambush the expedition and seize the treasure. While this might arguably have been Reinfrid's first duty as 'a Christian and an eminent soldier of the king' (*uirum Christianum et illustrem militem regis*), Albert nonetheless referred to him as a *uir leuis*, a trifling or capricious man, 'who did not consider it important if he broke a promise to gentiles and unbelievers.'⁹²⁰ Albert's dismissal of Reinfrid as a *uir leuis*, however suggests that he did consider this important.

6.2.9 Conversion

Albert also mentioned a greater number of Muslim converts to Christianity than his contemporaries. The first such example was admittedly of an insincere convert. A messenger was captured at Nicaea and, under threat of torture, gave up crucial intelligence about the approach of Kilij Arslan's relief force. He then claimed to be interested in converting, but later seized a chance to escape into Nicaea. Albert did not particularly condemn this action, perhaps believing that the threatening situation in which this Muslim had found himself would have rendered any conversion invalid due to coercion. The canonical position was that Jews could not be coerced to convert. This applied specifically to Jews, but Albert may have thought it did not. He observed that the conversions of the Rhineland Jews coerced by Count Emicho were invalid because 'God is a just judge and commands no one to come to the yoke of the Catholic faith against his will or under compulsion.'⁹²¹ Other conversions were more successful. Albert mentioned a convert named Bohemond who acted as a scout at Antioch. This seems to have referred to a real person, who took the name Bohemond at his baptism (perhaps surprisingly, as this was a nickname rather than a Christian name, but then it was also taken by Prince Bohemond II of Antioch). According to Albert this Bohemond was involved in the negotiations between his namesake, Bohemond of Taranto, and the tower commander Pirrus, which is not mentioned elsewhere but is highly plausible. Pirrus (whom Albert did

⁹²⁰ '*Reinfridus uero, uir leuis et non multum pensans si fidem erga gentiles et incredulos uiolaret, uniuersa regi detulit...*' Albert of Aachen, 826-8.

⁹²¹ '*...iustus iudex Deus sit, et neminem inuitum aut coactum ad iugum fidei Catholice iubeat uenire.*' Albert of Aachen, 58.

not name) did not display interest in conversion in Albert's account, however.⁹²² Albert also claimed that many Muslim inhabitants of Antioch were thoroughly demoralised by the Muslim defeat at the battle of the Iron Bridge, and began to flee from the city to the crusaders' camp, asking to convert.⁹²³ Albert did not mention Ahmed Ibn Marwan, the commander of the garrison of Antioch who decided to convert to Christianity after his surrender in the *Gesta* family, saying only that the garrison of the citadel fled when they heard of Kerbogha's defeat.⁹²⁴ He referred to Shams ad-Daula here, clearly unaware that Kerbogha had replaced Yaghi Siyhan's son with one of his own men as commander of the citadel, so it is likely that he simply had not heard anything at all about ibn Marwan rather than deliberately omitting this conversion.⁹²⁵ The aforementioned prefect of Ramla, deeply impressed by the singing and music of the Christians as they marched on Ascalon, expressed his amazement that they could be so joyful in the face of death. Godfrey briefly explained the Christian doctrines of martyrdom and eternal life, and the prefect was inspired to request conversion. Albert did not seem to be certain that this occurred in the end, however, saying at first that he was not sure whether the 'prefect' was baptised before or after the battle (but apparently assuming that one or the other was the case), and then only that 'some claim' (*quidam profitentur*) that he was baptised after witnessing the victory of the Christians.⁹²⁶ Albert also mentioned a certain 'Walter, surnamed Mohammed' (*Walterus, cognomine Mahumeth*), who held the castle of St Abraham's as the vassal of Baldwin I.⁹²⁷ Walter was a real figure who appeared as a witness in royal charters between 1104 and 1115.⁹²⁸ He is presumed to have been a convert who may have taken the name of his godfather at his baptism. Albert did not specifically mention this, but as discussed above, he clearly knew that *Mahumeth* was a Muslim name (if nothing more of the significance of the name). It is thus likely that he had some reasonably accurate idea of Walter Mahumeth's personal history.

⁹²² Albert of Aachen, 270-2.

⁹²³ Albert of Aachen, 246.

⁹²⁴ See above, 5.2.11, 4.2.11, 3.2.10.

⁹²⁵ Albert of Aachen, 340.

⁹²⁶ Albert of Aachen, 458-60.

⁹²⁷ Albert of Aachen, 748.

⁹²⁸ *Ibid.*, n. 34.

6.2.10 Praise and other indications of sympathy

In addition to drawing attention to instances in which Muslim allies were proven to be trustworthy and conduct their affairs with good faith, Albert sometimes included praise of other Muslim characteristics. He seemed to genuinely admire and sympathise with Kilij Arslan (whom he referred to as *Solimannus*) for much of his work. He introduced Kilij Arslan with a surprisingly humanising reference to his 'grief and his anger' (*ira et dolor*) at the slaughter of his men by a Swabian contingent of the People's Crusade.⁹²⁹ Albert echoed this later with a reference to Kilij Arslan's feelings after the battle of Dorylaeum: '*Solimannus*, defeated now once more, only just escaped capture and climbed the mountains of Rum, no longer having any hope for the city of Nicaea, his wife, and his sons, and feeling very great grief for his men, those whom he had lost before this time, destroyed by the Gauls on the plain of Nicaea, and now those whom he had left as prisoners or dead in the valley of *Gorgania*[i.e. Dorylaeum].'⁹³⁰ This is a strikingly sympathetic portrayal of a Muslim leader whom Albert believed had lost his family, and who clearly cared deeply about the men who followed him. Albert also praised him directly. He referred to him as 'a very noble man but also a gentile' when describing his preparations for the impending siege of Nicaea by the crusaders. He remained a prominent figure for longer in Albert's account of the First Crusade, fleeing to take refuge in Antioch and then being sent as an emissary of Yaghi-Siyhan to plead for assistance from the Sultan. This was incorrect, but provided Albert with further opportunities to praise this Muslim ruler. Yaghi-Siyhan asked him to be his emissary, 'knowing him to be a man of eloquence and very renowned in all the kingdoms of the gentiles.' At their meeting, Suleyman greeted the sultan 'because he was his elder and greatly renowned for his diligence and eloquence.'⁹³¹ Having presented his message to the Sultan, Kilij Arslan faced the scepticism and bombast of Kerbogha, whose reaction was to suggest that Kilij Arslan must be weaker than he had thought. Kilij Arslan, 'who is a man of great and wonderful diligence, listened to Kerbogha's arrogance and boastful words,' and replied 'in an even-tempered manner.'⁹³² On this occasion, however, there is a clear contrast between Kilij Arslan and

⁹²⁹ Albert of Aachen, 34.

⁹³⁰ Albert of Aachen, 136.

⁹³¹ '*Quem Solimannus quia erat etate prior et industria nominatissimus ac facundia salutavit.*' Albert of Aachen, 250.

⁹³² '*Solimannus, qui uir est mire et magne industrie, audita illius superbia et uerborum iactantia, equo animo hec illi responsa dedit...*' Albert of Aachen, 254.

Kerbogha, who was ‘a stubborn man and full of arrogant ferocity’ (*uir contumax et plenus superba feritate*) and had ‘burst out’ (*erupit*) with a tirade against the Christians.⁹³³

This praise appears despite Kilij Arslan’s slaughters of the People’s Crusade, civilians in the crusader camp at Dorylaeum and his soldiers’ massacre group of Danish crusaders who had attempted to catch up with the main body of crusaders (which took place before these events at Antioch).⁹³⁴ Indeed the slaughter of the Danish crusaders introduces a narrative inconsistency, as it does not make sense that Kilij Arslan had would have been driven out of Rûm to take refuge in Antioch if his soldiers were still in Rûm defeating crusaders. Albert apparently forgot this, although he might also have received information about the Danish expedition at a later date and added it to his draft in its chronological place without considering the contradiction it introduced. In light of the previous slaughters of Christians Albert attributed to him while continuing to praise him, however, this probably would not have affected Albert’s opinion of Kilij Arslan – it is a narrative inconsistency, but not an inconsistency of attitude. Eventually, Albert’s opinion of him was apparently tarnished and he appeared as an unsympathetic figure in Albert’s account of the captivity of Bohemond by Danishmend Ghazi.⁹³⁵ The most likely cause of this shifting attitude is simply narrative expediency. Albert emphasised Kilij Arslan’s qualities to portray him as a compelling and interesting foe in the first part of his narrative, and later ignored this on an occasion when he wished to depict Danishmend Ghazi as the more sympathetic figure and Kilij Arslan had ceased to be as relevant to the narrative. Other figures occasionally received similar regard. A ‘noble knight’ who was recognised as a ‘wise, noble and vigorous man’ was captured outside Jerusalem and offered conversion, though as noted above he refused and was executed.⁹³⁶ The prefect of Ramla too, as seen above, was considered a noble and faithful man by Albert, even before his (possible) conversion.

Albert also mentioned the prowess in battle of Muslims, especially Turks, on several occasions.⁹³⁷ Turkish soldiers attacked a German

⁹³³ Ibid.

⁹³⁴ Albert of Aachen, 34-6, 130, 222-4.

⁹³⁵ Albert of Aachen, 680-688.

⁹³⁶ Albert of Aachen, 410.

⁹³⁷ This is also mentioned by Ní Chléirigh, *The Crusaders and their enemies*, 238. Ní Chléirigh noted the frequency with which Albert mentioned their *audacia* and *virtus*. See Albert of Aachen, 38, 102, 132, 134, 296, 534, 700, 788, 840.

contingent of People's Crusaders 'boldly' (*fortiter*), albeit 'cruelly' (*crudeliter*).⁹³⁸ Kilij Arslan prepared Nicaea for the Christian assault with 'all the armament of brave men'. One such Nicaean who greatly impressed Albert (or his source) was 'a man of most warlike spirit and heart' who, having been mortally wounded, threw away his shield and continued to throw rocks at the crusaders even after being struck by twenty arrows. He was only killed when Godfrey of Bouillon managed to hit him in the heart with a crossbow.⁹³⁹ As the tide of battle turned against the Turks at Dorylaeum, they fought back 'courageously' (*uiriliter*).⁹⁴⁰ When the crusaders first reached Antioch and managed to capture the fortified bridge over the Orontes known as the Iron Bridge, they did so in the face of the stiff resistance of Turks who 'preferred to die rather than to yield'.⁹⁴¹

Albert showed some nuance in his view of the treatment of Christians under Muslim rule, as has been alluded to in places above. As has been seen, he denounced their treatment of the Christians of Tarsus and framed the entire crusade as a response to the treatment of pilgrims and Eastern Christians in Jerusalem as witnessed by Peter the Hermit. Nevertheless, he also made note of some accommodations of which he became aware. Albert noted that a chapel in Antioch had been 'left by the Turks' gift and licence for use among themselves of those Christians who remained'.⁹⁴² This was also the case with the Holy Sepulchre and the church of St Mary of the Latins, as noted above. These acts of sufferance are overshadowed by Albert's accounts of the depredations of Muslim rulers (in particular he described the torture of the patriarch of Antioch immediately after noting their allowing the Antiochene Christians to practice their religion in a chapel) but it is significant that Albert chose to mention them at all. It is likely that the authors who were eyewitnesses (if no one else) also knew of these provisions, but chose to remain silent. Albert's overall opinion of the Muslim treatment of Christians under their rule was negative, but he introduced this degree of nuance that is not found in his contemporaries.

⁹³⁸ Albert of Aachen, 34.

⁹³⁹ '*quidam miles illorum ferocissimi animi et cordis*', Albert of Aachen, 118.

⁹⁴⁰ Albert of Aachen, 134.

⁹⁴¹ '*maluerunt mori quam cedere*', Albert of Aachen, 192.

⁹⁴² '*...Christianis inter se post sibi subiugatam urbem dono et licentia eorum commorantibus solummodo relictum est.*' Albert of Aachen, 338.

6.3 Conclusion

While Albert has been described as remarkably impartial towards Muslims, this study has found that his attitude was more hostile than this suggests. He depicted Muslims as savagely violent, lustful and arrogant. He usually displayed the same indifference as his contemporaries towards Muslim victims of graphically-described violence committed by the crusaders. Nevertheless, this is to some extent balanced by evidence of a greater degree of tolerance for Muslims; indeed in comparison to his contemporaries it is perhaps fair to describe him as 'remarkably impartial', if not in an absolute sense. In contrast to his attitude to violence against Muslims for most of his account, Albert was clearly troubled by the massacre in Jerusalem. Though he ultimately concluded that it had God's approval and was necessary for practical reasons, he described it in very ambivalent terms. He discussed far more alliances and peace agreements with Muslims than any of his contemporaries. He also included praise of Muslim prowess in war, and of individual Muslim figures. 'Nuanced' is perhaps the best descriptor for Albert himself. Part of this nuanced view of Muslims stems from an apparent willingness to view some Muslims as individuals who can display noble characteristics, while still holding hostile views of Muslims collectively. This can be seen in his initial treatment of Kilij Arslan, and his accounts of faithful Muslim allies. Although some Muslim leaders broke their agreements with the crusaders, Albert did not pursue a polemical program of depicting Muslims as untrustworthy. Indeed, he gave equal or perhaps greater attention to Muslim leaders who kept their faith with the Christians, even in difficult circumstances. On occasion, however, he even seems to display sympathy for Muslims in general, not only outstanding individuals.

Albert did not at any point provide a systematic introduction to Muslims for his reader, but he provided a considerable amount of information scattered throughout his narrative. This information varied in its accuracy and level of detail. He distinguished between the Seljuks and the Fatimids, consistently referring to them as *Turci* and *Saraceni* but also demonstrating awareness of longstanding hostility between them. He might on one occasion have hinted at religious differences between them, but this is not certain. He understood the political structure of the Seljuks in feudal terms, but described that of the Fatimids in far less detail. He consistently made the mistake of assuming that Kilij Arslan, the Sultan of Rûm, was

subject to the Sultan of Baghdad. Albert displayed some understanding of Islam in that he didn't accuse Muslims of idolatry, as Edgington noted, but made little else of his conception of Islam clear. He referred to them as both monotheist and polytheist, though references to their worshipping a single god were more frequent. He did not mention the prophet Mohammed, though his repeated attribution of the name *Mahumeth* to individual Muslims may reflect some awareness of his identity. He attributed a reliance on soothsayers and magicians to Muslims, in terms which may have been freighted with both biblical and classical significance, as well as possibly suggesting idolatry and association with demons.

7 Ralph of Caen, *Tancredus*

7.1 Introduction

Ralph of Caen occupies a unique place among authors of early twelfth-century First Crusade accounts. Like Fulcher, Raymond of Aguilers and the *Gesta* author, he wrote his account while living in the East. But he was a late arrival and was not in the Holy Land while most of what he wrote about occurred: he was present for less even than Fulcher, who was with the main body of crusaders until he joined Baldwin of Boulogne's side-expedition to Armenia, and subsequently continued his account during many years he lived in Jerusalem. Ralph might have done the same, of course: his account is cut short in 1108, but we cannot be certain whether this was caused by his death or by the loss of the end of the work. Ralph's work, usually known as the *Gesta Tancredi*, is simply titled *Tancredus* in the one surviving manuscript copy.⁹⁴³ Although 'The Deeds of Tancred' would also be an apt title for the work, this thesis will follow the most recent editor of the work, Edoardo D'Angelo, and use the title given in the manuscript.

7.1.1 Ralph's identity and the date of the *Tancredus*

The *Tancredus* is one of the least well-studied of the contemporary crusade histories.⁹⁴⁴ In spite of this, Ralph of Caen's background is less obscure than many of the other contemporary authors of crusade histories, though there are still gaps in our knowledge. Ralph was probably from Caen or its jurisdiction, and spent his youth studying there under Arnulf of Chocques. Arnulf, to whom Ralph dedicated the *Tancredus*, was a prominent figure on the First Crusade, and eventually became patriarch of Jerusalem. His education by Arnulf, a prominent cleric associated with the ducal family of Normandy and tutor to the daughter of William the Conqueror, suggests that Ralph too was from a family of considerable importance, though they

⁹⁴³ Bruxelles, *Bibliothèque Royale*, 5369-5373, ff 84r-150r. The title is noted by D'Angelo, Radulphi Cadomensis, *Tancredus*, ed. Edoardo D'Angelo, CCCM 231 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011) xxiv. This thesis has used the RHC edition of Ralph's work, although D'Angelo's commentary is also referenced. Due to the existence of only one surviving manuscript, there is very little difference between the two edited texts. Ralph of Caen, *Gesta Tancredi in Expeditione Hierosolymitana*, RHC: Historiens Occidentaux III (Paris, 1866).

⁹⁴⁴ Bernard S. Bachrach and David S. Bachrach (trans.), *The Gesta Tancredi of Ralph of Caen: A History of the Normans on the First Crusade* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2005, rpr. 2010), 1.

remain unidentified.⁹⁴⁵ Ralph was probably born around 1080: when he described a comet that was seen at Antioch in 1097, he mentioned having seen it himself from France as an *adolescentulus*.⁹⁴⁶ This is compatible with his having reached the canonical age to be ordained a priest by 1106, when he was recruited as a chaplain by Bohemond.⁹⁴⁷

Some time before Bohemond's death in 1111, Ralph transferred his services to the prince of Antioch's nephew and frequent regent, Tancred.⁹⁴⁸ Ralph entered their service some years after the First Crusade, but he would have us believe that he enjoyed a close relationship with both men, 'especially' with Tancred.⁹⁴⁹ It is from their personal testimony, he implies, that he derived his account. As he wrote in his preface: 'Both of these men recalled daily the fleeing Turks and the approaching Franks. Sometimes they discussed the dead enemies and sometimes the captured cities...'⁹⁵⁰ Ralph's portrayal of this situation may at least in part be a rhetorical device intended to lend credibility to his account.⁹⁵¹ Ralph was consciously writing a *historia*, a genre of writing originating with Herodotus and codified for the Middle Ages by Isidore of Seville, who both emphasised the central importance of eyewitness testimony.⁹⁵² Ralph would have had access to the testimony of many eyewitnesses among their other followers, however – indeed on at least one occasion, he explicitly attributed his information to *veredicos relatores* rather than to Tancred personally.⁹⁵³ It is therefore very likely that his sources were the oral reports of eyewitnesses, even if he might have exaggerated the degree to which he relied on the personal testimony of Bohemond and Tancred. Both Hagenmeyer in his edition of the *Historia Hierosolymitana* of Fulcher of Chartres, and Fink in his introduction to the translation of the same source suggested a relationship between Fulcher and Ralph. Neither investigated this, however; nor do Bachrach and Bachrach, the RHC editors or D'Angelo. A thorough investigation of the question is thus long overdue.⁹⁵⁴

⁹⁴⁵ Ralph of Caen, Bachrach and Bachrach (trans.), 2.

⁹⁴⁶ Ralph of Caen, *RHC*, xxxviii; D'Angelo (ed.), v.

⁹⁴⁷ Ralph of Caen, Bachrach and Bachrach (trans.), 2.

⁹⁴⁸ Bachrach and Bachrach, 2.

⁹⁴⁹ 'Sic me uterque, at praecipue Tancredi familiaritas accendit...' Ralph of Caen, 603 (20).

⁹⁵⁰ '...quorum utriusque sermo quotidianus Turcos fugisse, institisse Francos, nunc peremptos hostes, nunc captas urbes...' Ralph of Caen, 603 (19).

⁹⁵¹ Bachrach and Bachrach, 3.

⁹⁵² Bachrach and Bachrach, p. 8. See Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiae* I.xli.1-xliv.5.

⁹⁵³ 'Habuisse me veredicos memini relatores, qui...' Ralph of Caen, 714 (170)

⁹⁵⁴ Fulcher of Chartres, 68; Fulcher of Chartres, trans. F. R. Ryan, 46.

The date of composition is not entirely straightforward to establish. Ralph writes that he waited until the deaths of his subjects so that he could not be accused of having been paid to flatter them (a familiar *topos* in prefaces of biographical works) which provides a *terminus post quem* of 1112. D'Angelo notes that in his preface, Ralph sought to excuse a delay before he began writing. He therefore suggests that we should consider 1113-14 as more likely to be when Ralph began. This is not unreasonable, but we have no indication as to how long the 'delay' Ralph spoke of was. We can at least point to 1112 with confidence as the earliest possible date for Ralph to have begun, however.⁹⁵⁵ The *Gesta* ends abruptly with events in 1108, so this does not help settle the date of composition: it is clear that Ralph either died with the work incomplete or the manuscript as it survives is defective. The dedication of the work to Arnulf of Chocques does suggest a *terminus ante quem* of 1118, the year of the patriarch's death, but Ralph later included an anecdote about a bad omen witnessed by Bohemond, which, as he noted, came true with the premature death of his son Bohemond II in 1130.⁹⁵⁶ The *RHC* editors believed that Ralph originally finished the work before 1118, adding this mention of Bohemond II's death later. This is probably the most likely explanation; Ralph would not have dedicated the work to someone no longer living, and the style of the passage is too consistent for it to be likely that anyone else added it. To what extent Ralph might have revised the *Tancredus* after 1130 is unclear; this passage is the only datable change, and the only one which shows foreknowledge of events after 1118. The *RHC* editors further argue that the surviving MS, *Bibliothèque Royale de Bruxelles* 5373, 'could well (*pourrait bien*)' be Ralph's autograph due to the number of erasures and corrections it contains.⁹⁵⁷ D'Angelo agrees that the author continued to make revisions, identifying a pattern in his editing on the basis of folios that appeared to be inserted and other changes visible in the manuscript. The revisions D'Angelo identifies mostly concern the lay and ecclesiastical politics of Jerusalem. Indeed, he even suggests that many of the insertions he identifies were

⁹⁵⁵ Ralph of Caen, 603; D'Angelo, *Tancredus*, xxxv.

⁹⁵⁶ Bohemond makes a bet at dinner that he can cut through a thick candle with his knife in one stroke; he does this near the top and the two parts of the candle stay lit for a while but the smaller part soon burns out. This is a bad omen, indicating that Bohemond will have a son but he will be shortlived: '*sobolis quidem aruspices promittunt spem futurae, at mox transiturae*: Ostendent (*aiunt*) terris hunc tantum fata, nec ultra/Esse sinent (Vergil, *Aeneid*, 6.370), *et cetera subdidit Mantuanus* [i.e. Vergil]: *quae nos in nece Boamundi junioris vidimus completa*.' Ralph of Caen, 658.

⁹⁵⁷ Ralph of Caen, *RHC*, xl.

suggested by Arnulf of Chocques himself, with Ralph's plea to his former master to correct his work having been more than just a *topos* in this case.⁹⁵⁸ In his analysis, Ralph's edits can mostly be characterised as the integration of '*piu Gerusalemme, piu Baldovino, piu Arnolfo, piu politica ecclesiastica*': compatible with what Arnulf might have wanted.⁹⁵⁹ It is thus possible that most of what Ralph altered was before 1118 and that later changes were slight.

The problem of later editing immediately raises the question of whether Ralph edited any of his material concerning Muslims as his knowledge and opinions developed over years of living in the East. Unfortunately this question cannot be answered without a detailed examination of the manuscript, which is beyond the scope of the present study; however, D'Angelo's analysis suggests that Ralph's edits were not of this nature. In this light, the precise chronology of Ralph's writing takes on secondary importance for this thesis.

7.1.2 Purpose and Characteristics of the *Tancredus*.

Ralph's stated reason for writing amounts to a concise summary of the generally accepted purpose of *historia* at the time: 'It is a noble exercise to recount accurately the deeds of princes. To do so is to consider generously all that is subject to time, to celebrate the dead, to entertain the living, and to set out a past life as a model for later generations... It eliminates sloth, conveys honesty, presents virtues and draws a crowd.'⁹⁶⁰ While Ralph was not necessarily insincere here, it is clear that this was not the only purpose he had in mind. Despite being at pains to defend himself from accusations of flattering Tancred, the *Tancredus* is very much focused on praising the prince. In many other crusade accounts, the explanation of the Muslim enemy to readers was clearly one of the author's central concerns. This is not the case with Ralph – perhaps also in part because he wrote for an audience in the Holy Land which he expected to be relatively familiar with Islam already.

⁹⁵⁸ D'Angelo, *Tancredus*, xxxi-xxxvii.

⁹⁵⁹ D'Angelo, *Tancredus*, xxxvii.

⁹⁶⁰ *Nobile est studium res probe gestas principum recensere, cujus beneficii largitas nihil temporis immune praeterit, sepultos celebrat, obiectat superstites, posteris longe ante vitam praestruit doctrinam... segnitiem aufert, probitatem affert, vitia transfert, plurimum confert.* Ralph of Caen, 19 (603).

Flori opted not to include the *Tancredus* in his analysis of the histories of the First Crusade, arguing that the work was a panegyric of Tancred rather than a chronicle of the Crusade.⁹⁶¹ However, despite the focus on Tancred in the title and throughout the work, the *Tancredus* as we have it is dominated by the crusade. The work begins with only a brief summary of Tancred's parentage, character and preparations for Holy War, before he joins Bohemond at Durazzo and they depart for the crusade.⁹⁶² The years after the crusade, 1100-1108 (when the *Tancredus* abruptly ends), are also very compressed compared to the events of the crusade. If there was once more to the *Tancredus*, it is possible that this latter pattern would have changed as Ralph began to be able to draw on his own experiences, but as it survives the focus is firmly on the events of the First Crusade. The central focus on Tancred's role in these events means that Ralph's views on Muslims often have to be pieced together from passing glimpses, and in some cases their depiction in the *Tancredus* is inevitably influenced more strongly by how they can be used to depict Tancred than by Ralph's opinion or by polemical intentions. Indeed, Flori goes so far as to argue that the 'ennemis naturels' in the *Tancredus* are not Muslims, but the Greeks and Provençals.⁹⁶³ This obscures the importance of Ralph's distinctive depiction of Muslims, as will be shown here.

Another important characteristic of the *Tancredus* is its prosimetric structure. Most of the *Tancredus* is written in prose, with about a quarter of the chapters in verse. Ralph's verse is in hexameters, usually not rhyming. Max Manitius observed that Ralph tended to use verse to describe battles.⁹⁶⁴ Bachrach and Bachrach go further, arguing that Ralph used verse to signal to the reader when the material had a more epic, and more dubiously authentic, character.⁹⁶⁵ Ralph used verse to describe the actions of the non-Norman commanders at Dorylaeum, for example, but switched to prose to describe the death of Tancred's brother in the same battle: he would of course have had more reliable information about his patron's brother than about the other crusade leaders. In support of this, they also note that Tancred himself is the subject of very few of Ralph's verse passages; the implication being that

⁹⁶¹ Flori, *Chroniqueurs et Propagandistes*, 14.

⁹⁶² Ralph of Caen, 604.

⁹⁶³ Flori, *Chroniqueurs et Propagandistes*, 13.

⁹⁶⁴ Max Manitius, *Geschichte der Lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, Handbuchs der Altertumswissenschaft, III Vols, (Munich, C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1923) III.423;

⁹⁶⁵ Bachrach and Bachrach, 7, 9.

Ralph wanted the reader to be certain of the veracity of what he said about his hero.⁹⁶⁶

This question of why Ralph used verse becomes an important one for this thesis because Tancred's looting of the Dome of the Rock is a verse passage with particularly important details about Muslims, as will be seen. Understanding Ralph's attitude to how he wrote this material is crucial to understanding to what degree the passage reflects his actual beliefs about Islam. There are a number of issues with Bachrach and Bachrach's assertion.⁹⁶⁷ For one, Ralph's classical influences would not have suggested such a structure to him. Classical histories in verse could be very highly regarded in the Middle Ages. Lucan's *De bello civili* was hugely influential on the writing of history. Lucan was known as a *verax hystoricus*, a truth-telling historian, a point of view which would tend to rule out any suggestion of using poetry when one was less sure of one's information.⁹⁶⁸ *De bello civili* was a work which Ralph knew and used; he quoted from it frequently. In particular, his use of quotations from the work when describing conflict between Tancred and Baldwin of Boulogne suggests a very deliberate reference, not merely the use of remembered phrases in a decorative manner. Ralph's familiarity with this work provides a strong possibility that he was using it as a model, and as such did not regard his verse sections as less truthful. Both Guibert of Nogent and Robert the Monk wrote prosimetrically, albeit with considerably fewer and shorter verse passages. It was clearly a structure Ralph's contemporaries considered appropriate for the material at hand. R. B. C. Huygens was certain that Boethius's *The Consolation of Philosophy* provided a model for Guibert's (less frequent) use of prosimetry.⁹⁶⁹ This was another influential work which, while not itself a history, provided a model of sober and serious work in both prose and verse. Epic poetry was by no means the only model from which Ralph might have taken his use of verse.

If Ralph's work consistently followed the pattern which Bachrach and Bachrach claim, his use of epic poetry as a model might still seem more

⁹⁶⁶ Ralph of Caen, Bachrach and Bachrach (trans.), 7-8.

⁹⁶⁷ D'Angelo, *Tancredus*, xix.

⁹⁶⁸ See for example Manegold of Lautenbach, *Liber ad Gebehardum*, MGH Libelli de lite 1, 313. Manegold wrote c. 1085, saying of Lucan: '*Non tam poete fabulosi quam veracis hystorici*.' This was a long-standing reputation: Jordanes, introducing a quotation from Lucan in his history of the Goths written c. 551, described him as '*...Lucano, plus storico quam poeta...*' Jordanes, *De Origine Actibusque Getarum*, <http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/iordanes1.html> (accessed 16 May 2016).

⁹⁶⁹ Guibert of Nogent, 13, n. 9.

likely, but this is not the case. His description of the embassy of Peter the Hermit to Kerbogha, for example, is in verse. While it features heightened dialogue – which is certainly invented – the broad outline of the conversation between Peter and Kerbogha is corroborated elsewhere: Albert of Aachen also mentioned both Peter's offer of a contest of champions; and Kerbogha's rejection of the embassy and denial of Christ was mentioned by the *Gesta Francorum*.⁹⁷⁰ It is unlikely that Ralph considered it necessary to warn the reader that this material was less reliable for two reasons. Firstly, *oratio recta* was a respectable tool of history writing even when the writer could not possibly have known what was said, following the revered example of Sallust.⁹⁷¹ Secondly, in this particular case it is quite plausible that Ralph had some idea what was said, given that Peter's embassy would have made a report to the crusade leaders.⁹⁷² The agreement between the sources might also suggest that details from this report spread to the ordinary crusaders. In contrast to this, Ralph presents the death of Yaghi-Siyhan in prose. Ralph presented a very detailed account for which he is very unlikely to have had a source: the only witness was Yaghi-Siyhan's killer, and Ralph did not claim to have heard the story from him or even an intermediary.⁹⁷³ According to Bachrach and Bachrach's interpretation this should have been presented in verse, and Peter the Hermit's embassy in prose, but they are not. Ralph's description of the massacre in the Temple when Jerusalem was seized, as discussed below, also runs contrary to their interpretation: it is presented in prose, but it is hardly a sober and realistic account.

D'Angelo argues that Ralph's use of verse was intended to give a sense of movement and drama to battle scenes: this is illustrated particularly well by Ralph's switching from a prose description of the preparations to besiege Jerusalem to a verse description of the attack itself.⁹⁷⁴ This does not explain all of Ralph's uses of verse, as for example the embassy just discussed. It is likely that Ralph's use of verse was indeed purely stylistic, with the intended effect varying slightly. Another explanation for Ralph's switching between prose and verse, compatible with this one, is provided by his dedication of the work to Arnulf of Chocques. Ralph would have been

⁹⁷⁰ *Gesta Francorum*, 66-7; Albert of Aachen, 318.

⁹⁷¹ See Beryl Smalley, 'Sallust in the Middle Ages', in *Classical Influences on European Culture, A.D. 500-1500*, ed. R. R. Bolgar (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971), 165-76.

⁹⁷² Indeed both Albert and the *Gesta* author report precisely this. *Gesta Francorum*, 66-7; Albert of Aachen, 320.

⁹⁷³ Ralph of Caen, 656.

⁹⁷⁴ Ralph of Caen, D'Angelo (ed.), xix.

eager to impress his former teacher, a common tendency which Carl Erdmann has identified in communication between masters and students.⁹⁷⁵ This could easily explain the pains Ralph took to demonstrate his ability at both poetry and prose. It is also consistent with the classical allusions and concepts which litter his work. He quoted Vergil and Lucan frequently, which was not unusual, but his familiarity with Ovid and Horace indicates greater than usual erudition, and Ralph has been described as ‘exceptionally’ well-educated.⁹⁷⁶

As suggested by his frequent quotations from Roman poets and historians, Ralph’s work displays a great number of classicizing tendencies. Indeed, for reasons that are unclear, Ralph was far less inclined to use biblical references. While this forms a striking contrast with most other authors of First Crusade histories, it does not have much direct effect on his depiction of Muslims, except for the general (but not complete, as will be seen) absence of the use of biblical terminology and imagery to describe Muslims. More relevant is Ralph’s tendency, as noticed by Manitius, to invent neologisms: this included an apparently unique word meaning Muslim, as discussed below.⁹⁷⁷

7.2 The Depiction of Muslims in Ralph of Caen’s *Tancredus*.

Ralph of Caen had a distinct perspective on Muslims, as did all authors of First Crusade accounts. Some of what Ralph says is unremarkable, and this chapter will be relatively short. Nevertheless, Ralph’s depiction of Islam does contain some particularly interesting and important elements, which make the inclusion of the *Tancredus* necessary. Creating a full picture and engaging with an attempt to understand the enemy – even a

⁹⁷⁵ Carl Erdmann, *Studien zur Briefsliteratur Deutschlands im elften Jahrhundert*, Schriften der MGH 1 (Stuttgart, 1938, 64-71.

⁹⁷⁶ Ralph of Caen, Bachrach and Bachrach (trans.), p. 4 n. 15; pp 4-5. See also H. Glaesener, ‘Raoul de Caen: historien et écrivain’, *Revue d’histoire ecclésiastique* 46 (1951), 5-21, pp 6, 16-17. Glaesener discusses Ralph’s classical education and its influence on his effective use of rhetorical figures, although his assertion that Ralph was familiar with Ancient Greek authors as well as Romans is unlikely. Ralph does mention such figures from Greek mythology as the Chimera, the Hydra and Pegasus, but there is no indication that he knew of them from original Greek works.

⁹⁷⁷ Manitius, *Geschichte der Lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, 423. Manitius cites a number of other examples in Ralph’s work, such as *Iherosolympta*, *retrosuadus*, *extrahabens*, and *remotiusculus* and its opposite *propiusculus*.

distorted polemical version of the enemy – was less of a priority for Ralph of Caen than for most of the other authors. However,, Ralph revealed a great deal of what he thought in the occasional details he included. As a result of this apparent lack of a specific program, he occasionally seems to contradict himself, but it is possible to reconstruct some general sense of how he intended to depict Islam and the characteristics of Muslims.

Ralph had some basic understanding of how the Muslims encountered by crusaders organised themselves politically, distinguishing between the Turks and the Fatimid subjects encountered around Jerusalem itself. As with all of his contemporaries, he included some glimpses of detail about their leadership and power centres – of varying degrees of accuracy – but the overall picture was vague. Ralph's treatment of violence differed from most other authors in that there is comparatively little depiction of Muslims as barbaric in the *Tancredus*. His mentions of their persecution of Christians before the crusade were sparse and rare, and Muslims were even more rarely portrayed as a significant threat to the crusaders. Consistent with this, Ralph always depicted Muslims as cowardly, often using prey-animal motifs to do so. The tendency of many other sources to depict Muslims as alternately threatening and cowardly or weak depending on narrative needs is thus not present in the *Tancredus*. Ralph's callous attitude to violence against Muslims is more in line with his contemporaries, but he also described fewer instances of this. The two most interesting aspects of the *Tancredus* are Ralph's understanding of Muslim beliefs and his association of Muslims with evil forces such as the devil and the Antichrist; these are the aspects of the work which will be discussed first in this chapter.

7.2.1 Muslim beliefs.

The most immediately striking element of Ralph's conception of Islam is his emphasis on idolatry.⁹⁷⁸ This is the centrepiece of what he has to say about Muslims; he introduces it in his preface and provides a detailed description of an idol at the climax of the narrative. This passage, for which Ralph's work is best known, is his account of the capture of Jerusalem in which he describes Tancred's despoliation of the Dome of the Rock, which the crusaders believed to be the Temple of Solomon. Ralph claimed that

⁹⁷⁸ '... sudor ille gloriosus, qui matri nostrae Iherusalem haereditatem suam restituit, idolatriam exstinxit, fidem reparavit...' Ralph of Caen, 603.

Tancred discovered: 'a cast image, made from silver, sat on the highest throne. It was so heavy that six men with strong arms could barely lift it, and ten barely sufficed to carry it.'⁹⁷⁹ Ralph added detail to his description in a dramatic passage:

For it was an image of Mohammed, entirely covered with gems, purple cloth and shining with gold. "Perhaps [Tancred exclaims] it is an image of Mars or Apollo, for it could never be Christ. There is no insignia of Christ here, no cross, no crown, no key, no pierced side. Therefore, this is not Christ but rather the original Antichrist, Mohammed the depraved, Mohammed the pernicious. Oh, if his comrade were here, that one that is to be! Already my foot would be treading down both of these Antichrists. Alas, alas, the fellowship of hell drinks in the Tower of God and Pluto's slave is in the edifice of Solomon's God!..."⁹⁸⁰

There are other points to analyse here such as connections to hell and Antichrist, which will be considered below. For now, this seems to be a plain and unambiguous statement of a belief that Muslims worshipped idols of Mohammed. However, if correct, Bachrach and Bachrach's claim that Ralph used verse to indicate that his information was less reliable would make it harder to be certain of how Ralph intended this passage to be read. But it is not at all clear that Ralph did not believe what he wrote here. While there was, of course, no such idol, Ralph was not the only author to mention it. Fulcher of Chartres also claimed that an idol of Mohammed was set up in the Temple, though there is some possibility that Ralph was not entirely independent of Fulcher.⁹⁸¹ Baldric of Bourgueil, however, who is entirely independent of both Ralph and Fulcher, also mentions an idol in the

⁹⁷⁹ 'Stabat in excelso simulacrum fusile throno,/Scilicet argentum grave, cui vix sena ferendo/Dextera sufficiat fortis, vix dena levando...' Ralph of Caen, 695.

⁹⁸⁰ 'Nam gemmis totus et ostro/Mahummet redimitus erat, radiabat et auro./"Forsitan hoc Martis vel Apollinis est simulacrum:/Numquid enim Christus? Non hic insignia Christi/Non crux, non sertum, non clavi, non latus haustum./Ergo neque hic Christus: quin pristinus Antichristus,/Mahummet pravus, Mahummet perniciosus./O si hujus socius nunc afforet, ille futurus!/Jam meus hic ambos pes supprimat Antichristos./Proh pudor! Arce Dei potitur conviva baratri;/Vernaque plutonis Deus est operi Salomonis!' Ralph of Caen, 695..

⁹⁸¹ *Hoc Templum dominicum in veneratione magna cuncti Saraceni habuerant, uni preces suas lege sua libentius quam alibi faciebant, quamvis idolo in nomine Mahumet facto eas vastarent...* Fulcher of Chartres, 290 (118).

temple.⁹⁸² It seems surprising to the modern reader that these authors who lived for many years in the Holy Land did not come to realise that Muslims did not worship idols – or learn from other witnesses present that day that this particular idol never existed. Matthew Bennett has suggested that the belief in idols such as the one Ralph described was influenced by the authors having seen lavishly ornate reliquaries and crucifixes, and depicting Islam as a distorted mirror of Christianity.⁹⁸³ It was also suggested in the chapter on Baldric that the authors may have been influenced by Josephus's claim that Emperor Caligula tried to set up an idol in the Temple. Either of these may well have influenced Ralph, but they are not incompatible with his having believed that Muslims did worship idols. Based on evidence elsewhere in the *Tancredus*, he did. In his preface, Ralph referred to the crusade itself as 'that pilgrimage, that great labour, which restored our mother Jerusalem to her heirs, extinguished idolatry and revived the faith.'⁹⁸⁴ Nearer the end of his narrative, he also blamed the crusading leader Raymond of Toulouse for the failure to follow up on the victory at the battle of Ascalon with the capture of the city. The result was that 'the newly captured city (Ascalon) returned to idolatry, spurning the reins of the count and the yoke of the king who had subdued it.'⁹⁸⁵ Whether or not Ralph knew of reason to be sceptical about the idol he described in the Temple, he was apparently convinced of Muslim idolatry – perhaps as no more than a casual assumption about what non-Christians must be like – and so would at least have thought that he was describing a general truth.

In keeping with the apparent worship of Mohammed with ostentatious and elaborate idols, Ralph also indicated that he believed Mohammed to be the god of the Muslims. In his version of the embassy sent to the commander of the Muslim forces, Kerbogha, the Atabeg of Mosul, on the eve of the final battle for Antioch, Kerbogha began his response to the Christian ambassador by saying, 'this migrant people despoiling the kingdom of the Persians offends the god Mohammed'.⁹⁸⁶ That Ralph really

⁹⁸² See above, 4.2.3.

⁹⁸³ Matthew Bennett, 'First Crusaders' Images of Muslims: The Influence of Vernacular Poetry?' in *Forum for Modern Language Studies* 22 (2) 1986, 101-116, 103.

⁹⁸⁴ ...illa peregrinatio, sudor ille gloriosus, qui matri nostrae Iherusalem haereditatem suam restituit, idolatriam exstinxit, fidem reparavit... Ralph of Caen, 603.

⁹⁸⁵ Urbs neophyta at idolatriam redit, spretis comitis simul et iugo regis, et subjugatorum habenis... Ralph of Caen, 703 (154).

⁹⁸⁶ "Persarum regnum populantes gens peregrina/Offendere deum Mahummet..." Ralph of Caen, 664 (104).

believed this is not entirely certain; the passage is a heightened one and it is possible to read his later reference to Mohammed as an Antichrist as a suggestion that he was at least vaguely aware of how he was really regarded in Islam, as will be discussed later. But this reading of Ralph's later statement is not definite. As quoted above, Ralph's account of Tancred's desire to fight and defeat Mohammed (and the true Antichrist) does suggest Ralph thought he was a real person and not the (implicitly false) god of the Muslims. However, Ralph might easily have believed one thing about Mohammed himself, and thought that Muslims believed another. Ralph may have been influenced by the explanation of the origins of the classical pagan gods which held that they were historical figures whose reputations grew to the point that they were mistakenly worshipped.⁹⁸⁷ This interpretation would reconcile these apparently contradictory statements. On one occasion, after Tancred captured Adana in 1097, Ralph did mention a prayer of the Muslims: 'From this point on, *Allachibar*, which the infidels call out in prayer, was no longer heard in the city.'⁹⁸⁸ He clearly had the Arabic phrase *Allahu akbar*, 'God is great', in mind. This too could mean Ralph had greater knowledge of Islam, and described Mohammed as their god in a mocking or deliberately misleading way. But there is no certain indication that Ralph actually understood what the phrase meant. The question of whether authors of First Crusade accounts knew more about Islam than they included in their account and deliberately misrepresented it is essentially unanswerable. Of them all, the *Tancredus* contains the most hints that this might be the case, but still there is nothing conclusive. If, on the other hand, Ralph did think Muslims regarded Mohammed as a god he would not have been alone in this belief: one of the changes Peter Tudebode made to his very close adaptation of the *Gesta Francorum* was to change a reference to 'Mohammed and our gods' to 'Mohammed and our other gods'.⁹⁸⁹

Ralph emphasised that Muslims rejected and denied Christ. He did this most vividly in the same passage discussed above, in which a Christian embassy is addressed by Kerbogha. After mentioning the 'god' Mohammed, the Atabeg continued, 'Send back these, my words, to your Latins. For what

⁹⁸⁷ See, for example, Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiae*, VIII.xi.1-2. For discussion of this tendency, see Jean Seznec, *The Survival of the Pagan Gods: The Mythological Tradition and its Place in Renaissance Humanism and Art*, trans. Barbara F. Sessions, (Princeton, 1995)

⁹⁸⁸ '...Ex illo, Allachibar, quod infidelitas orando exclamat, hac in urbe obmutuit...' Ralph of Caen, 636 (65).

⁹⁸⁹ See above, 2.2.2, 2.4.

do I care about Peter or Christ? What is Peter or Christ to me? Neither one matters to me. They make me laugh, both of them make me laugh.’⁹⁹⁰ Ralph repeated this accusation during his account of the storming of Jerusalem, in which he rhetorically addressed the Muslims he described trying to escape the massacre, asking: ‘Why have you hidden yourself away, evil denier of Christ?’⁹⁹¹ No authors of crusade accounts did acknowledge how Islam regards Jesus (although Guibert of Nogent came closest).⁹⁹² Nevertheless, the polemic force behind Ralph’s emphasis on this denial of Christ should not be underestimated, especially in the case of Kerbogha’s particularly derisive rejection of Christianity. That Muslims were aware of and consciously chose to reject Christianity was a clear sign of evil to Ralph, and – although this is not a major theme in his work, as it is in other crusade histories – it would have helped to establish the justice of waging war against them.

There is another, more subtle way in which Ralph did distinguish himself in terms of his understanding of what Islam was: his use of the term *mahummicola*.⁹⁹³ The word as apparently coined by Ralph himself: as mentioned above, Manitius included it in a list of neologisms which he attributed to Ralph.⁹⁹⁴ *Mahummicola* does not appear in any of the major Latin dictionaries, including those specialising in Medieval Latin. Nor does it appear – outside of Ralph’s usage of it – anywhere in searchable collections of Medieval Latin texts such as the *Patrologia Latina*, the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* or the Library of Latin Texts. It seems not to have attracted much attention from modern scholars either. Manitius simply listed it as an example of a word Ralph invented. Franz Blatt similarly gave it as an example of how medieval writers sometimes formed new words by combining two existing words (in this case, *Mahummet* and *colere*, to worship), without even mentioning Ralph.⁹⁹⁵ Bachrach and Bachrach obviously had to work out a translation for it, but did so without comment. D’Angelo does not comment either.

⁹⁹⁰ “*Haec mea, vade, tuis responde verba Latinis.*/(665) *Nam quid ego Petro, quid vestro reddere Christo/Inveniam? Quanti Petrus, tanti mihi Christus/Cura mihi neuter, risus mihi, risus uterque.*” Ralph of Caen, 654-5 (104).

⁹⁹¹ “*Quid latitasse tibi, Christi scelerate negator?*”, Ralph of Caen, 697 (146)

⁹⁹² See above, 5.2.2.

⁹⁹³ Examples can be found at Ralph of Caen, 620, 670, 679, 692, 698.

⁹⁹⁴ Manitius, *Geschichte der Lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, 423.

⁹⁹⁵ Franz Blatt, ‘Aus Der Werkstatt Eines Mitellateinischen Lexicographen’, in *Philologus: Zeitschrift fuer Anike Literatur und ihre Rezeption* 115(1), April 1971, 11-15.

So the term seems to have originated with Ralph, and found absolutely no traction with his contemporaries or successors. It is possible *mahummicola* was being used around Antioch and only Ralph happened to record it, but given how clearly the word was constructed it does seem likely it was the invention of a particular person, and Ralph is the only candidate. The term's lack of influence probably reflects that of Ralph himself, as indicated by the survival of only one copy of the work, his autograph. It is conceivable that Ralph's term did find its way into more Latin writing from the East than has survived, but this can only be a speculative suggestion. In any case, it is easily translated: it is clearly based on the common medieval term *Christicola*, meaning 'worshipper of Christ', or Christian. Ralph also uses that term, often in opposition to *mahummicola*, which, by analogy, is obviously intended to mean 'worshipper of Mohammed'.⁹⁹⁶ That Ralph invented his own unique term for Muslim is quite significant in its own right, but the term also suggests two important assumptions Ralph must have made about Islam. The first is that Mohammed occupied a position in Islam equivalent to Christ's in Christianity, which is particularly suggested by the use of the term as a direct counterpart to *Christicola* – that is to say, not simply in that both were the founders of their respective religions, but in the sense that Christ (as part of the Trinity) was the central figure of worship for Christians. In coming up with a term based on *colere*, Ralph may in fact have been influenced by the belief that Mohammed was considered a god by the Muslims, though as mentioned there is a strong possibility he had not intended his remark which suggested that literally. Either way, the idea that Mohammed was worshipped – with elaborate idols, as we have seen – is a distortion of Muslim beliefs, and probably arose from a tendency towards depicting Islam as the direct opposite of Christianity. This assumption that Islam mirrored Christianity in this regard was common, but not universal: Guibert of Nogent was aware of Mohammed's role as a prophet, and others referred to him as the *praeceptor* or *advocatus* – teacher or advocate – of the Muslims.

The second idea inherent in Ralph's use of the term *mahummicola* is the depiction of Muslims as a discrete category of people. *Mahummicola* is the only term used in the works considered here which collectively identifies

⁹⁹⁶ For examples of the juxtaposition of *Mahummicola* and *Christicola*, see Ralph of Caen, 620, 679, 692, 698.

Muslims by their religion and does not apply to a number of other groups. Other collective terms used in crusade histories include national terms such as *Turcus* or *Saracenus*; religious terms that apply to many kinds of non-Christian such as *paganus* or *gentilis*; and even more general terms such as *barbarus*, *natio*, and *gens*. Another term which referred so precisely to Muslims was apparently very slow to appear in the West.⁹⁹⁷ This is not to say that the other authors of crusade accounts make no distinction between Muslims and other non-Christians. But as has been seen, they frequently used terminology to de-emphasise this, blurring the lines between Muslims and historical enemies of Christianity. Ralph's use of *Mahummicola* – synonymously with all the national terms for Muslim which he used, such as *Turcus* and *Aegypticus* – emphasises the specific corporate identity of Muslims as a particular kind of non-Christian.⁹⁹⁸ There is an inconsistency in Ralph's work in this regard, however; on one occasion he mentioned a group of captives from Raymond of Toulouse's army who became apostates. He referred to this group as *Turcati*; 'men who had become Turks'.⁹⁹⁹ This suggests a misconception that 'Turk' was a religious identity, which is somewhat at odds with how Ralph usually used *mahummicola*. It was a common enough idea, however: the *Gesta Francorum* had Kerbogha offer great rewards to the crusaders if they would 'become Turks', and Raymond of Aguilers used the term *turcandum*, another participle variant of the implied verb *turcare* to refer to converting to Islam.¹⁰⁰⁰ Ralph might just have been defaulting to a phrase that was in common circulation, quite possibly because this passage was in verse, and '*Mahummicolati*' or some other such construction would not have fit the meter. It is *possible* that this is a hint that Ralph did know of religious differences between the Sunni Turks and Shia Fatimids, and meant that these apostates had become Sunni Muslims specifically, but that is far more than can be safely assumed in the absence of any other indications.

⁹⁹⁷ 'Islam' entered French vocabulary in the Seventeenth Century and English only in the Nineteenth Century; 'Muslims' were first referred to in both languages only in the Seventeenth Century. Morton, *Encountering Islam on the First Crusade*, 15.

⁹⁹⁸ Ralph used *Mahummicola* for the Turkish attackers at Dorylaeum (Ralph of Caen, 620), the Fatimid defenders of Jerusalem (692, 698), and referred to the compound force of many ethnic groups which he claimed Kerbogha had brought to Antioch as *omnigenae mahummicolarum* (Ralph of Caen, 670).

⁹⁹⁹ Ralph of Caen, 672.

¹⁰⁰⁰ '*Si cupiunt... effici Turci...*' *Gesta Francorum*, 67; Raymond of Aguilers, 278. The English term 'turn Turk' is obviously related. Examples can be found in Shakespeare: it is used metaphorically in *Hamlet* III.ii.285 'if the rest of my fortunes turn Turk with me', and more literally in *Much Ado about Nothing* III.iv.57, 'an you be not turned Turk'.

Unfortunately, in his focus on Tancred Ralph gives little further detail about his conception of Muslim beliefs. He does not clearly indicate whether he believes Muslims are mono- or polytheistic, for example: his phrasing when he refers to Mohammed as a god is ambiguous in this regard. There is no definite indication of the Sunni-Shia divide (though this is usual), although Ralph does distinguish between Turks and the subjects of the Fatimid Caliphate, as mentioned. Nevertheless, from the details he did mention, it is clear that Ralph had a distinctive understanding of what Islam was.

7.2.2 The Political Structure of Muslim society

No authors of First Crusade histories demonstrate a full understanding of the political structures of the societies fought by the crusaders. Ralph is no exception, but like the others, he does show that he had some grasp. As with most of the authors, he distinguished between Turks and the subjects of the Fatimid Caliphate, though there is no indication that he was aware this was a religious as well as ethnic divide. However, unlike the *Gesta Francorum* and many other authors who followed its pattern, Ralph did not use a blanket term for all of the Muslims south of Antioch who were not Turks. These Shia Muslims, at least nominally subject to the Fatimid Caliphs, were typically referred to as *Sarraceni* by those authors who made a consistent distinction, but Ralph did not use the word. He mentioned Egyptians, the ‘flutes of Arabia’ and the ‘spears of Ethiopia’, but for the most part he simply used non-specific phrases like ‘the enemy’, ‘the townsmen’, ‘the defenders’ and so on.¹⁰⁰¹ The most frequently-used single term was *Mahummicola*, Ralph’s general term for Muslims.¹⁰⁰² On another occasion he mentioned that in addition to Damascus (standing in for the Turks), Egypt, Palestine and Arabia were opposing the crusaders: this suggests that his reason for not using the term *Sarraceni* here was because he did not think of the inhabitants of these lands as one cohesive group in the way implied by his contemporaries’ use of the term.¹⁰⁰³ He also consistently avoided the use of the term *Turci* in the part of his narrative dealing with events from the capture of Marra to the battle of Ascalon. Turks reappeared after Ralph’s attention shifted back to Antioch; a clear indication that he at least distinguished sharply between Turks and non-Turks.

¹⁰⁰¹ Egyptians, 688; *cannae Arabiae* and *pila Ethiopiae*, 690; the enemy, 674, 681, 693; the townsmen, 681; the defenders, 692-3.

¹⁰⁰² Ralph of Caen, 679, 692, 698.

¹⁰⁰³ Ralph of Caen, 691.

Ralph also showed some awareness of the opposing political leaderships of these groups. He knew that Jerusalem had only recently been recaptured by the Egyptians (whom he referred to allusively as 'Memphis') from the Turks ('Damascus'), when the crusaders arrived.¹⁰⁰⁴ Ralph gave no indication of the political structure of the Fatimids. This was probably due to a deliberate choice to be brief, as the Turks were generally more relevant to the deeds of the princes of Antioch. Accordingly, Turkish politics received a little more attention. The Turks were ruled by the *rex Persarum*, and Kerbogha was his *dux*.¹⁰⁰⁵ Ralph associated the Turks strongly with Persia, a common tendency among crusade authors. This demonstrates some awareness on the part of the authors that the Turks had invaded Asia Minor from their power base in Persia. The association also may have allowed Ralph to reconcile the situation in the East with his education: from both classical and biblical sources, contemporaries would have expected to find Persians rather than Turks.¹⁰⁰⁶ The Persian *rex* was second only to the 'god' Mohammed himself.¹⁰⁰⁷ Kerbogha was also referred to as a 'Satrap', the term used for regional governors in the Persian empire, though in the absence of a definitive statement like Guibert's assertion that the Turks were Parthians going by a new name it is as likely that Ralph used the term simply to demonstrate his erudition rather than to establish that the the Turks were literally Persians.¹⁰⁰⁸

7.2.3 Violence Against Muslims

Most authors of crusade accounts wrote of violence against Muslims with a callous or even celebratory tone, creating a dehumanising effect in the depiction of Muslims. Ralph is no exception, although there are somewhat fewer examples. Descriptions of extreme violence in the *Tancredus* usually appear either in the context of establishing Tancred's prowess (or less frequently, that of another crusade leader) or on a small number of occasions in the context of revenge for past Muslim acts. Most examples of extreme violence depicted are perpetrated by Tancred, or in some cases by another crusade leader who was also being praised. Such is the case, for example,

¹⁰⁰⁴ Ralph of Caen, 688.

¹⁰⁰⁵ 'Corboran, regis Persarum dux...' Ralph of Caen (658).

¹⁰⁰⁶ Morton suggests, however, that this was a habit which the crusaders picked up from the Byzantines. Morton, *Encountering Islam on the First Crusade*, 123.

¹⁰⁰⁷ Ralph of Caen, 644.

¹⁰⁰⁸ See above, 5.1.2, 5.2.1, 5.2.5.

when Ralph described Tancred's ambush of a foraging party from Antioch during the siege:

He charged into their midst and devoured them all with the mouth of his sword. Their guts were scorched even more sharply because of the three-day thirst which his sword had endured while sitting among these goblets. Lest this account be too long, after about 700 [of the Turks] had been killed, Tancred sent 70 heads taken from the dead men to the bishop of Le Puy, a tenth of his triumph.¹⁰⁰⁹

Other crusade leaders were also the focus of such passages. Ralph mentioned Godfrey's great feat of arms in battle at Antioch: 'For who would presume [to pass over in silence] the amazing strength of Godfrey whose drawn sword turned one Turk into two, whose lower half rode into the city and whose other half swam in the river holding his bow?'¹⁰¹⁰ That Ralph was primarily interested in demonstrating Tancred's prowess above other considerations is demonstrated by his account of the massacre of Greek Christians at the Vardar river by Tancred's forces. He describes this encounter in the same manner as he describes the violence against Muslims:

Tancred opened the path with his sword. He cut down anyone whom he intended to kill. The markers left in his wake made it easy for those following him. Half-dead bodies filled the banks on both the right and left with a middle channel of blood.¹⁰¹¹

The other two similar cases of extreme violence against Muslims were presented in terms of revenge for past Muslim crimes. In one (less graphic) case, Ralph wrote that the Christian inhabitants of Adana had

¹⁰⁰⁹ '...qui in medios irrumpens tanto avidius in ore gladii omnes absorbet, quo acrius eorum viscera torrentur quibus sustenta est inter pocula sitis tridua. Ne longum faciam, caesis circiter septingentis, caesorum capita Tancredus LXX. Appodiensi transmittit episcopo, decimam de triumpho...' Ralph of Caen, 644 (77). See also 670-1

¹⁰¹⁰ 'Quis enim de Godefridi viribus stupendis praesumat, cujus ense trajectus Turcus duo factus est Turci: ut inferior alter in urbem equitaret, alter arcitenens in flumine nataret?' Ralph of Caen, 646 (79). See also 80, where Stephen of Blois is praised.

¹⁰¹¹ 'Tancredus viam gladio aperit; et quot aggreditur caedendos, tot praeterit caesos. Illum sequentibus facile, qua se certisset, vestigia declarabant. Trunci semineces a dextra et laeva medio cruoris alveo supplebant ripas.' Ralph of Caen, 608 (26).

massacred the city's ruling Turkish population, motivated by revenge: 'The victor punished at one time the wounds which he had suffered from old and returned manifold death for his servitude.'¹⁰¹² As with all the other crusade accounts, Ralph described the massacre that took place when Jerusalem was taken most vividly of all.¹⁰¹³ He placed this, too, in the explicit context of revenge, rhetorically addressing the Muslim victims of the slaughter: 'Disperse, be dispersed you depraved people, you evil men. Shedder of innocent blood, the guilty man pours out his own blood. You who have torn apart Christ completely in his limbs, receive now the limbs that Christ's supporters return to you.'¹⁰¹⁴

Ralph's description of the massacre of those who took refuge in the 'Temple' is also notable for its similarity to all the other accounts:

The sanctuary was covered with vast quantities of blood. The glory of all of the craftsmen from throughout the world, was submerged in a lake at whose waves even its creator shuddered. How great, how great was the amazement at the interior of the temple. The doors, walls, seats, tables, columns, were all bloody. There was nothing without blood. The floor was completely covered by the slaughter. The walls were submerged knee high [in blood]. The gore was so great that waves stained the furnishings.¹⁰¹⁵

Similar imagery is used even in accounts that are independent of each other, suggesting that the accounts must have some basis in the real event – and that it made a lasting impression on eyewitnesses. As discussed in the chapter on the *Gesta Francorum*, Thomas F. Madden concluded that while definitely exaggerated – the amount of blood supposedly shed was mathematically impossible – such a large slaughter confined to a small area

¹⁰¹² '...semel omnia victor punit vulnere quae a diebus antiquis pertulerat, in multimoda nece cognate servitutis.' Ralph of Caen, 635 (64).

¹⁰¹³ Ralph of Caen, 696-9.

¹⁰¹⁴ 'Spargite, spargimini, gens prava, viri scelerati. Sanguinis insontis fusor, sons fundere sanguis: Qui Christum totiens in membris dilacerasti, excipe membra vices tibi quas reddunt modo Christi.' Ralph of Caen, 697 (145-6).

¹⁰¹⁵ 'Sic quoque sopitum gladius non praeterit ullum: Costas rimatus, per colla, per ilia ductus, terga per et ventres, larga sanie oblitit aedes. Gloria cunctarum quas mundus habet fabricarum, fit lacus, haerendi vel ut actor obhorreat undae. Quantus quantus erat templi stupor ille capacis! Limina, maceriae, sedes, tabulata, columnae, omnia sanguis erant. Nihil exstabat nisi sanguis: namque pavimentum penitus sub strage latebat, ut nisi submersus non tangat marmora poples quippe cruor tantus, tanta inficit unda penates...' Ralph of Caen, 698-9 (148).

must have been such a disturbing sight that it would not be surprising for eyewitnesses to have formed an exaggerated impression.¹⁰¹⁶ This was not necessarily a deliberate attempt to dehumanise the victims of this massacre; as the obvious climax of Ralph's narrative, a heightened tone was called for. Nevertheless, this is the effect which most authors produced, and Ralph is no exception. Even the passages which do focus on Tancred's prowess are callous in their attitude to Muslims, suggesting they were beneath sympathy. In Ralph's case, however, this seems unlikely to have been intentional polemic.

7.2.4 Violence by Muslims

In contrast to the above, Ralph wrote considerably less about Muslims as the perpetrators of violence. There are some examples, including examples of violence against the local Christian population which implicitly justifies the violence of the crusade, but not many, and they are considerably less graphically described. Ralph stands out from most other authors of First Crusade histories in this regard. Generally, both sides had acts of extreme violence attributed to them, albeit with more emphasis on violence by the crusaders, and with the explicit or implicit view that violence by Christians was justified, while violence by Muslims was barbaric. Ralph included comparatively few such incidents. His few depictions of Muslims as barbaric are also light compared to those of other authors. He wrote of historical violence against the local Christian population only in general terms: as above, the men of Adana punished 'the wounds which [they] had suffered from old and returned manifold death for [their] servitude', while the inhabitants of Jerusalem were shedders of unspecified 'innocent blood.'¹⁰¹⁷ Ralph blamed Raymond of Toulouse for the failure to follow up the victory at Ascalon with the capture of the city, which allowed it to remain a thorn in the side of the newly-formed Kingdom of Jerusalem. Ralph rhetorically addressed the count: 'Alas, you miserable man, you do not know what chains and slaughter you have unleashed on the innocent because you have abandoned Ascalon...'¹⁰¹⁸ Even these examples lack the graphic detail included by other authors, or even of Ralph's own few depictions of violence against Muslims. Violence against the crusaders themselves was reported in

¹⁰¹⁶ See above, 2.2.3; below, Conclusion, 8.6.1.

¹⁰¹⁷ See above.

¹⁰¹⁸ '*Miser, nescis... quae vincula, quas strages innocentiae struis, dum stragis vinculorumque instrumentum Ascalonam solvis: nocentem non premis, jugum detrahis*' Ralph of Caen, 703 (154).

little greater detail, if at all. Turkish forces at Dorylaeum broke through the crusader lines into their camp:

The old men were killed and the young were carried off.
Those in middle age suffered the fate of those whom they
most closely resembled in appearance. What happened
most frequently, however, and most savagely was that the
sword point made claims on those at the age of puberty.
The great quantity of booty made the most savage man
even more savage.¹⁰¹⁹

While Ralph offers a clear judgment, calling the Turks *saevissimi* (the superlative form of *saevus*, savage), there is no graphic detail, unlike his descriptions of violence against Muslims. This is all Ralph writes that can be interpreted as depicting Muslims as barbaric towards Christians. Although the theme is present, it was clearly not one of Ralph's central messages for his readers.

7.2.5 Cowardice

As a general rule, Ralph depicted Muslims as cowardly. There is little of the *Gesta Francorum*'s ambiguity: Ralph does not alternate between depicting Muslims as extremely threatening and cowardly and ineffective as the anonymous author does. When Antioch was captured, Ralph noted that among the inhabitants who fled to the citadel in the mountains above the city, 'the father did not wait for the wounded son nor did the son await the aged father' – the latter of which was probably a deliberate contrast to Vergil's *Aeneid*, in which the heroic Aeneas carried his father to safety on his own back when Troy fell.¹⁰²⁰ At Nicaea, Tancred 'raised up the morale of the soldiers of Christ and transformed the enemy into women.'¹⁰²¹ At the final battle for Antioch, 'having scattered their swords and quivers, they fled... Some of the enemy rushed off willingly after giving up their reins and

¹⁰¹⁹ 'Trucidantur itaque senes, pueri abstrahuntur, aetas media utrius partis expressius figurat faciem, ejus patitur sortem; saepissime tamen, ac saevissime mucro et de impubibus praesumit, praeda copia saeviorum de saevissimo faciente praedonem.' Ralph of Caen, 622 (47).

¹⁰²⁰ '...saucium pater filium non exspectat, sed nec filius patrem grandaevum.', Ralph of Caen, 655 (92). Cf. Vergil, *Aeneid*, 2.650-71.

¹⁰²¹ '...Christi effervavit milites, effeminavit hostes.' Ralph of Caen, 617 (39).

saddles. They climbed under thornbushes hoping to hide there.’¹⁰²² They were struck with terror at the sight of the cross: ‘they trembled, shook, and shuddered at its brilliance... Thus they showed themselves to be cattle while the Franks were zealous lions. The former preferred flight to death while the latter preferred praise to life.’¹⁰²³ This latter is representative of a tendency for Ralph to frequently reinforce Muslim cowardice with comparisons to animals; as well as cattle contrasted with lions, they were coots attacked by falcons,¹⁰²⁴ a hare hiding from puppies,¹⁰²⁵ and on two occasions sheep with a panther or a lion in their midst.¹⁰²⁶

Ralph drew attention to the Turks’ traditional feigned retreat tactics on a number of occasions, but did not depict this as an inherently cowardly tactic in itself, perhaps respecting its proven efficacy. When describing the effects of Robert of Flanders’ arrival at the battle of Dorylaeum, for example, while he described the retreating Muslims as terrified, this was *in addition to* their tactic of shooting arrows while retreating, and this fear ruined their gambit rather than prompting it: ‘But following the custom of their fathers, their bows also caused wounds even in flight. They acted, however, trembling with fear, so that the arrows caused no damage.’¹⁰²⁷ On other occasions, these tactics were either effective or successfully countered by Tancred without much judgment on Ralph’s part. For example in August 1100, Bohemond led a relief force to break the Turkish siege of Melitine; at his approach, ‘they gave up their siege, by design, and as is their practice, withdrew. They had more success, at least over the short term, when retreating rather than when attacking because they were accustomed to shoot arrows while in retreat and thus wound their pursuers.’¹⁰²⁸ Ralph also described an occasion in 1105 on which Tancred countered the tactics by luring Ridwan of Aleppo’s forces across rough ground which blocked their retreat from his counterattack: ‘The Turks quickly retreated hoping, as was

¹⁰²² ‘*Ensibus et pharetris etiam fugit illa solutis./.../Quidam sponte ruunt, freno sellaue relictis,/Et subeunt dumos sperando later sub ipsis...*’ Ralph of Caen, 671 (110).

¹⁰²³ ‘*...Fit tremebunda, gemens, quae venerat aeris et horrens./.../Ergo se pecudes, Francos genus acre leonum/Fassa, fugam morti praefert, et vivere laudi:/Dum nequit ad montem regredi, refugit secus amnem.*’ Ralph of Caen, 668 (108).

¹⁰²⁴ Ralph of Caen, 648.

¹⁰²⁵ Ibid, 656.

¹⁰²⁶ Ibid, 670, 673.

¹⁰²⁷ ‘*...more tamen patrio, fugiens quoque vulnerat arcus,/ Sed tremebunda metu ferit, et non laedit harundo...*’ Ralph of Caen, 627 (52-3).

¹⁰²⁸ ‘*obsidionem ex industria dimittentes, ut eorum est consuetudo, recesserunt. Magis enim ipsi ad tempus vel horam terga vertendo quam accedendo recesserunt. Nam et fugiendo spicula ejiciunt, seseque insequentes vulnerant.*’ Ralph of Caen, 705 (157).

their custom, to turn about while fleeing and shoot. However, their hopes and their tricks were foiled, and both the spears of the Christians and the path itself made sport of them.¹⁰²⁹ Ralph specifically reminded the reader once again that this was their customary tactic, perhaps inviting them to draw their own conclusions about Turkish valour, but did not directly comment. However, at the battle of Harran in 1104, Ralph went so far as to write that the Turkish forces ‘simulated flight with adroitness’.¹⁰³⁰

7.2.6 Associations with Satan and Antichrist

Ralph associated Muslims with hell on several occasions. After Antioch was captured, the Christians ‘[were] raised from humility to the stars and the others became submerged in Hell because of their luxury and drunkenness.’¹⁰³¹ Later, when Tancred was ambushed on the Mount of Olives by five men from the garrison of Jerusalem as the siege was beginning, ‘he sent the soul of the first one he found on the mountain to Hell and his body crashing to the ground...’¹⁰³² The words translated as ‘hell’ by Bachrach and Bachrach here are *Styx* and *Tartarum*, the classical underworld and the famous river which flows through it, but it is clear that the Christian meaning of ‘hell’ is intended. Along similar lines, when Ralph referred to Mohammed as ‘Pluto’s slave (*verna Plutonis*)’¹⁰³³, it is clear that he used Pluto as a poetic stand-in for the Christian devil, rather than the considerably more ambiguously evil Roman god of the dead. Ralph did also use contemporary terminology, however: in the same passage as he referred to ‘Pluto’s slave’, he lamented that ‘the fellowship of Hell drinks in the Tower of God’; using the medieval term *baratrum* for Hell.¹⁰³⁴ Ralph created a related but slightly different association on another occasion, in which he wrote of Muslim forces being defeated in battle by Christians in these terms: ‘Baal rushed about, while Alpha overwhelms.’ Baal was a false god of the enemies of the Israelites in the Old Testament; while ‘Alpha’ here indicates

¹⁰²⁹ ‘*illi facile terga vertunt, sperantes, ut est moris, fugiendo gyrare, gyrando sagittare. Delusae sunt autem eorum spes et artes, deluserunt eas lancea et via...*’ Ralph of Caen, 714 (171)

¹⁰³⁰ ‘*...astutia fugam simulant...*’ Ralph of Caen, 710 (164).

¹⁰³¹ ‘*...alios ab humili ad sidera extulit, alios sub Tartara a luxu et crapula summersit...*’ Ralph of Caen, 674 (114).

¹⁰³² ‘*...et quem primum reperit in montem advolasse, primi cogit spiritum sub Styga, corpus in vallem corruere.*’ Ralph of Caen, 686 (131).

¹⁰³³ Ralph of Caen, 695 (144).

¹⁰³⁴ ‘*Arce Dei potitur conviva baratri...*’ Ralph of Caen, 695 (144).

Christ as in the statement 'I am Alpha and Omega' (Revelation 21:6).¹⁰³⁵

Ralph also included a passing comparison of Muslims to the Hydra of Greek myth, but this association with monsters did not form a repeated pattern.

Ralph also associated Islam with Antichrist in the passage in which he described the discovery of a supposed Muslim idol, as mentioned above. The eschatological theory underpinning Ralph's comments is unclear and warrants deeper consideration, but the intended message about Muslims is clear enough. Ralph has Tancred describe the idol to himself, listing the *insignia Christi* whose absence prove it is no Christian statue, concluding:

'Therefore, this is not Christ but rather the original Antichrist, Mohammed the depraved, Mohammed the pernicious. Oh, if his comrade were here, that one that is to come! Already my foot would be treading down both of these Antichrists.'¹⁰³⁶

Ralph calls Mohammed the 'original Antichrist', and has Tancred boast that he would defeat them both if Mohammed and the Antichrist who will usher in the Last Judgment were present. What does Ralph mean by writing as if there are multiple antichrists? There are a number of possibilities, although it is possible that the simplest explanation is ultimately correct.

Immediately, we can discount any suggestion that Ralph thought Mohammed was literally the Antichrist spoken of in the Bible: while he does not indicate any knowledge of how long ago Mohammed lived, none of the other foretold events had happened or were happening, so Mohammed could not be that Antichrist. That is, clearly, to whom Ralph was referring when he mentioned '*ille futurus*'. Ralph was also not connecting Muslims to Antichrist as part of any specific claim that they will play an imminent role in the end of days; nor is there any particular indication that he believed the Antichrist would arise soon at all – though he was sure it would happen eventually.

¹⁰³⁵ This is an example of the *color rhetorici* of *personificatio*. Ralph repeated the rhetorical figure on another occasion, with the crusaders embodying Christ and the defenders Mohammed when a siege tower was brought up to the walls of Jerusalem: '*En iterum sumpto fulmine Christicolis Mahummicolae pluunt, ut stillata nocentem amphora potet, qui prius utilis et pice et sulphure et face fuerat ustulatus. Expertus est itaque idem bis inflammatus, bis aquatus, bis Mahumet victum, bis victorem Christum...*' Ralph of Caen, 692 (140).

¹⁰³⁶ '*Ergo neque his Christus: quin pristinus Antichristus./Mahummet pravus, Mahummet perniciosus./O si hujus socius nunc afforet, ille futurus!/Jam meus hic ambos pes supprimat Antichristos.*' Ralph of Caen, p. 695.

Ralph is not alone in his implication of multiple Antichrists. As Robert E. Lerner has noted, medieval theology and folklore allowed for the existence of many 'antichrists – so to speak with a small *a*,' a belief justified by 1 John 2:18, which warned that 'even now are there many antichrists.'¹⁰³⁷ This same passage drew a distinction between the 'many antichrists' and a great Antichrist who 'shall come (*venit*)', much as Ralph does. Patristic and Medieval theologians concluded that the 'many antichrists', of which Ralph may have been claiming Mohammed was one, were 'any members of the diabolically inspired human society of evil, all of whom helped to prepare the way for the true Antichrist's coming but none of whom were to be confused with this one true Antichrist himself.'¹⁰³⁸ Lerner goes on to analyse the thought of Joachim, abbot of Fiore (c.1135-1202), who did believe in multiple Antichrists of a more literal nature prefiguring 'The' Antichrist, of whom Mohammed was one (Saladin was another).¹⁰³⁹ It is not impossible that Ralph provides evidence of an early version of this interpretation, but there is no clear indication that this is the case).

If 1 John 2:18 or any of its exegeses was the basis of Ralph's thinking, this passage was considerably more theologically sophisticated than anything previously recognised in his work. Rather than basing his depiction of Mohammed on this theory directly, it may be that Ralph encountered the idea of multiple antichrists in a more accessible form. Isidore of Seville's widely-accessible *Etymologiae* is a possible source for Ralph to have encountered a broader definition of antichrist. Isidore defined 'Antichrist' as 'also one who denies that Christ is God, for he is opposed to Christ. So all those who depart from the Church and are cut off from the unity of faith are themselves antichrists.'¹⁰⁴⁰ Although Isidore was almost

¹⁰³⁷ Robert E. Lerner, 'Antichrists and Antichrist in Joachim of Fiore', *Speculum* 60(3) (1985), 553-570, pp 553-4.

¹⁰³⁸ Lerner, 'Antichrists and Antichrist in Joachim of Fiore', 554. The distinction between the 'many antichrists' and the Antichrist is found in Jerome, *Commentarii in Daniele*, ed. F. Florie, Corpus Christianorum series Latina 75A (Turnhout: Brepols, 1964), 915-17; Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, ed. B. Dombart and A. Kalb, CCL 48(Turnhout: Brepols, 1964), 732; Adso of Montier-en-Der, *De Ortu et Tempore Antichristi*, CCCM 45 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1976), 22.

Morton also discussed Ralph's reference to multiple antichrists, pointing out that several Patristic authors mentioned multiple antichrists, including Tertullian, Lacatantius, Polycarp and Irenaeus. References to 'antichrists' and precursors of Antichrist also appeared in the letters of Gregory VII, and ninth-century Iberian tradition. Morton, *Encountering Islam on the First Crusade*, 225-6.

¹⁰³⁹ Lerner, 'Antichrists and Antichrist in Joachim of Fiore', *passim*. Joachim of Fiore's apocalyptic thought is also discussed by Daniel, *Islam and the West*, 211 and Hamilton, 'Western Understanding of Islam at the time of the crusades' 381.

¹⁰⁴⁰ Isidore of Seville, *Etymologies*, VIII.xi.22 p. 185.

certainly influenced by exegesis of 1 John 2:18, Ralph may have simply encountered usage of the word in the way he understood it without knowing of the exegetical basis for the theory. It is even possible that Ralph simply used 'Antichrist' as a general term of abuse, without intending a more specific meaning, though this seems unlikely in light of the similarity of his statement to the uses of the term 'Antichrist' by all of the above authors. It may indeed be the case that Ralph was basing this passage on exegesis of 1 John 2:18. It is possible that he was more theologically adept than he revealed elsewhere, and the strong emphasis on classical erudition in the *Tancredus* was therefore the result of a conscious choice rather than a deficiency in other areas of scholarship. Whatever the depth of Ralph's scholarship behind his description of Mohammed as an antichrist, he also described him as the *socius* of the true Antichrist. This was another idea that appeared sporadically but more commonly in the corpus of First Crusade sources: Robert the Monk referred to Muslims as *satellites antichristi*, for example.¹⁰⁴¹ It remains clear, however, that Ralph did not associate Muslims with the Antichrist as part of an apocalyptic interpretation of the crusade. The association he made was with the evil of Antichrist, rather than incorporating Muslims into an eschatological theory.

7.2.7 Prophecy

Ralph's account contains a single reference to the success of the crusade being foretold in prophecy. This is a theme which comes up more prominently in many other crusade histories. All of the *Gesta Francorum* revisions reproduce its account of a conversation between the Muslim leader Kerbogha and his mother. While obviously a fabrication, the conversation was used by all of the authors to make a number of points about the nature of the crusade. One of these was a claim that the success of the crusade is foretold not only by biblical prophecy, but by the prophets of the 'pagans' themselves. Independent as he is from the *Gesta Francorum*, Ralph does not include a conversation between Kerbogha and his mother, but he does echo the *Gesta*'s ideas about prophecy. He added a supposed letter from Emperor Alexios I Komnenos to Bohemond at the beginning of the crusade in which he informed the future prince that even the Turks' own prophets foretold the success of the crusade: 'As I see it, God has favoured the undertaking of the

¹⁰⁴¹ See above, 3.2.8.

Franks since he undertook to strengthen them with such a great companion. Your approach promises in its own right an answer to my desires. For although I shall remain silent on other matters, the very prophets of the Turks foretell your victory over their people...'¹⁰⁴²

7.2.8 Arrogance

Other sources often made a point of emphasising the arrogance of the Muslim enemy, with Kerbogha in particular often characterised in this way.¹⁰⁴³ Ralph follows this tendency only with regard to Kerbogha. In addition to his haughty rejection of Christ, discussed above, in his speech to the Christian envoy Peter the Hermit, Kerbogha declared: 'I have found my booty. They are enclosed within walls that I shall break down. I will give your bodies to the teeth of dogs and lions.'¹⁰⁴⁴ Later, Ralph explicitly noted the arrogance of his having ignored the crusaders' preparations for their sally from Antioch in order to continue a chess game:

It is well known that the satrap of the Persians was playing chess as the first standard-bearer raised up the banner of Gaul. When news came that the Franks had marched out to battle, the prince took no action and continued to play the game as before... What arrogance!

1045

This was a relatively common motif, also mentioned by Raymond of Aguilers and Fulcher of Chartres. This may be the result of direct borrowing,

¹⁰⁴² *'Aspiravit, ut video, Deus coeptis Francorum, quos tanto comite muniendos praevidit. Meis quoque desideriis efficaciam tuus singulariter promittit accessus; nam, ut cetera taceam, ipsi etiam vates Turci de gente sua tibi destinant triumphos...'* Ralph of Caen, 611 (30).

¹⁰⁴³ See below, 9.8.

¹⁰⁴⁴ *'Perquirere, perdere missus,/Inveni praedam; sed claudunt moenia: frangam./Corpora vestra canum dabo rictibus atque leonum.'* Ralph of Caen, 664 (104).

¹⁰⁴⁵ *'Persarum Satrapam scaccis operam dare fama est,/Gallica quum primus vexillifer extulit arma,/Illico rumor adest exire ad praelia Francos:/Princeps nil motus ludum tractabat ut ante;/...proh quanta superbia!'* Ralph of Caen, 667, 106. This was a relatively common motif, handled slightly differently by different authors: Raymond of Aguilers simply mentioned that this was what Kerbogha was doing when he heard of the crusader manoeuvre (Raymond of Aguilers, 124 (62)); whereas Fulcher of Chartres presents this and his exchange with his advisor Amirdalis in a way that makes him seem incompetent (Fulcher of Chartres, 253 (105)). It probably arose from efforts by the authors to explain why Kerbogha did not immediately attack the crusaders in the bottleneck created as they marched out from the city – Baldric of Dol struggled to offer an alternate explanation, for example, suggesting that Kerbogha wished to allow all the crusaders to leave the city so they could be surrounded and defeated all at once (Baldric of Dol, 80).

or it may have circulated as an oral account (or both) – in either case, it seems to stem from efforts to explain Kerbogha's inaction as the crusaders left the city.¹⁰⁴⁶ The depiction of Kerbogha as a particularly arrogant Muslim figure by crusade authors is usually consistent with a more general tendency to depict Muslims as arrogant. Ralph does not follow this tendency, however. Although he adds another example of what is a remarkably consistent characterisation of Kerbogha, he does not make similar comments (or attribute similar actions) to other Muslims – except to the extent that Kerbogha himself can be read as representative of Muslims generally.

7.2.9 Alliances and Treaties

Ralph is alone among the authors under consideration for omitting any mention of treaties and alliances made with Muslims. Discussion of these treaties, without apparently feeling any criticism was necessary, seems to indicate a willingness on the part of the other authors to accept that, despite the hostility with which they usually depicted Muslims, pragmatic arrangements could be made with them. However, Ralph's reticence may not necessarily indicate disapproval. His account is focussed closely on the actions of Tancred, and then only those which occurred before 1108. None of the treaties made during the First Crusade itself involved Tancred in any capacity mentioned by other authors, and of course several of the later treaties and alliances mentioned by Fulcher of Chartres and Albert of Aachen took place after the last events in the *Gesta Tancredi*. It may also be the case then that they were omitted because they were of little direct relevance to an account of Tancred's deeds.¹⁰⁴⁷

7.3 Conclusion

Presenting a particular depiction of Muslims was less of a concern for Ralph than for most other authors, who tended to give more space to explanations of who the enemy were, or more polemical descriptions of their characteristics. Nevertheless, one can reconstruct a good deal of what Ralph thought about Muslims from what he does mention, sometimes only in passing. Ralph included some information about the political structure of Muslim society in his account, distinguishing between Turks and non-Turks

¹⁰⁴⁶ See below, 9.8.

¹⁰⁴⁷ See below, 9.11.

with different power-bases, but little detail. He associated the Turks with Persia, as did most authors of First Crusade accounts. Although he recognised separate centres of power around Damascus and Memphis, he did not include any detail about the southern Muslims' rulers, or any further detail about the political organisation of the Turks.

Ralph depicted Muslims as cowardly and usually ineffectual in battle: they were rarely the perpetrators of extreme violence and even more rarely a threat to the crusaders. Ralph includes none of the praise of Muslim abilities for which the *Gesta Francorum* is famous and which its revisers sometimes elaborated. This may be related to his tendency not to depict Muslims as arrogant, except to the extent that Kerbogha (who seems to have had a consistent reputation attributed to him in crusade histories) may have been intended to represent all Muslims: in depicting Muslims as consistently weak, Ralph did not need to use bombastic threats or assertions of their confidence in victory to make the enemy seem more dangerous at appropriate moments in the narrative. The imbalance of military ability between Muslims and Christians is more pronounced in the *Tancredus* than in any of the other sources considered here. Consistent with this, Ralph included a brief mention of the idea that the crusade's success was fated and had been foretold. This imbalance exists in spite of Ralph also including fewer vividly described instances of violence perpetrated by crusaders against Muslims. Although the violence described retains the dehumanising effect it has in other sources, in the *Tancredus* the primary purpose often seems to be praise of Tancred's (or other leaders') military prowess. Even violence against Byzantines, to whom Ralph was not especially hostile, was described in the same manner when Tancred was its author. This suggests that while there may have been some polemical intent behind other authors' depiction of graphic violence against Muslims, this as less of a factor for Ralph. On other, slightly fewer occasions, violence was explicitly presented as revenge for past atrocities and oppression by Muslims. While Ralph followed a common tendency in contextualising (and implicitly justifying) crusader violence in this way, it was less prominent in the *Tancredus*, an inevitable result of the comparatively reduced and less vivid discussions of violence.

Ralph had some specific conception of Muslim beliefs, although he may have contradicted himself somewhat with regard to the role of Mohammed. He definitely believed Muslims were idolators: although his

most detailed discussion of this occurs in a passage Bachrach and Bachrach would argue was one he deliberately indicated was somewhat fanciful, he reinforced the claim elsewhere. Similar to many authors, he depicted Muslims as deniers of Christ, the polemical force of which should not be underestimated. His depiction of Muslim beliefs would be compatible with an assumption that they were polytheists, but nothing Ralph wrote can confirm this one way or another. Ralph's most unique feature is his coining of a word meaning Muslim, *Mahummicola*. He obviously based this on the term *Christicola*, meaning 'worshipper of Christ'. Ralph thus defined Islam on the basis of Muslims' relationship to Mohammed, which he believed to be the equivalent of Christians' relationship to Jesus; he even indicated on one occasion that he may have thought Muslims worshipped Mohammed as a god (in a way which did not rule out their worship of other gods). Ralph's use of the term *mahummicola*, which he used synonymously with the national terms he also used for Muslims (most often *Turcus*, *Persus* and *Aegypticus*), emphasised the distinctness of Islam from other forms of non-Christianity. This was something all other authors tended to de-emphasise, using terms like *paganus*, *barbarus* or *gentilis* in a way that connected Muslims to the historical enemies of Christianity.

Like other authors, Ralph associated Muslims polemically with supernatural evil. Muslims killed by the crusaders went to hell, and he described the Muslim occupiers of the 'Temple of the Lord' as the 'fellowship of hell'. Ralph also called Mohammed 'Pluto's slave', clearly using the classical god as a stand-in for Satan. Ralph's description of Mohammed as the *antichristus pristinus* might simply have been a term of abuse, but it may also have had layered meanings; connoting a position as a preacher against Christ, but also with connections to the great supernatural evil which would arise at the end of days: that Antichrist, *ille futurus*, who was Mohammed's *socius*.

8 Fulcher of Chartres, *Historia Hierosolymitana*

8.1 Introduction

8.1.1 Identity and Dating

Fulcher of Chartres was one of four participants in the First Crusade to write a history which survives.¹⁰⁴⁸ His name is the most securely known among authors of First Crusade accounts. He identified himself as ‘Fulcherus’ or as ‘Fulcherus Carnotensis’ several times in his own text, and was named by Guibert of Nogent and William of Malmesbury, both of whom used his work as a source.¹⁰⁴⁹ He was also referred to as *frater Fulcherius Carnotensis* by an anonymous contemporary, usually called Bartolf of Nangis, who produced an epitome of the part of Fulcher’s *Historia* which was complete by the winter of 1105-6.¹⁰⁵⁰ That he was born in, or at the very least felt a strong attachment to Chartres, is indicated by Fulcher’s own statement that he had wished he was back in Chartres or Orléans when he was caught in an ambush accompanying Baldwin I on his journey to succeed his brother Godfrey in Jerusalem.¹⁰⁵¹ Fulcher’s tendency to quote classical authors is as might be expected from the product of the cathedral school of Chartres, in which Bishop Fulbert (†1028), Chancellor Bernard († c. 1130) and later John of Salisbury (†25 October 1180, made bishop of Chartres 1176) maintained a tradition of classical studies.¹⁰⁵²

Fulcher initially travelled with the northern French contingent of crusaders led by Stephen of Blois, Robert II of Normandy and Robert II of Flanders, before joining Baldwin of Boulogne as his chaplain when he split from the main body of crusaders and launched an expedition into Armenia. Fulcher accompanied Baldwin when he completed his pilgrimage to Jerusalem in the winter of 1099-1100, and later in 1100 when Baldwin returned to succeed his brother Godfrey and become king of Jerusalem. He

¹⁰⁴⁸ Fulcher of Chartres, *A History of the Expedition to Jerusalem, 1095-1127*, Trans. Frances Rita Ryan, Edited and with an introduction by Harold S. Fink, (Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1969), 3. Fink counts only three accounts by participants, apparently ruling out Peter Tudebode’s perhaps because he considered it too close a copy of the *Gesta Francorum* despite Tudebode’s status as an eyewitness.

¹⁰⁴⁹ Fulcher of Chartres, *Historia Hierosolymitana*, ed. Heinrich Hagenmeyer (Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitaetsbuchhandlung, 1913), 1-2. Hereafter ‘Fulcher of Chartres’.

¹⁰⁵⁰ Fulcher of Chartres, 1; Fulcher of Chartres, trans. F. R. Ryan, 5-6. For Guibert of Nogent’s use of Fulcher of Chartres, see above, 5.1.3.

¹⁰⁵¹ Fulcher of Chartres, 360.

¹⁰⁵² Ibid.

seems to have remained a member of Baldwin I's court until the latter's death in 1118, often accompanying the king on expeditions. Three contemporary documents from the Crusader Kingdom name a certain Fulcher as a witness, one of them from 1112 naming him as Prior of the Mount of Olives.¹⁰⁵³ That this was our author is not definite (he was not the only Fulcher from Chartres to participate in the First Crusade, let alone the only Fulcher who appears in the sources), but likely. Fulcher would live out the rest of his life in Jerusalem, though he does not seem to have been as closely associated with Baldwin II as with Baldwin I.

Fulcher mentioned that he was 65 in 1123 and 66 in 1125; he would thus have been born in 1058-9.¹⁰⁵⁴ His appointment as the chaplain of Baldwin of Boulogne indicates he had become a priest by then, though possibly many years earlier (he would have been nearly 40). Unfortunately, little else is known about his life before the crusade. The precise date of Fulcher's death is not known, but the *Historia* ends abruptly with a description of a plague of rats in 1127. As Fink notes, such important events as Baldwin II's expedition to the Wadi Musa in September 1127 or the arrival of Count Fulk of Anjou to become Baldwin's son-in-law and heir in the spring of 1128 remained unrecorded.¹⁰⁵⁵ This strongly suggests that completion of the work was prevented by Fulcher's death, or perhaps an illness from which he never recovered sufficiently to continue the *Historia*. Thus we have a likely if not entirely certain date for both the final additions to the work and Fulcher's death.

Beyond this, the question of the dating of a work which was completed over a number of years is necessarily not a simple one. We do know for certain that Fulcher began writing the *Historia* long before his death: copies of the *Historia* that included events as late as 1106 began to circulate in time for at least one to be transmitted to Europe and used by Guibert of Nogent in 1108-9. Beyond that, the process of writing the *Historia* must be pieced together from clues in the text, an analysis which Hagenmeyer and Fink provide in detail in their respective introductions.¹⁰⁵⁶ In his description of Clermont, Fulcher mentioned his intention to write a history of the march to Jerusalem and its success; indicating that he decided to write the work after the capture of Jerusalem in 1099. Fulcher's use of the

¹⁰⁵³ Fulcher of Chartres, trans. F. R. Ryan, 6.

¹⁰⁵⁴ Fulcher of Chartres, 3.

¹⁰⁵⁵ Fulcher of Chartres, trans. F. R. Ryan, 18.

¹⁰⁵⁶ Fulcher of Chartres, 42-5; Fulcher of Chartres, trans. F. R. Ryan, 18-24.

Gesta Francorum indicates he did not begin writing until after that work had been completed, probably early in 1100. His reference at one point to 'the year in which the Franks first passed through Rome on their way to Jerusalem' suggests that he was writing after news of the Crusade of 1101 reached him and he had been made aware that Franks had passed through Rome on the way to Jerusalem for a second time. More definitively, Fulcher's attitude to Stephen of Blois can be seen to change. He first called the latter's flight from Antioch a disgrace, adding that 'a good beginning does not profit if one does not end well'. However, he then recorded Stephen's death at Ramla on 19 May 1102, praising him as a 'prudent and noble man'.¹⁰⁵⁷ It is likely, then, that Fulcher began before news of Stephen's redemption reached him, and was already in the process of writing when it did. A start date between Fulcher's settlement in Jerusalem late in 1100 and some time in mid-1102 thus seems likely. According to Fink's analysis, he probably wrote continuously until 1106, at which point a version of the work began to circulate.. Fulcher continued recording the history of the new settlements in fits and starts over the following decades. In addition to the now lost 'first version' of Fulcher's text which was used by Guibert of Nogent, manuscripts of Fulcher's work up to chapter xxvi of Book III also survive, covering events down to the capture of Tyre 1124. This group of manuscripts is referred to as the 'first redaction' of the *Historia*. Between 1124-7, Fulcher made revisions to the rest of the text as well as continuing it, making slight changes as well as more significant revisions of his description of Jerusalem and adding chapters on the battle of Harran in 1104; Baldwin of Edessa's release from captivity in 1109 (in which he referred to Baldwin as the future king), and Bohemond's journey to France in 1106.¹⁰⁵⁸

8.1.2 Status as Eyewitness and Relationship to Written Sources

In his introduction to Frances Rita Ryan's translation, Fink discusses in detail the question of which events Fulcher did or did not witness in person. Fulcher participated in the crusade, lived in the East and was personally present for many of the events described, but certainly not all of them. The level of detail with which Fulcher described the council of Clermont has suggested to some historians that Fulcher may have been

¹⁰⁵⁷ Fulcher of Chartres, 228, 443.

¹⁰⁵⁸ On the process of writing the *Historia*, see Fulcher of Chartres, 42-7; Fulcher of Chartres, trans. F. R. Ryan, 18-24.

present. Henri Wallon believed this, but Hagenmeyer was less certain.¹⁰⁵⁹ Even if he had been, however, it is very likely that his report of Pope Urban II's speech – even perhaps his actual recollection of the speech – would have been strongly influenced by hindsight. More straightforward to determine is which parts of the First Crusade itself Fulcher personally witnessed. After travelling with the main body of crusaders through Asia Minor, he joined the future Baldwin I's expedition to Edessa. Baldwin and his followers remained in Armenia until after the capture of Jerusalem, and so apart from brief discussions of their experience, Fulcher had to rely on other sources for the majority of his account of the First Crusade. He relied on written sources for most, but not all, of his information about the parts of the First Crusade that he missed: he does add details about the capture of Jerusalem and the battle of Ascalon which he probably gathered from eyewitnesses; possibly as early as when he first came to Jerusalem in late 1099.¹⁰⁶⁰ For his continuation of his *Historia* down to 1127, Fulcher would have relied on a mixture of his own experience and such information as he could gather from his home in Jerusalem, but the settlement period will not be discussed in great detail here.¹⁰⁶¹

Fulcher's main written sources were the *Gesta Francorum* supplemented by the *Historia Francorum* of Raymond of Aguilers. He is also known to have used letters such as the letter of Bohemond and the other crusade leaders to Urban II after the capture of Antioch on 11 September 1098 (although he removed this from his second redaction, possibly considering it superfluous because nothing came of the letter's appeal to Urban to join the crusaders and assume leadership of the crusade).¹⁰⁶² Fulcher adhered closely to the *Gesta Francorum*'s account of the events of the First Crusade, but although he did add some information gained from Raymond of Aguilers' *Historia Francorum*, and some that is unique to his account, overall he tended to abridge the *Gesta* somewhat – most noticeably for the events between the capture of Antioch and the beginning of the siege of Jerusalem. His version of events remained close to that in the *Gesta*, at least as far as the bare facts of the expedition are concerned. In his edition of

¹⁰⁵⁹ Fulcher of Chartres, 3-4.

¹⁰⁶⁰ Fulcher of Chartres, trans. F. R. Ryan, 26.

¹⁰⁶¹ Hagenmeyer reconstructed Fulcher's biography as thoroughly as he could in his introduction to his edition. This was probably the basis for Fink's arguments about which events Fulcher did and did not personally witness in his introduction to F.R. Ryan's translation. See Fulcher of Chartres, 3-18; Fulcher of Chartres, trans. F. R. Ryan, 7-18.

¹⁰⁶² Fulcher of Chartres, 65-6.

the *Historia Francorum*, France expressed scepticism about most of the correspondences between the accounts of Fulcher and Raymond. He did consider it likely that Fulcher borrowed from Raymond in his account of the Holy Lance, in two other passages concerning the late entry of the Provencals into Jerusalem and the rejoicing after the fall of the city. Beyond these, France did not consider any correspondences conclusive, though it is clear that Fulcher had access to the *Historia Francorum* and made some use of it.¹⁰⁶³

In his attitude to the events, and in particular in his depiction of Muslims, Fulcher shaped his own text. In addition to these written sources, and for the events after they ended, Fulcher would have had ready access to many letters and documents in his position as chaplain to Baldwin I. Based in Jerusalem until his death, he would also have had many opportunities to interview eyewitnesses for those events which he did not personally witness.

8.1.3 Characteristics of the *Historia*

One of the unfortunate characteristics of the *Historia* is that it becomes less and less detailed as it goes on, so that the unique material it contains becomes less useful. Fulcher is also frustratingly reticent about some of the subjects for which he might have been hoped to be an extremely valuable source. He passes very lightly over his time in Edessa. Although he offers a reasonable justification for Baldwin and Bohemond's having remained behind at Edessa and Antioch – that they protected the crusade from attacks from the rear – this silence may indicate some level of embarrassment on behalf of his patron.¹⁰⁶⁴ It may also be the case, however, that he simply considered the activities of the main body of crusaders far more important to record. Fulcher is also reticent on the subject of the internal political struggles of the newly-formed Kingdom of Jerusalem. Conversely, Fulcher displays considerable interest in the geography of the region, indulging in digressions such as a detailed description of the Dead Sea.¹⁰⁶⁵ Fulcher's aims in writing seem, understandably, to have shifted over the decades in which he was writing. The aim given in his preface, and one

¹⁰⁶³ Raymond of Aguilers, ccxlii–ccxliii.

¹⁰⁶⁴ 'Erat enim necesse, ut terra et civitates cum tanto labore iam Turcis ablatae sollerter custodirentur, ne forte terra incaute derelicta, si cuncti Iherusalem tunc abissent, recursu repentino a Turcis usque Persidam iam repulsis resumeretur.', Fulcher of Chartres, 323–4.

¹⁰⁶⁵ Fulcher of Chartres, 339–341. Most of Fulcher's observations on geography and natural history were drawn from the Old Testament or the works of Solinus, however. See Fulcher of Chartres, 63, 69, *passim*.

of the central aims of the genre of *historia* as a whole, was to record great deeds done in order to inspire and guide the reader. Fulcher stated that his aim was to inspire others to follow God – interestingly, he does not explicitly say to follow God on crusade, and may only have meant to inspire others to be closer to God in a variety of ways.¹⁰⁶⁶ However, this general aim, which arguably applies to some extent to all examples of *historia*, was not incompatible with other aims. It is here that Fulcher seems to have changed his mind over the course of writing his *Historia*. At times it seems he is trying to entice settlers, which would explain his descriptions of natural wonders and possibly the relative lack of polemic against Muslims. This aim is reflected in his famous passage declaring that the Westerners had become Easterners.¹⁰⁶⁷ At other times, however, he does emphasise the dangers faced by the settlers, and there is evidence that his *Historia* was used as propaganda in preparation for the Second Crusade.¹⁰⁶⁸ It is possible that he swung between the aims of attracting settlers, attracting crusaders, and emphasising the achievements of notable men by recording the difficulties they faced.

8.2 Muslims in Fulcher's *Historia*

Of all the writers considered here, Fulcher displays the least apparent interest in Muslims. His account contains considerably less hostility and polemic, but this relative absence of hostility is not matched by signs of increased tolerance. Fulcher seems to simply lack interest in Muslims, and as such the details and characterisations he gives about the crusaders' enemies are sparse. A distinct picture of Muslims can be reconstructed from his work, however, albeit less detailed than the other works analysed. Fulcher did distinguish between the Seljuks and the Fatimids, following the example of the *Gesta* in using the terms *Turcus* and *saracenus* as his primary way of doing so. He referred to Muslims as *pagani*, although he provided little detail about their beliefs. He thought they were idolators, which should probably be taken to imply polytheism, but this latter is never made explicit. He knew the name of Mohammed and seems to have been a little clearer on his role within Islam than the *Gesta Francorum*, but either did not know or did not choose to include much detail beyond this. He likewise did not impart many details about the structure of Muslim society. He indicated

¹⁰⁶⁶ Fulcher of Chartres, 115-6.

¹⁰⁶⁷ Fulcher of Chartres, 747-9.

¹⁰⁶⁸ See Flori, *Chroniqueurs et Propagandistes*, 226.

some awareness of the governing structure of the Turks, and seems to have begun to recognise that the contemporary Muslim world was more fractured than the Seljuk/Fatimid divide alone as time went on, though he never sought to explain this to his readers explicitly. He included far less detail about the Fatimids than the Seljuks. Fulcher made far fewer statements attributing negative character traits to Muslims, including only a few scattered depictions of Muslims as cowardly, arrogant or materialistic and not the much more frequent polemical depictions of his contemporaries. Fulcher's attitudes to violence also seem to contribute to his apparent lack of hostility to Muslims, though there may be other reasons for this. He described violence in far less detail than the other accounts described here, and rarely included celebratory statements or recorded rejoicing on the part of the crusaders at the slaughter of Muslims when it occurred. However, he seems to have been personally disturbed by violence, and this – or perhaps his own sense of decorum – rather than sympathy with Muslims may explain his reticence. Fulcher's tendency to avoid graphic depictions of violence extended also to violent acts committed by Muslims. Although often less graphic, they continued to occur more consistently throughout Fulcher's entire work, unlike the tendency in the *Gesta* family for such incidents to appear less frequently after the end of the People's Crusade. As stated above, however, this was not matched by any evidence of higher levels of tolerance or admiration for Muslims: he included little if any praise and glossed over or omitted many peace agreements and alliances between the crusaders and Muslim powers.

8.2.1 Terminology

Fulcher's use of terminology is typical of his contemporaries. He seems to have used the terms *Turci* and *Sarraceni* to distinguish between Turks and subjects of the Fatimid Caliphate, as did the *Gesta Francorum*. Hagenmeyer noted in his introduction that Fulcher always accurately distinguished between Turks and 'Saracens'.¹⁰⁶⁹ This is a slight overstatement: Fulcher was not entirely consistent in this, but the inconsistencies are rare. Turks are referred to almost exclusively until the crusade reached Ma'arrat an-Nu'man and Albara, at which point Saracens become more common (with a more abrupt changeover than the *Gesta*, which mentioned both Turks and Saracens several times while the crusade

¹⁰⁶⁹ Fulcher of Chartres, ed. Hagenmeyer, 20-21.

was in this region near the borders of Seljuk and Fatimid territory).¹⁰⁷⁰ Fulcher does mention Turks, along with Arabs and Ethiopians, occupying the Tower of David at Jerusalem.¹⁰⁷¹ Fulcher may, like Guibert of Nogent, have thought that there were indeed Turks in the tower who had been permitted to remain in the city after its capture by al-Afdal, as discussed in more detail in that chapter.¹⁰⁷² In the absence of any direct statement to this effect, however, it is more likely that in Fulcher's case this was simply a slip in his use of terminology. Similarly, when Fulcher described the ambush of Baldwin I near Beirut as he travelled south to succeed his brother as ruler of Jerusalem, the attackers were at first Turks and then Saracens.¹⁰⁷³ He also mentioned 'Saracen towns... scattered about' on the way to Edessa, a long way from Fatimid-held lands, and 'Saracen footsoldiers' (*pedites Saraceni*) in the army of Kerbogha at Antioch.¹⁰⁷⁴ These are probably inconsistencies rather than uses of *Saracenus* for a group other than subjects of the Fatimid Caliphate. In one final case, Turks and Saracens are known to have been present together. Fulcher referred to Tughtigin of Damascus surrendering Tyre to save the lives of 'his Turks and the Saracens' (*Turcos suos et Saracenos*), on 7 July 1124. Tyre was a Fatimid city which Tughtigin had been defending from the crusaders with Fatimid assent, so the presence of representatives of both groups is certain.¹⁰⁷⁵

In all other cases Fulcher uses the term in the latter way. Aside from these examples, then, Fulcher was quite consistent in switching between *Turci* and *Saraceni* when describing Turks and Fatimids. In particular, Fulcher referred to Saracens in Jerusalem when describing his pilgrimage there in the entourage of Baldwin (at the time count of Edessa) at the end of 1099; then referred to Turks when discussing Baldwin's activities upon his return to Edessa in January of 1100; and reverted to Saracens again when he recorded Baldwin's return to Jerusalem to be crowned Baldwin I in December 1100. In this, he consistently followed the pattern set by the *Gesta Francorum* as he began to continue his *Historia* beyond what it had covered. This was a pattern which he followed throughout the *Historia*.¹⁰⁷⁶ Fulcher

¹⁰⁷⁰ See above, 2.2.1.

¹⁰⁷¹ Fulcher of Chartres, 324-5.

¹⁰⁷² See above, 5.2.1; 5.2.5

¹⁰⁷³ Fulcher of Chartres, 361, 365.

¹⁰⁷⁴ Fulcher of Chartres, (106-7) .

¹⁰⁷⁵ Fulcher of Chartres, 733 (266). See also Fulcher of Chartres, (264) n. 2.

¹⁰⁷⁶ Turks: almost exclusively before 255 as the crusade had not yet reached 'Saracen' lands; along with Arabs and Ethiopians in the Tower of David at Jerusalem, 308; discussing Baldwin at Edessa, mentions Turks, 324-5; Baldwin

may have been prompted to do so by his use of the *Gesta Francorum*, but his status as an eyewitness and an inhabitant of the Holy Land for decades suggests that there was general agreement among crusaders that this terminology was correct.

The other two 'national' terms Fulcher used most frequently were 'Ethiopians' and 'Arabs'. For Fulcher, these seem to have been peoples subject to the Saracens (i.e., the Fatimid Caliphate). They almost exclusively appear alongside Saracens (one exception, a mention of *Turci et Arabes* in Fulcher's first redaction, was changed to refer only to *Turci* in the second redaction).¹⁰⁷⁷ Fulcher suggested that Arabs functioned as cavalry for the Saracens, while Ethiopians were their footsoldiers.¹⁰⁷⁸ Fulcher described Ethiopians as black on several occasions; skin colour was clearly the association that led him and others to believe this was an accurate term for Africans serving in the Fatimid armies.¹⁰⁷⁹ Fulcher, however, seems at some point to have come to think that it was not accurate to refer to all black people as Ethiopian. On one occasion Fulcher described a group of dark-skinned Ethiopians ('blacker than soot', *fulgine nigrioribus*) in his first redaction, but removed the term 'Ethiopian' from the second. He had apparently come to make some distinction between these dark-skinned people and Ethiopians, although what the distinction was is unfortunately obscure, and may have been no more accurate than his previous understanding.¹⁰⁸⁰ Fulcher also used the term *Parthi* (Parthians) for the Turks on a few occasions, though as Morton observed the term only enters Fulcher's account after 1104. Morton suggested that the association between Parthians and Turks was made in Europe and Fulcher only learned of it later

ambushed by Turks near Beirut, 361 (but then at 365 the same ambushers are Saracens); Turks appear in Fulcher's short account of 1101 crusade, 431; Joscelin allies with Turks against Tancred, 480; Turks around Edessa, 540; Maudud of Mosul, killed in Damascus, was renowned among Turks, 578; Baldwin II fights Il-Ghazi, 630; Antioch calls for aid against Turks, 649; Baldwin II goes to confront Aksungur al-Bursuki of Mosul, raiding lower Syria, whose forces are Turks, 765-9. Saracens: Near Edessa, 211 (this seems unlikely, but may simply have been a mistake rather than an inconsistent use of the term); Seems to be a more immediate changeover than the *Gesta*: Fulcher quickly goes through capture of Ma'arrat an-Nu'man and Albara and only mentions Saracens, 266-7; at Jerusalem, 290, 299-302; Saracen corpses still in Jerusalem when Fulcher arrives with Baldwin and Bohemond – switches to referring to Turks when discussing Baldwin's activities, then back to Saracens as they reach Jerusalem, 332-3; Some bandits who live between Ramla and Jerusalem are Saracens, 372-4; more people nearby were Saracens, 379; capture of Arsuf, 400; capture of Caesaria, 401.

¹⁰⁷⁷ Fulcher of Chartres, 300, 308, 311, 314, 417-8; cf 134 n. 13.

¹⁰⁷⁸ Fulcher of Chartres, 314.

¹⁰⁷⁹ Fulcher of Chartres, 300, 308, 312, 763.

¹⁰⁸⁰ Fulcher of Chartres, 379, n. 13.

through some form of contact with Western scholars. This is plausible, but Morton's further argument that Fulcher had come to believe that the Turks were literally the Parthians (as Guibert did) is less certain.¹⁰⁸¹ Fulcher used the term twice in short verse passages where it was probably chosen to fit the meter, and on another occasion his reference to the Turks as 'Parthians and Medes and Chaldaeans' was clearly metaphorical – they could not be the descendants of all three races.¹⁰⁸² Fulcher did refer to the Turks once as *gens illa Parthica*, but this seems to have had a more adjectival meaning. He immediately went on to parenthetically describe their use of the 'Parthian shot' tactic, suggesting that his meaning on this occasion may well have been 'this Parthian-like race (who are like the Parthians in their use of this tactic)'.¹⁰⁸³

Fulcher sometimes, infrequently, used *pagani* as a term for Muslims.¹⁰⁸⁴ He used the term synonymously with the 'national' terms he used. In particular, he referred to the *Turci* as '*scilicet paganis Persicis*'.¹⁰⁸⁵ Similarly, he referred to the inhabitants of Jerusalem as Ethiopians, Arabs and Saracens, and collectively as *pagani*.¹⁰⁸⁶ Aside from these few uses of *pagani*, Fulcher mostly used the ethnic terms discussed above. Occasionally he also used disparaging descriptors such as *gens illa nefaria*, *illi nefandi*, or *nefanda gentis*, but these are rare.¹⁰⁸⁷ He did not adopt the *Gesta Francorum's* use of the term *inimici Dei*. He referred to Muslims once as enemies of the Lord's Cross, but this was the only such example.¹⁰⁸⁸ He also did not use the term *barbarus*. Among many aspects of his work, Fulcher's use of terminology appears less hostile than many of his contemporaries in this respect.

¹⁰⁸¹ Morton, *Encountering Islam on the First Crusade*, 198.

¹⁰⁸² '*Parthi et Medi atque Chaldei*', Fulcher of Chartres, 468. This is from a passage introducing the Battle of Harran in 1104, and is the first time *Parthi* occurs in Fulcher's work. *Parthia* and *Parthi* are mentioned in short verse passages at 631 and 653.

¹⁰⁸³ '*...Sed quia gens illa Parthica in procinctu vel apparatu bellico moraliter nunquam in eodem statu permanentes (nunc enim visum, nunc dorsum obsistentibus opinione celerius vertunt et praeter spem simulate fugiunt et recursu repentino impetunt)*,' Fulcher of Chartres, 649-50.

¹⁰⁸⁴ Fulcher of Chartres, 135, 143, 152, 192-3, 227, 255, 280, 299-300, 659, 673.

¹⁰⁸⁵ Fulcher of Chartres, 192-3. Fulcher also used *pagani* synonymously with *Turci* on pp 227 and 255.

¹⁰⁸⁶ Fulcher of Chartres, 299-300.

¹⁰⁸⁷ Fulcher of Chartres, 346, 361, 630.

¹⁰⁸⁸ '*Vere dignum erat et iustum, ut qui ligno dominicae crucis muniti erat, super inimicos eiusdem crucis victores existerent*'; 'Truly it was right and just that they who were protected by the Lord's Cross should emerge as the victors over the enemies of that Cross.' Fulcher of Chartres, 453 (173).

8.2.2 Muslim Beliefs

The evidence regarding Fulcher of Chartres' understanding of Muslim beliefs is very thin. For whatever reason – lack of interest, disapproval, or the belief that his audience would already know – Fulcher clearly did not intend to include very much detail about this aspect of the enemy faced by the crusaders. It is true that of the authors considered here, only Guibert of Nogent set out systematically to introduce the history and character of Islam to his readers (however distorted by polemic). In all other cases the authors' interpretation of Islam must be pieced together from passing references, but these have sometimes been quite informative. Fulcher does not even provide many details in this way. Nevertheless, there are a few which can be gleaned. Fulcher knew the name of Mohammed – he would have known it from the *Gesta* even if somehow not from his own experience – and does seem to have had some idea of the Prophet's identity. He referred to the governor of Antioch, Yaghi-Siyhan, and his son Shams ad-Daula seeking the assistance of the sultan (*Soltanus, scilicet imperator Persidis*) because, 'they had no hope of other help except from Mohammed their advocate'.¹⁰⁸⁹ As Hagenmeyer noted, the term *advocatus* is used of Christ in 1 John 2:1.¹⁰⁹⁰ This indicates therefore that Fulcher saw Mohammed as a figure whose importance to Muslims was similar to that of Christ for Christians (he probably intended the comparison with a degree of irony, as well). Fulcher mentioned Mohammed again when describing the Temple of the Lord in the midst of a longer description of Jerusalem as a whole. He noted that the 'Saracens' held the Temple 'in great veneration', and it was where they 'preferred to say the prayers of their faith'. Such prayers were wasted, however, as they were 'offered to an idol set up in the name of Mohammed.'¹⁰⁹¹ This reinforces his conception of the centrality of Mohammed to Islam. In this case, the presumption that Mohammed was the central figure of worship (rather than God) is taken so far that it becomes a distortion, although probably a misunderstanding rather than deliberate polemic.

¹⁰⁸⁹ '...quia in nullo alio spem auxiliandi eis habebant, praeter Mahumet advocatum eorum.' Fulcher of Chartres, 220 (93-4).

¹⁰⁹⁰ Ibid, n. 28. 1 John 2:1 reads 'Filioli mei haec scribo vobis ut non peccetis sed et si quis peccaverit advocatum habemus apud patrem Iesum Christum iustum.'

¹⁰⁹¹ 'Hoc Templum dominicum in veneratione magna cuncti Saraceni habuerant, ubi preces suas lege sua libentius quam alibi faciebant, quamvis idolo in nomine Mahumet facto eas vastarent...' Fulcher of Chartres, 290 (118).

What may indeed have been deliberate polemic is Fulcher's assertion that Muslims worshipped idols. He repeated the accusation in his description of Tancred's looting of the 'Temple', saying that the *Saraceni* had 'practiced their rule of idolatry there with superstitious rites'.¹⁰⁹² As discussed in the chapter on Baldric of Bourgueil, the specific location of this idol is reminiscent of the idol which the Emperor Caligula tried to have installed in the Temple as punishment for a Jewish revolt, according to Josephus.¹⁰⁹³ That two authors who did not know each other's work made the same claim does seem to add weight to the possibility that it was a deliberate reference (Ralph of Caen also mentioned an idol in the Temple, but there may be an as-yet unresolved relationship between Ralph and Fulcher).¹⁰⁹⁴ Such a reference may have been intended to suggest that Muslims were worse than Caligula (having actually succeeded in driving out the Temple's 'rightful' occupants and installing their idol), or it may simply have been something Fulcher and Guibert believed was a typical thing that non-Christian occupiers of Jerusalem might attempt. Like Baldric, Fulcher included information elsewhere that was definitely derived from the works of Josephus.¹⁰⁹⁵ In this case there is no direct textual correspondence to Josephus, and there is an obvious distinction between a thwarted attempt to install an idol and one which was supposedly present, so the similarity may just be a coincidence. It is surprising that Fulcher could have lived so long in the East without ever realising that far from worshipping idols, Islam was in fact an iconoclastic religion. If indeed he did, he did not consider it necessary to revise these passages. Deliberate polemical distortion, possibly influenced by Josephus, may well be the reason for this, but it is difficult to say for certain without any indication that Fulcher knew better. If the apparent lack of interest in Muslims demonstrated by the *Historia* accurately reflects Fulcher's general preoccupations and not simply an authorial choice about where to focus attention, it would also be entirely possible that Fulcher

¹⁰⁹² '...cum Saraceni legem suam idolatriae superstitioso ritu exercerent...' Fulcher of Chartres, 303 (122).

¹⁰⁹³ See above, 4.1.6.

¹⁰⁹⁴ Hagenmeyer believed that Ralph and Fulcher may have both used each other's accounts at different times, but he only suggested that Fulcher may have used Ralph for the battle of Harran in early 1104. If there is a possibility that Ralph got his information about this idol from Fulcher, there is no suggestion that it might been the other way around. A thorough investigation of the possible links between Ralph and Fulcher is long overdue. For Hagenmeyer's suggestion, see Fulcher of Chartres, 68. Fink only considered the possibility that Ralph may have used Fulcher: Fulcher of Chartres, trans. F. R. Ryan, 46.

¹⁰⁹⁵ See Fulcher of Chartres, 68-9.

simply had so little interest in Islam that he never learned much detail about Muslim beliefs.

Fulcher occasionally used the term *paganus* to refer to Muslims, as mentioned above. As Guibert of Nogent's use of *paganus* demonstrates, however, this term alone cannot be used to determine anything about what Fulcher thought Muslims believed. He may have thought they were polytheists, as did most other authors writing contemporary crusade histories, or he may like Guibert have known more accurate details about Muslim beliefs but still considered the term *paganus* an appropriate one. He provided no clear indication to his readers as to whether Muslims were polytheist or monotheist. One possible clue is Fulcher's reference to Muslim religious leaders in Tyre using classical pagan terminology. On the capture of the city (7 July 1124), he wrote that 'whereas among the heathen the city had a high priest (*primiflaminem*) or arch-priest (*archiflaminem*) in authority,' it would now have Christian bishops.¹⁰⁹⁶ This suggests that Fulcher was applying a classical pagan model to Muslims, but quite close to this passage he included another one describing a prophetic vision supposedly given to Nur ad-Daula Belek, the captor of Baldwin II and Count Joscelin of Edessa. Belek saw his eyes torn out by Joscelin, and went to his 'priests' (*sacerdotes*) for an explanation.¹⁰⁹⁷ In this case, Fulcher used the medieval term *sacerdos*, the same word he would use for Christian priests.¹⁰⁹⁸ It is clear therefore that he was not using this terminology to consistently convey any particular implication about Muslim beliefs.

8.2.3 Violence

Fulcher of Chartres depicted fewer instances of graphic violence, in less detail, than his contemporaries. There are some examples of violence, committed by both Muslims and Christians, that are similar to those described in other crusade accounts, but even with Fulcher's continuation of his narrative for decades longer than any other author considered here, there are relatively few. Indeed, with the incidents spread out across the longer account, the impression of less violence is only reinforced. This may have been the result of a general aversion to violence on Fulcher's part, having seen and been horrified by several battles in his career. As mentioned above,

¹⁰⁹⁶ '...apud ethnicos civitas habuerat in magisterio primiflaminem vel archiflaminem...' Fulcher of Chartres, 737-8 (267).

¹⁰⁹⁷ Their reply was that this or something equally bad would happen to Belek should he fall into Joscelin's power. Fulcher of Chartres, 680.

¹⁰⁹⁸ As indeed he did of the priests who baptised Pirrus. Fulcher of Chartres, 227.

he plaintively admitted that he had wished he was back in Chartres or Orléans when he was among the followers of Baldwin I ambushed on the road to Jerusalem for Baldwin's coronation.¹⁰⁹⁹ On one occasion, describing another battle he witnessed personally, Fulcher lamented the horrors of war: 'Oh war, hateful to the innocent and horrible to the spectators! War (*bellum*) is not beautiful (*bellum*) although it is called thus by antiphrasis. I saw the battle, I wavered in my mind, I feared to be struck... Human understanding recoils when it sees such misery.'¹¹⁰⁰ Fink considered this uncharacteristic of Fulcher, who was 'usually inclined to rejoice at the slaughter of Muslims' but was horrified here.¹¹⁰¹

This is not a fair characterisation of Fulcher's writing about violence against Muslims: as will be shown below, Fulcher did not tend to rejoice at the slaughter of Muslims. This passage, alongside his confession of his fears on the road from Edessa to Jerusalem, suggests that Fulcher's less graphic depiction of violence (if not a corresponding tendency always to express active disapproval of it) was likely due to his having been deeply affected by the violence he witnessed. This does not necessarily hold true for other eyewitnesses, but perhaps simply as a result of his personality, it does seem possible for Fulcher. This statement against the horrors of war is striking when violence against Muslims was usually depicted as glorious by the other authors, as has been seen. Fulcher may not usually have disagreed that the defeat of Muslims was glorious, and he does not display the level of ambivalence towards violence of Albert of Aachen other than in this one instance.¹¹⁰² Nor, however, does he revel in the killing of Muslims as did many other authors of crusade accounts, and he seems to have had little taste for the details when he did discuss these killings. It is possible, indeed, that this absence of lurid detail had more to do with his sense of decorum or other stylistic considerations. Nevertheless, the statements discussed here do suggest that revulsion and horror at the violence he personally witnessed influenced his depiction of violence in general in his *Historia*.

¹⁰⁹⁹ Fulcher recalled that he had wished for this the day before battle was joined, when Baldwin had received warning that an attack was imminent and tensions ran high. Fulcher of Chartres, 360 (139)

¹¹⁰⁰ '*O bellum insontibus odiosum et intuentibus perhorridum! Bellum, quia non bellum, nam per antiphrasim est dictum. Bellum cernebam, mente nutabam, ictus timebam... Mens refugit humana, ubi talis cernitur miseria.*' Fulcher of Chartres, 416 (159).

¹¹⁰¹ Fulcher of Chartres, trans. F. R. Ryan, 159 n. 2.

¹¹⁰² See above 6.2.5.

8.2.4 Violence against Muslims

Fulcher was neither inclined to celebrate great acts of violence against Muslims, nor to describe them in very much detail. On several occasion he also emphasised Muslims being driven to flee or captured rather than killed, even in instances where he made it clear that some killing did occur. This even applied to some incidents for which Fulcher used *Gesta Francorum*, in which he reduced the level of violence depicted by his source. The following examples all illustrate one or more of these tendencies:

On the capture of Antioch, Fulcher did record that a massacre took place, but with little detail and no rejoicing.¹¹⁰³ Fulcher did not rejoice at the massacres he (very briefly) mentioned occurred at Ma'arrat an-Nu'man and Albara, and made no mention of the violent clash before Tripoli that preceded the latter city's treaty with the crusaders in the *Gesta Francorum*.¹¹⁰⁴ Even at Jerusalem, where Fulcher did describe the massacre in somewhat graphic detail by the standards of his own work, Fulcher was reticent compared to the others:

In the courts of these buildings a fierce attack was pressed upon the Saracens. There was no place where they could escape our swordsmen. Many of the Saracens who had climbed to the top of the Temple of Solomon in their flight were shot to death with arrows and fell headlong from the roof. Nearly ten thousand were beheaded in this Temple. If you had been there your feet would have been stained to the ankles in the blood of the slain. What shall I say? None of them were left alive. Neither women nor children were spared.¹¹⁰⁵

This was Fulcher's full account of the massacre. Although clearly drawn from the *Gesta*, it is terse and abridged even compared to that work,

¹¹⁰³ Fulcher of Chartres, 234.

¹¹⁰⁴ Fulcher of Chartres, 266; see also above, 2.2.3.

¹¹⁰⁵ ... in quorum atriis impetus in eos agebatur nimius: nusquam erat etiam locus, quo Saraceni gladiatores evadere possent. Supra Salomonis templum, quod fugiendo ascenderant, multi eorum ad mortem sagittati sunt et deorsum de tecto praecipitati, in quo etiam templo X milia fere decollati sunt. Quod si inibi essetis, pedes vestri sanguine peremptorum usque ad bases tingerentur. Quid narrabo? Nullus ex eis vitae est reservatus. Sed neque feminis neque parvulis eorum pepercerunt.' Fulcher of Chartres, 300-301 (121-2).

let alone the elaborations on this passage found in the *Gesta* revisions.¹¹⁰⁶ Fulcher did include the graphic detail that in the aftermath of the massacre, squires and footmen ‘split open the bellies of those they had just slain in order to extract from the intestines the bezants which the Saracens had gulped down their loathsome throats while alive’, but his account of the storming of Jerusalem remains the least vivid.¹¹⁰⁷ Here again he included no note of celebration of the slaughter which occurred. Two chapters later, he did add the following celebratory statement:

Oh day so ardently desired! Oh time of times the most memorable! Oh deed before all other deeds! Desired indeed because in the inner longing of the heart it had always been hoped by all believers in the Catholic faith that the place in which the Creator of all creatures, God made man, in His manifold pity for mankind, had by His birth, death and resurrection, conferred the gift of redemption would be restored to its pristine dignity by those believing and trusting in Him. They desired that this place so long contaminated by the superstition of the pagan inhabitants, should be cleansed from their contagion.¹¹⁰⁸

However, it is clear here that he was rejoicing at the recovery of Jerusalem rather than the violence through which this was achieved. The statement is entirely separate from his terse account of the massacre that took place.

Fulcher was similarly terser than the *Gesta* in his account of the slaughter at Ascalon, saying only that ‘Many of the enemy in their flight climbed to the tops of trees. Yet here they were shot with arrows and, mortally wounded, fell miserably to earth. In the sweeping attack the Saracens perished on all sides.’¹¹⁰⁹ He repeated the accusation that Muslims had swallowed gold to keep it from the crusaders (adding that women had also hidden it ‘in a way that was wicked and which is more shameful for me to tell’) when Caesarea was captured, but described their retrieval less

¹¹⁰⁶ See above, 2.2.3, 3.2.5 4.1.8, 5.2.4.

¹¹⁰⁷ ‘... calliditate Saracenorum comperta, ventres eorum iam mortuorum findebant, ut de intestinis eorum bisantios exciperent, quos vivi faucibus diris transglutiverant.’ Fulcher of Chartres, 301-2 (122).

¹¹⁰⁸ Fulcher of Chartres, 305-6 (123)

¹¹⁰⁹ ‘Tunc multi eorum metuentes, ascendebant arborum cacumina; qui tamen inibi sagittati et morti laesi ad terram infeliciter corruiebant. Incursu in eos penetrabili undique Saraceni perimebantur.’ Fulcher of Chartres, 315 (126-7).

graphically on this occasion.¹¹¹⁰ In one of Fulcher's more graphic passages, he described how the feet of the combatants in a sea battle between a Venetian and a Fatimid fleet were tinged with blood, and when the victorious Venetians cast the bodies overboard from the ships they captured, 'you could have seen the sea redden for four miles outward.'¹¹¹¹ On none of these occasions did Fulcher include a celebratory statement or record rejoicing among the crusaders who were present.

Examples of celebration in Fulcher's *Historia* are all connected to the enemy being put to flight rather than slaughtered. At Nicaea, Fulcher referred to the defeat of the Muslim forces that came to the aid of the besieged city as 'a great miracle of God', and added that 'gladdened by such a victory, we all gave thanks to God.' On this occasion, however, he recorded no slaughter: Fulcher rejoiced that the Turks were put to flight and 'during the next and the third days the Turks did not cease to flee.'¹¹¹² On the occasion of the ambush that caused Fulcher to wish he had been back in France, he also rejoiced at the Christian victory, writing: 'And so rejoicing and glorying in so great a victory, we went back to the men of our baggage-train... Oh how admirable are the works of God! Oh how very miraculous and how worthy of remembrance!'¹¹¹³ Although Fulcher did mention Muslim casualties – it was, after all, a battle – he did not depict this victory as a slaughter but as a rout, with the Turks put to flight. Fulcher never went so far as to suggest, as Albert of Aachen did, that violent acts committed by the crusaders may have been more than was warranted.¹¹¹⁴ There is no indication that he actively disapproved of violence, although he did not revel in the gory details in his text.

It should be noted that while Fulcher was inclined not to dwell on the visual details of battle, he does mention unpleasant smells twice. Indeed, the smell of battle and its aftermath seems to have bothered him from what he writes, which supports the possibility that Fulcher was personally disinclined to write about violence in lurid detail because of his horror of what he had witnessed. Fulcher wrote that when he reached Jerusalem in late

¹¹¹⁰ 'quod et nefas erat sic recondendum et multo turpius mihi ad recitandum.' Fulcher of Chartres, 404 (154-5). Guibert of Nogent had fewer qualms about describing where the women hid their bezants, as seen above, 5.2.6.

¹¹¹¹ '...usque ad IV milia passuum salum rubescere circumquaque videretis.' Fulcher of Chartres, 672 (243).

¹¹¹² Fulcher of Chartres, 180-190.

¹¹¹³ Fulcher of Chartres, (140-1), II.iii.2-5.

¹¹¹⁴ See above, 6.2.5.

1099, when Baldwin and Bohemond completed their pilgrimages, the bodies of those slain when the city was taken were still lying where they had fallen: 'Oh what a stench there was around the walls of the city, both within and without, from the rotting bodies of the Saracens ...!'¹¹¹⁵ Similarly, when recording the capture of Caesarea, Fulcher noted that the bodies of the 'Saracen' dead were burned, implying that this was because 'the fetid odour of their bodies bothered us greatly.'¹¹¹⁶

8.2.5 Violence by Muslims

As discussed above, Fulcher does not depict violence in very graphic detail. This is equally true of violent acts committed by Muslims as those committed by the crusaders against them. Nevertheless, he does depict Muslims as relatively violent and inclined towards savagery. In the *Gesta Francorum* and its revisers, there is a greater or lesser tendency towards describing violent acts by Muslims in more vivid detail in the 'past' relative to the main narrative, which then falls away as the authors began to focus on the crusaders and their deeds – establishing Muslim savagery, but without allowing it to interfere with the impression of the effectiveness of the crusaders. Fulcher does not follow this tendency: he depicted a relatively consistent level of cruel acts of violence by Muslims throughout his account of the First Crusade. He did not heighten accounts of extreme violence that preceded the crusade, but did include a small number of instances of violence that depict Muslims as savage not mentioned by the *Gesta* or its revisers. He also remained consistent as he continued his account beyond what is described by his contemporaries, although as the entries in the *Historia* became less detailed towards the end in general, so too do descriptions of violence.

In his prologue, while comparing the crusaders favourably to the Israelites and the Maccabees, Fulcher gave an overview of the suffering faced by the crusaders in their campaign:

Indeed we have seen these Franks in the same regions,
often right with us, or we have heard about them in
places distant from us, suffering dismemberment,

¹¹¹⁵ *O quantus tunc erat fetor circa muros civitatis, intus et extra, de cadaveribus Saracenorum adhuc ibi marcentium...* Fulcher of Chartres, 332-3 (132).

¹¹¹⁶ *Vidi de Saracenis plurimos ibi peremptos, acervo de illis facto, igne concremari, quorum cadaverum nimius fetor nos valde molestabat.* Fulcher of Chartres, 403 (154).

crucifixion, flaying, death by arrows or by being rent apart, or other kinds of martyrdom, all for the love of Christ... Oh how many thousands of martyrs died a blessed death on this expedition!¹¹¹⁷

The emphasis here is on the suffering itself rather than the perpetrators, establishing at the outset that the crusaders had acted out of love of Christ and that those who had died were martyrs. Nevertheless, the cruel forms of death described also reflect on the implied enemy. Depictions of Muslims acting in such cruel and savage ways as this are not very common in Fulcher's *Historia*, but they do continue persistently throughout the work. Although Fulcher did not include an extensive account of the ill-fated People's Crusade in 1096 (preceding the better-organised armies that began arriving in Constantinople later that year), he recorded his impressions upon arriving in Asia Minor and witnessing the aftermath of its defeat: 'Oh how many severed heads and how many bones of the slain we found lying in the fields near the sea around Nicomedia!'¹¹¹⁸ He also attributed a gruesome form of psychological warfare to the Turkish defenders of Nicaea: 'Truly you would have grieved and sobbed in pity when the Turks killed any of our men in any way near the wall, for they lowered iron hooks by means of ropes and snatched up the body to plunder it. None of our men dared or were able to wrest such a corpse from them. After stripping the bodies the Turks would throw them outside [the walls].'¹¹¹⁹ Similarly, Fulcher claimed that the Turks in Antioch killed many Greek, Syrian and Armenian Christians in the city (fearing that they would ally with the crusaders) and threw their heads out over the walls with catapults (*petraria et fundibula*).¹¹²⁰ These were incidents which Fulcher added from his own sources; they were not in the *Gesta Francorum*, which tended to depict violence by Muslims in considerably less detail following the defeat of the People's Crusade.¹¹²¹

¹¹¹⁷ '...quos quidem vidimus in regionibus eorum saepe apud nos aut audivimus longe a nobis positos, pro amore Christi emembrari, crucifigi, excoriari, sagittari, secari et diverso martyrii genere consummari...' Fulcher of Chartres, 117 (58).

¹¹¹⁸ 'quot capita caesa et ossa occisorum ultra Nicomediam prope mare illud in campis iacentium tunc invenimus!' Fulcher of Chartres, 180 (80).

¹¹¹⁹ 'Vere doleretis et pietate suspiraretis, cum aliquem de nostris prope murum quoquomodo trucidassent et submissis uncis ferreis, quos funibus deorsum demittebant, corpus perempti sursum ad se rapiebant, quod nullus nostrum audebat nec poterat ab eis extorquere. Corpore sic exspoliato, cadaver foris iaculabantur.' Fulcher of Chartres, 187 (82).

¹¹²⁰ Fulcher of Chartres, 211.

¹¹²¹ See above, 2.2.3.

Similar examples occur throughout Fulcher's continuation of the work beyond the end of the First Crusade.¹¹²²

Fulcher also depicted Muslims as savage in even less graphically violent passages, sometimes with descriptive imagery and sometimes simply by calling them savage. At Dorylaeum, he referred to the attacking Turks as 'howling' (*ululatus*), and 'furiously' shooting arrows.¹¹²³ *Ululatus* is a term strongly associated with dogs or wolves, an association that Fulcher later made explicit: when Baldwin I's entourage was ambushed en route to his coronation in 1101, Fulcher wrote: 'on all sides they taunted us, yelling at us and howling like dogs or wolves as they brandished their swords...'¹¹²⁴ This, too, was a consistent tendency in Fulcher's accounts of later events as well.¹¹²⁵

Fulcher also twice presented violence by Muslims as punishment for crusader misdeeds. On Kerbogha's arrival at Antioch with his very large army, Fulcher wrote: 'Seeing these things the Franks were again discouraged, and no less than usual, because their punishment was doubled on account of their sins. For when they had entered the city many of them had at once commingled with unlawful women.'¹¹²⁶ much later, on the occasion of the assassination of Maudud ibn Altunash (†2 October 1113), who had made several attempts to reconquer the land taken by the crusaders on behalf of Sultan Mehmed I, Fulcher noted that 'the Lord permitted him to scourge us for a while but afterwards willed that he should die a vile death and by the hand of an insignificant man.'¹¹²⁷

8.2.6 Structure of Muslim Society

Fulcher did not include a great deal of information concerning the structure of Muslim society, real or assumed. Nevertheless, some picture of

¹¹²² 'Fulcher of Chartres, 400 (153), 692 (254), 763 (278).

¹¹²³ '*Turci autem ululatibus concrepantes et pluviam sagittarum vehementer emittentes...*' Fulcher of Chartres, 194 (85). Cf above, 2.2.5.

¹¹²⁴ '*Undique adversum nos vociferantes et tamquam canes vel lupi ululantes et enses suos vibrantes conviciabantur nobis.*' Fulcher of Chartres 362 (140). See also Charlton T. Lewis and Charles Short, 'Ululatus' in *A Latin Dictionary*, (Oxford: Clarendon, 1987 (first published 1879))

¹¹²⁵ Fulcher of Chartres, 515 (191), 697 (256), 691 (253).

¹¹²⁶ '*Quibus visis, non minus solito iterum Franci sunt desolati, quia propter peccata sua poena est eis duplicata. Nam cum civitatem ingressi fuissent, confestim cum feminis exlegibus commiscuerunt se ex eis plures.*' Fulcher of Chartres, 243 (101).

¹¹²⁷ '*Permisit eum Dominus aliquandiu nos flagellare, postea voluit eum morte vili et imbecilli manu perire.*' Fulcher of Chartres, 578 (29).

Muslim society as Fulcher saw it can be pieced together from occasional details he included and assumptions he revealed. As discussed above, Fulcher was usually if not always consistent in distinguishing between Turks and Saracens. Fulcher clearly recognised the political aspect of this division: he referred to the Sultan of the Turks and the *Rex* of the Egyptians. However, he demonstrated only a little further knowledge of their respective political structures, and no knowledge of the religious aspect of the Turk/Fatimid division. Fulcher included particularly little about the structure of the Fatimid Caliphate. His distinction between the 'king of Babylon' and the commander of his forces, *Lavedalius* (a reasonable approximation of al-Afdal) is the only real detail he provided; one which he added to the *Gesta Francorum*'s version of events.¹¹²⁸ He included more detail relating to the politics of Turkish society.

Fulcher was aware of the Sultan as a figure, twice referring to him as *Soltanus*. He glossed this variously as '*scilicet imperatorem Persidis*' or '*rex Persarum*.'¹¹²⁹ Fulcher may have simply absorbed this detail from the *Gesta Francorum*. Other Turkish leaders were referred to as emirs, which Fulcher equated with the title *princeps*. 'Aoxianus' (Yaghi Siyhan) was the 'prince and emir' of Antioch; Kerbogha, 'Maleducat' and 'Amisoliman' were referred to as 'the princes of the Turks... whom they called emirs.'¹¹³⁰ Kerbogha was also referred to as the satrap (*satrapa*) of the sultan, reinforcing the connection of the Turks to Persia.¹¹³¹

As noted above, Fulcher introduced the Turks as *gens Persica* in his account of Urban II's speech at Clermont.¹¹³² In Fulcher's case it is quite clear what he meant by this, unlike other authors who left the exact connection between Turks and Persians somewhat ambiguous. Fulcher wrote that the Turks were a race who came from the geographic region of Persia, and it is probably this rather than a supposed connection to the ancient Persians which led him to refer to Persia so frequently in relation to the Turks. At Nicaea, he described them as *Orientalis* who had 'crossed the Euphrates river from Persia fifty years before and had subjugated the whole

¹¹²⁸ Fulcher of Chartres, 311.

¹¹²⁹ Fulcher of Chartres, 219, 242.

¹¹³⁰ '*Principes Turcorum multi erant, quos admiratos praenominabant. Hi sunt: Corbagath, Maleducat, Amisoliman et multi alii, quos nominare perlongum est.*' Fulcher of Chartres, 249-50. 'Aoxianus, Antiochiae princeps et admiratus' is mentioned on pages 219-20.

¹¹³¹ Fulcher of Chartres, 242.

¹¹³² Fulcher of Chartres, 133.

Roman land as far as the city of Nicomedia.’¹¹³³ This statement also reveals that Fulcher had a relatively accurate impression of the identity and recent history of the Seljuks (although his figure of fifty years was too long assuming this passage was written before 1105, as it probably was). Later in the *Historia* Fulcher justified the decisions of Baldwin and Bohemond to remain in Edessa and Antioch rather than directly helping to recover Jerusalem. His argument was that the land that had been captured must be guarded, lest they be lost in a sudden attack by the Turks who were ‘now driven back as far as Persia.’ This confirms that to Fulcher, the Turks were ‘Persian’ in the sense that they had come from and now ruled the geographic region of Persia, rather than making a rhetorical connection – or presuming an actual one – to the ancient Persians.

8.2.7 Character traits of Muslims

Fulcher’s account includes considerably less characterisation of Muslims than his contemporaries. As discussed above, he occasionally used phrases such as *gens nefaria* to refer to them, and also accused them of possessing a savage nature. Aside from these traits, the characteristic he ascribed to Muslims most often was cowardice. Even in this case, however, Fulcher made only a few references scattered throughout his long account. An impression of Muslim cowardice is given by gathering all of these references together, but would have been considerably weaker for a contemporary reader of Fulcher’s work. Indeed, occurring as rarely as they do, it could be argued that Fulcher’s depictions of Muslim forces fleeing in terror simply reflected the fact that battles in the medieval period tended to sometimes end with one side or the other being routed. Nevertheless, it is worth noting the examples Fulcher recorded in the context of the greater emphasis his contemporaries gave to Muslim cowardice. Fulcher described the flight of the Fatimid forces at the battle of Ascalon (12 August 1099) with an image borrowed from the *Gesta Francorum*: he claimed that the fleeing soldiers tried to find refuge by climbing trees, but were shot with arrows.¹¹³⁴ Fulcher added the observation that ‘Lavedalius, their leader, who had hitherto

¹¹³³ ‘*Hi quidem de Perside iam a L annis, Euphrate fluvio transito, terram Romaniae totam usque Nicomediam urbem sibi subiugarant.*’ Fulcher of Chartres, 180. By ‘*terra Romania*’ here, Fulcher would have meant Rûm.

¹¹³⁴ Fulcher of Chartres, 315; see above, 2.2.3.

despised the Franks, now in the very first encounter turned his back in precipitate flight.’¹¹³⁵ Fulcher also wrote of the rout of Kerbogha’s forces at the battle for Antioch on 28 June 1098. On this occasion, however, Fulcher attributed their flight directly to divine intervention: they were ‘struck by a heaven-sent fear’, and ‘the Lord, perceiving his [Kerbogha’s] pomp from afar, utterly destroyed his power.’ The attribution of this defeat to divine intervention reduces the impression of cowardice to some extent: in the face of God’s opposition, it naturally would not have mattered how brave they were. Indeed, they would have some justification for being terrified. Nevertheless, Fulcher wrote that the Turkish army ‘fled precipitately as if the whole world had fallen down upon them,’ a mocking image which reflected and reinforced the impression of cowardice given elsewhere.¹¹³⁶ Fulcher may have been influenced by the *Gesta Francorum* here: the *Gesta* author mentioned that the crusaders defeated the Turks *deo iuvante*, and they fled in terror.¹¹³⁷ Fulcher made a more direct connection between God’s assistance and the terror of the Turks here, although interestingly he omitted a similar assertion by the *Gesta* that God struck the Fatimids with fear at Ascalon in the passage quoted above.¹¹³⁸ He also included a number of further incidents of routs in which he asserted the cowardice of the Muslim fighters in his accounts of the years following the crusade.¹¹³⁹

Fulcher only rarely depicted Muslims as arrogant. Aside from his observation about al-Afdal quoted above (which was possibly a very brief encapsulation of the *Gesta Francorum*’s speech attributed to the vizier), there is little else.¹¹⁴⁰ In particular, Fulcher did not choose to include any of the *Gesta Francorum*’s depictions of Kerbogha as arrogant – a characterisation shared by every other account. Only on one occasion did Fulcher suggest this of the atabeg: Kerbogha was warned by a certain Amirdalis that the crusader armies had begun to issue forth from Antioch to attack his besieging forces on 28 June 1098. Amirdalis warned Kerbogha:

¹¹³⁵ ‘*In prima quidem acie dux eorum Lavedalius, licet antea Francos vilipendisset, non lente fugiens dorsum vertit...*’ Fulcher of Chartres, 316 (127).

¹¹³⁶ ‘*Sed immisso timore caelitus in eos ac si totus mundus super eos rueret, fugam omnes immoderatam egerunt... cuius pompam Dominus a longe prospiciens omnino cassavit et virtutem.*’ Fulcher of Chartres, 256 (106).

¹¹³⁷ *Gesta Francorum*, 70.

¹¹³⁸ *Gesta Francorum*, 96.

¹¹³⁹ Fulcher of Chartres, 540, 666, 790.

¹¹⁴⁰ *Gesta Francorum*, 96, see also above, 2.2.6, 2.2.7.

‘...I see the banner of the mighty Pope advancing. Tremble today lest you be overcome by those whom you thought you were going to utterly destroy.’¹¹⁴¹

Fulcher also included a small number of scattered observations which depicted Muslims as extremely wealthy or materialistic. As Fink noted, he slightly exaggerated the *Gesta Francorum*’s account of the plunder taken from Kerbogha’s camp at Antioch, the only such example of his treating the work in that way. In the camp, the crusaders found ‘objects of many kinds, namely gold, silver, robes, [other] clothing, utensils, and many other things which the Turks in their panic and disorderly flight through their camps had either left or thrown away. For example, there were horses, mules, camels, asses, magnificent turbans, bows, and arrows with quivers.’¹¹⁴² As discussed above, Fulcher claimed that Muslims had swallowed their gold for safekeeping before the capture of Jerusalem. He later repeated and elaborated this accusation when recording the capture of Caesarea

As discussed in the chapter on Guibert of Nogent, this accusation depicts Muslims as highly materialistic and obsessed with money. Fulcher made this explicit, asserting that the Caesareans did this simply to prevent the Franks getting their property, rather than for the sake of their later survival if they had managed to escape.¹¹⁴³

8.2.8 Praise and Tolerance of Muslims

As alluded to above, although Fulcher’s *Historia* displays comparatively less hostility towards Muslims than most of his contemporaries, this is more a result of a less detailed depiction of the crusade’s enemies generally. Fulcher included only occasional praise of

¹¹⁴¹ ‘...signum video magni procedere Papae. Et quos aestimabas omnino supplantari, hodie timeas ab eis superari.’ Fulcher of Chartres, 254 (105).

¹¹⁴² ‘De rebus quoque eorum multiformibus in eisdem tentoriis reppererunt aurum scilicet, argentum, pallia, indumenta, utensilia et cetera multa, quae valde timidi per campos sparsim fugientes vel reliquerant vel iaciebant, videlicet equos, mulos, camelos, asinos, galeros optimos, arcus et sagittas cum pharetris.’ Fulcher of Chartres, 256 (106). The *Gesta* author’s report was less extensive, but similar enough that it is clear Fulcher was elaborating it: ‘aurum, et argentum, multaue ornamenta; oues quoque et boues, equos et mulos, camelos et asinos, frumentum et uinum, farinam et alia multa quae nobis erant necessaria’. *Gesta Francorum*, 70.

¹¹⁴³ Fulcher of Chartres, 403-4.

Muslims.¹¹⁴⁴ He may on one occasion have praised Muslim military ability, but this is open to interpretation. In F. R. Ryan's translation, he introduced the Turks as 'a valiant race from the East skilled with the bow.' Hagenmeyer's preferred text, however, reads '*Turci Orientales...acer nimis et arcubus sagitarii*'.¹¹⁴⁵ *Nimis acer* would be better translated as 'too severe' or 'too harsh'. The translation 'exceedingly vigorous' is also possible, but the context suggests otherwise. Fulcher was describing the Turkish occupation of Nicaea as part of their 'subjugation' (*subiugare*) of Asia Minor, immediately before reporting the crusaders' discovery of the bones of the members of the People's Crusade whom the Turks had 'annihilated' (*peremerant*): harshness seems a more appropriate quality than vigorousness in this context. Ryan might have derived the translation 'valiant' from those variant manuscripts noted in Hagenmeyer's apparatus which read *animi* or *animis* instead of *nimis*.¹¹⁴⁶ This would have been an unusual practice, but the translation would fit better if she had. *Animus* can be translated as 'courage' or 'spirit', allowing the interpretation of *acer animus* as meaning 'vigorous courage', a reasonable synonym for 'valiant', but the issue of context remains. It is also likely that if Fulcher *had* intended this statement as a compliment, he would have used a less ambiguous term than *acer*.

Fulcher only mentioned Muslims converting to Christianity once, but his opinion on that occasion is clear. Pirrus, who is not mentioned by name, does not convert in Fulcher's account, and Ibn Marwan, the garrison commander of Antioch and the other prominent figure whose conversion is mentioned by most accounts is only mentioned in Fulcher's reproduction of the letter of Bohemond and the other crusade leaders to Urban II (which itself was omitted from Fulcher's second redaction).¹¹⁴⁷ In his famous passage elucidating the virtues of life in the east, Fulcher noted with evident approval that some of the settlers had married Syrians, Armenians, 'or even Saracens who have obtained the grace of baptism.'¹¹⁴⁸

¹¹⁴⁴ On one occasion, for example, he referred to Maudud of Mosul as rich, powerful and astute Fulcher of Chartres, 578.

¹¹⁴⁵ Fulcher of Chartres, 179-180 (80)

¹¹⁴⁶ *animi* ABDHORß; *animis* FIKSµ. Fulcher of Chartres, 180 n. a.

¹¹⁴⁷ Fulcher of Chartres, 231-2, 263.

¹¹⁴⁸ '*ille vero iam duxit uxorem non tantum compatriotam, sed et Syram aut Armenam et interdum Saracenam, baptismi autem gratiam adeptam...*' Fulcher of Chartres, 748 (272).

Fulcher tended to avoid mentioning or to minimise occurrences of peace agreements and alliances with Muslim powers. In his account of the journey of the First Crusaders from Antioch to Jerusalem, Fulcher mentioned none of the agreements that were made with cities such as Caesarea and Tripoli.¹¹⁴⁹ On some of the later occasions when Fulcher did mention such arrangements, he was quick to claim that they were purely pragmatic and did not indicate the growth of any closer diplomatic relationships. During Baldwin I's journey to Jerusalem to be crowned in late 1100, Fulcher wrote that the emir of Beirut sent food to Baldwin when he camped near the city, but that this was done 'more from fear than from love.'¹¹⁵⁰ Likewise, when Tyre, Sidon and Acre also sent tribute, 'They feigned friendship but had none at heart.'¹¹⁵¹ This was, of course, probably true, but it is significant that Fulcher emphasises it. Similarly, when Baldwin I captured Caesarea in 1101, Fulcher wrote that he spared the emir and the qadi of the city, but 'for a ransom rather than for love'.¹¹⁵² This tendency remained consistent throughout his work.¹¹⁵³

8.3 Conclusion

Fulcher of Chartres did not depict Muslims in as much detail as his contemporaries, but nevertheless a distinct impression can be reconstructed from his work. He thought Muslims were idolators, worshipping an idol they had blasphemously placed in what the crusaders believed to be the Temple of Solomon. This probably implied that he thought they were polytheistic, but Fulcher did not specify this. He might have learned the name of Mohammed from the *Gesta Francorum*, but as likely as not he had already encountered it independently by the time he used the *Gesta* as a source. He imparted a clearer idea of who Mohammed was than the *Gesta Francorum*. Identifying Mohammed as their *advocatus* seems on the surface merely to hint at some additional knowledge, but with the understanding that this was a reference to 1 John 2:1 it becomes clear that Fulcher thought Muslims saw Mohammed as a figure with a role equivalent to Christ's role as the founder of their religion and their protector. Fulcher also included a few details

¹¹⁴⁹ Fulcher of Chartres, 266-281.

¹¹⁵⁰ '...*plus causa timoris quam amoris...*' Fulcher of Chartres, 365 (142).

¹¹⁵¹ '...*fingentes amicitiam, sed cor habentes nequam.*' Fulcher of Chartres, 366 (142).

¹¹⁵² 'Admiratum ipsius urbis et episcopum, quem archadium praenominant, rex vivos habuit, quibus plus pro pecunia quam pro amicitia pepercit...' Fulcher of Chartres, 403 (154).

¹¹⁵³ Fulcher of Chartres, 767, 772.

regarding the political structure of Muslim society. He distinguished between the Turks and the Saracens, meaning the Seljuk Turks and the subjects of the Fatimid Caliphate – possibly following the example of the *Gesta Francorum*. The Turks, he knew from this source (and possibly also independently), were ruled by a sultan, the equivalent of a king. Emirs, the equivalent of princes, ruled under him. He followed the common tendency to associate the Turks with Persia, though in his case he was quite clear that by this he simply meant that they had come from and ruled that geographic region. As his account continued, he hinted at the more fractured nature of local Muslim politics than the simple Seljuk-Fatimid divide shown by most of his contemporaries, but little more than this. He included even fewer details about the Fatimids.

The primary point to emphasise with regard to Fulcher's depiction of Muslims is that although his account displays less overt hostility towards them, there is no evidence to suggest this was due to his possessing higher levels of sympathy towards them. Contrary to Fink's assessment, Fulcher did not take pleasure in accounts of violence against Muslims, nor did he record rejoicing on the part of the crusaders after incidents in which Muslims were violently defeated. This may be due to a personal aversion to violence: his account contains fewer instances of graphically-described violence and is less graphic when it does. From what he reveals of his own feelings in places discussed above, it seems likely that this aversion could have sprung from finding his own experiences witnessing battle disturbing. While his depictions of violent acts committed by Muslims are generally less graphically-described, they are also more consistently spread throughout his work than most of the *Gesta* family. This creates a more consistent impression of Muslims as savage and threatening, though a less intense one. Fulcher also included far fewer statements attributing negative characteristics to Muslims: on a handful of occasions they appear cowardly or arrogant, and on another small number of occasions Fulcher emphasised not only their wealth but ascribed to them an obsession with money. There is a great deal less of this in his account than those of his contemporaries. There is also little or no praise of Muslims, not even the Turks' military prowess, which usually made a strong impression on the first generation of historians, aside from his emphasis on their skill with the bow. Likewise, Fulcher mentioned very few peace agreements or alliances with Muslims, omitting peace

agreements and alliances mentioned by the *Gesta Francorum* and Albert of Aachen. Fulcher also omitted prominent examples of Muslims converting to Christianity, but on the one occasion when he did refer to conversion, it is clear that he approved of it and welcomed Muslim converts.

The most likely reason for Fulcher's apparent attitude is that he simply was not very interested in conveying a strong message about Muslims to his readers. Despite a long career in the East over which he had ample time to learn and impart to his readers many details of the political situation among the Crusader States' neighbours, he included very little such information, as stated above. This lack of information about Muslims contrasts sharply with his many detailed digressions concerning geography, in which he seems to have had a deep personal interest. Fulcher clearly did not exclude information about Muslims in order to adhere rigidly to his aim to record the deeds of the crusaders, as set out in his preface. It might be argued that Fulcher deliberately avoided much discussion of Muslims out of a fear of appearing corrupted to readers in the West; however, if this were the case we should probably expect to see more polemic directed against Muslims, as a pre-emptive way of defending his own position. The most likely case is that Fulcher, either through a lack of personal interest or whatever way he envisioned his narrative, did not consider a detailed depiction of Muslims – either in terms of facts or polemic – necessary for the completion of his *Historia*. Nevertheless, as has been shown, he did include enough details to communicate his own particular image of Muslims.

9 Conclusion

This study has sought to examine the depiction of Muslims in contemporary Latin narrative histories of the First Crusade using close textual analyses of the individual texts, rather than treating the entire corpus of texts as a whole. This approach has revealed a great deal of diversity among the authors in their terminology, understanding of Islam, characterisation of Muslims, and the sources of their information, that has previously been underrecognised. This conclusion will now provide an opportunity for a more comparative approach, illustrating these variations more clearly. This finding is significant. Many previous studies, including all of the most significant book-length investigations of the depiction of Islam in the Middle Ages have frequently treated only a small selection of the authors as generally representative, where they often disagreed with one another on particular issues. Some of the findings of previous studies are confirmed by this approach, such as Morton's argument that the term *paganus* was used in a general sense rather than because Muslims were assumed to be classical pantheists.¹¹⁵⁴ Other insights, such as the rarity of unambiguous references to Mohammed as a god of the Muslims, rather than at best a hazily-identified figure, are revealed only by giving serious consideration to the unique attitudes of each author.

9.1 Geographical and Chronological Patterns

One of the primary research questions which this thesis has sought to answer is whether there are clear patterns in how Muslims were depicted by authors in Europe and authors who had actually been to the East; between authors who wrote earlier and authors who wrote later; and between authors who personally witnessed the crusade and those who did not (or witnessed only part of the events they described, as in Fulcher's case).¹¹⁵⁵ In the event, this study has found that the sources cannot be neatly divided into such

¹¹⁵⁴ Morton, *Encountering Islam on the First Crusade*, 81-2.

¹¹⁵⁵ Marcus Bull cautioned against 'reductive' acceptance of the term 'eyewitness accounts', a label which 'underplays the narratological ambition and substantive complexity within the texts.' As this study will not argue there was a distinct pattern of differences between the 'eyewitness' and 'non-eyewitness' sources, the point is moot for the present purposes, but it is a valid and important criticism. Marcus Bull, 'The Western narratives of the First Crusade', in David Thomas and Alex Mallett (eds) *Christian-Muslim Relations: A Bibliographical History* (Leiden, 2011), vol. 3, 15-25, 16.

groups in terms of their depiction of Muslims.¹¹⁵⁶ The high level of diversity among the sources rules this out. In terms of their knowledge of what Islam is, for example, there is no consistent pattern. Fulcher of Chartres, Ralph of Caen and the author of *Gesta Francorum* do not display much accurate knowledge, despite their experience in the East. While the other sources do not tend to display much more knowledge, the main exception is Guibert of Nogent, who never travelled to the East (Raymond of Aguilers also had one important insight none of the other authors displayed, but he did witness the crusade personally—there is no pattern that connects him and Guibert).¹¹⁵⁷ The *Gesta* and Fulcher are perhaps not as hostile to Muslims as Guibert, Baldric of Bourgueil, and Robert the Monk, who wrote in Europe, but the account of Albert of Aachen is a great deal less hostile than these. The account of Ralph of Caen, who did not personally witness the crusade but did travel to the East afterwards, is also quite hostile – although, in his case, this is closely related to his focus on the great deeds of his hero.

There is a slight pattern in that the authors who continued their accounts into later years (Fulcher and Albert) are relatively less hostile towards Muslims, but this probably has little to do with the time when they finished their works. The tenors of their depictions of Muslims were set in their writing on the First Crusade itself, and both are generally believed to have written these near-contemporaneously before going on to continue their accounts over many subsequent years. Furthermore, while Albert shows himself more willing than most to praise the virtue of individual Muslims, discusses more diplomatic arrangements than his contemporaries and seems to have been genuinely troubled by the massacre in Jerusalem; the comparative lack of hostility in Fulcher's account is attributable to the lower level of detail in his depiction of Muslims generally.

There is some tendency for the revisers of the *Gesta Francorum* to appear to be more hostile in their depiction of Muslims than their *fons formalis*. A considerable amount of this difference is due in large part to their heightening of the rhetoric of the *Gesta*: they frequently took passages in which the *Gesta* wrote of the savagery, cowardice or other negative traits

¹¹⁵⁶ The sources do, however, display other patterns that are not directly related to their depiction of Muslims. Throop, for example, found the motif of vengeance was much more common in non-eyewitness sources than eyewitness sources, and became even more common as the Twelfth Century progressed. Throop, *Crusading as an act of Vengeance*, 46-52.

¹¹⁵⁷ See below, 9.4; on Raymond see Appendix I.

of Muslims, or the violence enacted by the crusaders against them, and exaggerated them. In such cases it is not clear that they did this due to an intention to make their accounts more hostile, rather than their self-declared intentions to improve the quality of the *Gesta*'s prose. They may have been seeking only to convey the same messages more emphatically; hence this impression of greater hostility would owe more to literary pressures than to any characteristic the authors had in common with each other (such as their location or their not having joined the crusaders).

A deliberate or subconscious intention to alter their accounts to display more animosity may also have been a factor, however, which could perhaps be due to some factor such as their location. Both Guibert of Nogent and Robert the Monk did make their accounts more hostile to Muslims in other ways as well. The centrality of the conception of the crusade as divine revenge to Robert's account (though as Throop has shown this was also a factor to a lesser extent for all of the writers in Europe) is in itself inherently more hostile than the *Gesta Francorum*. Moreover, in reshaping the narrative of the crusade Robert added considerably to the history of persecution of pilgrims and eastern Christians by Muslims and removed the *Gesta*'s acknowledgment of the military prowess of the Turks, a passage that had seemed to express some sympathy.¹¹⁵⁸ Guibert offered an entirely different conception of Islam than the *Gesta* (or the rest of his contemporaries), one which was ultimately rooted partly in accurate knowledge, but which was delivered in the form of a deeply polemical attack on the founder of the religion. His account also provides a dimmer view of the prospects of Muslim conversion to Christianity which, in keeping with the deep disdain he displayed for the East and its people as a whole, may indicate hostility to Muslims rooted in ethnic as well as religious animosity: where the other authors all saw Muslims as capable of redemption if they should choose to convert, Guibert may have thought their evil tendencies were inherent (though there are caveats to this possible interpretation of Guibert's account, as discussed below).

Baldric is the weak link in this argument: for the most part, where his account appears more hostile to Muslims this manifests only in the kind of heightening of the rhetoric of the *Gesta* that renders it difficult to be certain of his actual attitude. He did add an introductory passage and an

¹¹⁵⁸ Robert's treatment of Pirrus is a little more complicated than this allows for; see below.

account of Urban II's speech of Clermont in which the persecutuion of pilgrims and Eastern Christians by Muslims was mentioned, but not with the level of detail of the accounts of Guibert and Robert.¹¹⁵⁹ He also compared Muslims to Amalekites, a race whom God commanded the Children of Israel to wipe out entirely, which would seem to indicate an especially deep level of animosity. He only made this comparison once, however, so it is ultimately questionable whether his account can really be said to form a pattern with those of Guibert and Robert.

9.2 The Depiction of Islam as an Important Motive for the Revisers of the *Gesta Francorum*

The simple Latin style of the *Gesta Francorum* was given as the main reason for the necessity of more extensive revisions by Guibert of Nogent, Robert the Monk, and Baldric of Bourgueil. In fact, as has been thoroughly demonstrated in the secondary literature, as well as 'improving' its style, Robert, Guibert and Baldric made much more extensive changes to the *Gesta*, adding a great deal of material, making some important omissions and, in particular, refining the *Gesta*'s theological message.¹¹⁶⁰ As was repeatedly shown in Chapters 3-5 and is summarised below, the revisers made many deliberate changes to the depiction of Muslims given by the *Gesta* author. These changes added accurate information as well as additional misinformation, and also added deliberate polemic characterisations of Muslims. Robert the Monk reframed the crusade in terms of an act of vengeance against the Muslims wrought by God through the crusaders, structuring the account and altering its portrayal of Muslims to better fit this interpretation. Robert also added a little detail to the *Gesta*'s interpretation of Islam and the identity of Mohammed. Guibert of Nogent made less structural changes to the *Gesta*, but his revision completely changed its fundamental concept of what Islam was. He also added considerably more moral condemnation of Muslims than is seen in the *Gesta*, emphasising their deceitfulness and licentiousness, and may have taken a considerably dimmer view of the prospects of Muslim conversion to Christianity. The changes Baldric made cannot be summed up as easily as Robert and Guibert, but he clearly took an interest in the Muslim enemies of the crusade and extensively altered their depiction by his source in a number

¹¹⁵⁹ Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Iherosolimitana*, 5-6.

¹¹⁶⁰ See above, 3.1.2; 4.1.3; 5.1.2. See also Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the idea of Crusading*; Throop, *Crusading as an act of Vengeance*.

of ways, as will be seen below. Even Peter Tudebode, whose work so closely resembled the *Gesta Francorum* that it did not warrant a full chapter devoted to it, made changes apparently based on his differing ideas about what Muslims believed and how they behaved, as will be noted where relevant below. It is thus clear that the revision of the depiction of Muslims in the *Gesta Francorum* was an important concern for these authors, though they did not acknowledge it as such when they gave their reasons for writing.

9.3 Terminology

The terminology used by a number of the authors considered here to describe the enemies of the crusade (and the crusaders themselves) has been thoroughly examined by Léan Ní Chléirigh in her doctoral thesis.¹¹⁶¹ While it is not the central focus of this project, some observations can be added to her work on the basis of additional sources used here. Each author used his own distinct set of terms to describe Muslims, adding or removing terms for various reasons (literally in the case of the direct revisers of the *Gesta Francorum*). Indeed Robert the Monk and Guibert of Nogent seem to have given conscious attention to ‘correcting’ the terminology of their source in various ways, as seen in the chapters and discussed further below. Certain terms were used by most authors, but even in these cases, the ways in which they were used could vary. While this thesis can not devote as much attention to the question of terminology as Ní Chléirigh, some important observations can be made.

The terms *Turcus* and *Saracenus* were often used to distinguish the Turks (primarily the Seljuk Turks) from the Arabs of Syria and Palestine and the subjects of the Fatimid Caliphate in Egypt. This was found by Ní Chléirigh, and it is true of some but not all of the sources considered here. As will be discussed further below, the extent to which the authors elaborated on the difference between these two groups varied considerably. The distinction was made by the *Gesta* author, who was usually consistent in referring to *Turci* when the crusaders faced the Turks from Nicaea to Antioch, and *Saraceni* to refer to the Muslims encountered further south. There was some overlap in which both groups were referred to as the crusade began to move on from Antioch, and sometimes the author referred to both as part of large conglomerate forces containing many groups, but in these latter cases his aim was clearly to emphasise the size and diversity of

¹¹⁶¹ See Introduction, 1.1.

these armies, rather than failing to distinguish the two peoples. That they were different was the point of using both terms on these occasions, and the *Gesta* author did not use them synonymously. The use of these terms in this way by Fulcher of Chartres (as well as Peter Tudebode and Raymond of Aguilers who were also participants) suggests that the difference between Seljuks and Fatimids was broadly appreciated and the distinction made using these terms among the crusaders themselves. It is true that Fulcher, Raymond and Peter all used the *Gesta* to some degree and so may have been prompted to use these terms by their use of the *Gesta Francorum*. But Fulcher in particular was an intelligent and erudite scholar who had travelled with the crusaders part of the way and went on to enjoy a long career in the East. His adoption of the terminology of the *Gesta* can safely be thought of as agreement. Albert of Aachen, meanwhile, relied on some combination of the reports of returning crusaders and one or more composed oral accounts of the crusade related to the version of the *Chanson d'Antioche* that would later be written down. That he made the distinction between Seljuks and Fatimids in the same terms is strong evidence for its having been current among the crusaders themselves.

Two of the three Northern French revisers of the *Gesta Francorum* did not reproduce this distinction, however. Ní Chléirigh found that Baldric of Bourgueil did not retain the *Gesta*'s distinction between *Turci* and *Sarraceni*, using the two terms synonymously. This may have been due to not recognising what the anonymous author had done; or it may have been because of Baldric's awareness that *Sarracenus* was a term that had long been used of Muslims in general, not a specific group of them.¹¹⁶² If Baldric was making a conscious change, however, this would suggest that he did not consider the distinction worth making, as he does not replace the *Gesta*'s terminological distinction with any other indication of a separate Turk and Saracen identity. He might still have understood some political division to exist, which would suggest this was a deliberate change. As discussed further below, however, understanding of a division was only implied by some statements he made, not made clear. Similarly, this study has found that Robert the Monk also did not accurately distinguish between *Turci* and *Sarraceni*. This seems to have stemmed in part from his preference to avoid the term *paganus*, which will be discussed further below. In several instances he replaced other terms used by the *Gesta* with *Turci*, obscuring

¹¹⁶² Ní Chléirigh, *The Crusaders and their Enemies*, 107; see also above, 4.2.1.

the distinction made in his source between the *Turci* and the *Sarraceni*. Like the *Gesta*, he alternated between *Turci* and *Sarraceni*, but unlike the Anonymous there does not seem to have been a pattern to Robert's usage. In Robert's case, there is no indication that he might nevertheless have understood there to be a difference between the *Turci* and the *Sarraceni*; indeed his comments on the relationship between the *ammiravisus Babylonii* and the *rex Persarum* suggest that he did not.¹¹⁶³

Guibert of Nogent, on the other hand, clearly had sources of information outside the *Gesta Francorum* and a broader understanding of the political divisions in the Muslim world. He followed the *Gesta*'s lead in using *Turci* and *Sarraceni* to distinguish Turks and Fatimids, though he complained that the Turks were simply the Parthians now known by a new (and therefore in his view inferior) name. Where the *Gesta Francorum*'s distinction between the Turks and Saracens was indicated only by the author's use of terminology and references to their separate power-structures, Guibert made it explicit. He gave a brief, partially accurate history of the conquest of the Middle East by the empire of the *Babylonii* and their recent losses to the newly arrived *Turci*.¹¹⁶⁴ Finally, Ralph of Caen offered another variation on this theme, by using the term *Turci* but not *Sarraceni*. He nevertheless made a detectable distinction between the Turks, to whom he was consistently referring when using the word *Turci*, and the subjects of the Fatimid Caliphate, for whom he used no single term consistently but never used *Turci*.¹¹⁶⁵

The authors may have varied in their understanding of the meaning of the word *pagani* as applied to Muslims. The *Gesta Francorum* described Muslims as polytheists and frequently used the word *pagani* as a collective term to describe them. This has contributed to the suggestion that a Patristic model was used to depict Muslims, applying the writings of the Church Fathers on Roman pagans to this enemy.¹¹⁶⁶ In the *Gesta*'s case there are no direct allusions to support this, and the depiction of Muslims does not appear to draw from any one model exclusively. Guibert of Nogent's use of the term indicates that to at least some twelfth-century authors, the term could be used generically of any non-Christians. Guibert was clear the Muslims were a new form of monotheist, modelling his depiction closely on Christian

¹¹⁶³ See above, 3.2.1; 3.2.8.

¹¹⁶⁴ See above, 5.2.1, 5.2.5.

¹¹⁶⁵ See above, 7.2.2.

¹¹⁶⁶ Housley, 'The Crusades and Islam', 197.

heresies: he wrote that Mohammed taught Muslims ‘to acknowledge only the person of the Father as the single, creating God, and he said that Jesus was entirely human.’¹¹⁶⁷ Nevertheless, he referred to Muslims consistently as *pagani*. Raymond of Aguilers may have used the term in a similar manner to Guibert. He did not discuss Muslim beliefs and history in as much detail, but was aware of Mohammed, Muslim monotheism, and demonstrated the most detailed knowledge of any of his contemporaries of the religious schism between Sunni and Shia Muslims. Despite this understanding – especially of Muslim monotheism – he frequently used the term *pagani*.¹¹⁶⁸

While the *Gesta* author did depict Muslims as polytheists, they bore little closer resemblance to the pagans of classical literature or the polemic of the Church Fathers (due as much to the general lack of detail about their beliefs as to certain details that suggest a distinction such as the author’s awareness of Mohammed). It is not certain that he used the word in the same generic sense as Guibert and Raymond, however, as this way of using the word does not seem to have been universal. Robert the Monk removed almost every use of the word *paganus* from his revision of the *Gesta* – he can be clearly seen replacing it with another term in passages otherwise close to the wording of his source.¹¹⁶⁹ Robert believed that Muslims were polytheistic idolators, but apparently considered *pagani* an inaccurate term to describe them. The *Gesta* author may thus have either used the term *pagani* in the generic sense Guibert did or may have thought of it as a more specific term as Robert did but considered it accurate anyway. It is also possible, of course, that he simply gave the matter less thought than these two revisers.

Other variations appear in the works of other authors. Baldric of Bourgeuil used the term *pagani* and does in fact seem to have altered the *Gesta*’s depiction of Muslims to adhere somewhat more closely to a classical model. He removed the name of Mohammed, and attributed attitudes typical of ancient Roman thought to Muslims, such as a concern with the vicissitudes of *fortuna* and a belief that their society was in decline. He also

¹¹⁶⁷ ‘...eos a Filii et Spiritus sancti prorsus credulitate diduxerit, solius Patris personae quasi deo uni et creatori inniti docuerit, Iesum purum hominem dixerit... ut breviter eius dogma concludam...’ Guibert of Nogent, 94 (32).

¹¹⁶⁸ Raymond’s use of *pagani* and knowledge of Muslim beliefs is discussed in Ní Chléirigh, *The Crusaders and their Enemies*, 177-8, 181. For his understanding of the Sunni-Shia divide see Raymond of Aguilers, 209, 212; for the single *deus* of the *Turci* see 118, 144; and for Mohammed see 218, 341, 368.

¹¹⁶⁹ See above, 3.2.1.

added an accusation of idolatry.¹¹⁷⁰ Albert of Aachen did not use the term *pagani*, perhaps because he had some idea of Muslim monotheism, though he did not always consistently depict Muslim beliefs as monotheist.¹¹⁷¹ Fulcher used *pagani* infrequently and thought that Muslims were idolators, but wrote little else that would have clarified what he understood the term to mean.¹¹⁷² The anonymous continuator of Frutolf of Michelsberg's chronicle used the term *pagani*, but included no detail about their beliefs, so his understanding of the word is entirely unclear.¹¹⁷³

Ralph of Caen, like Robert, avoided the term *pagani* but did believe Muslims were idolators. He did not clearly indicate whether he believed Muslims were polytheistic: he referred to Mohammed as a god on one occasion, but his phrasing was ambiguous in this regard. However, although he did not discuss their history and may not have known much of it, Ralph very clearly thought of Muslims as a distinct kind of non-Christian not previously encountered. This is shown by Ralph's use of a word not found in any other works and thus probably his own coinage: *Mahummicola*. Meaning 'worshippers of Mohammed' and based on the common medieval term *Christicola*, Ralph's term was the only one to be found in the sources considered here that encompassed all Muslims without also potentially referring to other types of non-Christian. This might be why he avoided the term *paganus*.

Sometimes, of course, the association of Muslims with other types of non-Christian was the authors' intention. It is not always clear that this was the case, as with the *Gesta* author's use of *pagani*, though even in this case, such an association may have been understood by the audience. In other cases, the authors juxtaposed Biblical terms for non-Christian such as *gentilis*, *natio* and *inimicus Dei* with terms associating the crusaders with the Israelites. This served to emphasise the inherent opposition of the Muslim enemy, using terminology to suggest that this enmity went deeper than mere rivalry for control of territory.

¹¹⁷⁰ See above, 4.2.1; 4.2.3

¹¹⁷¹ See above, 6.2.1, 6.2.2.

¹¹⁷² See above, 8.2.2

¹¹⁷³ For examples, see *1106 Continuation*, 132, 133, 136, 148, 160. The terminology of the continuator was analysed by Ní Chléirigh, at a time when the author was still believed to be Ekkehard of Aura. *The Crusaders and their Enemies*, 313, 327. See also Appendix II.

Other patterns in the authors' use of terminology are detectable, though of less interest. All authors associated the Turks with the Persians (Guibert, who insisted that they were really Parthians, still referred to their leader as the *rex Persarum*). Morton makes a compelling case that this was a habit of thinking adopted from contact with the Byzantines, who had long made the same association.¹¹⁷⁴ It was not an unlikely one for the crusade authors: the Persians were a familiar race, mentioned often in the Bible and in classical literature, and the Seljuk Turks had first come to power in, and still ruled, the geographic region of Persia. Morton and Louchitskaja have both argued that authors of crusade accounts used the term to refer specifically to Turks in or from the actual region of Persia with some consistency.¹¹⁷⁵ Indeed, Fulcher of Chartres was relatively clear that he only believed the Turks to have come from the geographic region of Persia, though this was not stated so clearly by the other authors.¹¹⁷⁶ Even so, it is still very possible that the authors – Fulcher included – also intended an allegorical meaning, or were drawn to emphasise this geographic connection for its Biblical implications.

In addition to this Persian connection, Morton argued that there was consensus among later writers in Western Europe that the Turks were the Parthians.¹¹⁷⁷ This is certainly true of Guibert of Nogent, who was convinced of this on the basis of his reading of Jordanes and Solinus. It is much less clear that Robert and Fulcher, who used the term more sparingly, intended it literally.¹¹⁷⁸ Morton also believed that Robert may have mentioned Medes because of their connection to the Parthians in Jordanes's history, but this misses the stronger Biblical connection of the Medes to the Persians.¹¹⁷⁹ Persians and Medes are often mentioned together in the Bible, and indeed as seen in Chapter 3 Medes always appear close to if not immediately beside Persians in Robert's account.¹¹⁸⁰

¹¹⁷⁴ Morton, *Encountering Islam on the First Crusade*, 123.

¹¹⁷⁵ Luchitskaya, 'Barbarae Nationes,' 104; Morton, *Encountering Islam on the First Crusade*, 123.

¹¹⁷⁶ See above, 8.2.5.

¹¹⁷⁷ Morton, *Encountering Islam on the First Crusade*, 196-8.

¹¹⁷⁸ See above, 3.2.1; 8.2.1, 8.2.6.

¹¹⁷⁹ Morton, *Encountering Islam*, 197.

¹¹⁸⁰ Persians and Medes appear together in Judith 16:12, Esther 1:3, 1:14, 1:18-19, 10:2; Daniel 5:28, 6:8, 6:15, 8:20; 1 Maccabees 1:1. See also I Maccabees 6:56 and 14:2. Acts 2:9 does mention *Parthi et Medi*, but as can be seen Persians and Medes are a far more common combination. See also above, 3.2.1; 3.2.8.

Nearly all of the authors also used the term *Babyloni*, sometimes synonymously with *Aegypti*, to refer to the Fatimids. This was usually synonymous with *Sarracenus*: though sometimes the term only appeared in the phrase *rex Babylonii*, the 'king of Babylon' always ruled over *Sarraceni*. This usage occurs even in entirely independent sources, again suggesting that it was current among the crusaders themselves. Their reasons for associating Fatimid Egypt with Babylon are less clear (except in the case of Guibert of Nogent, who thought that Memphis had come to be known as Babylon in modern times – his usual excuse to reconcile what he knew of geography with the *Gesta*'s account). An allegorical association with the Babylonians of the Bible is quite possible, though less geographically apt than the association of the Turks and the Persians. 'Babylon' as the metaphorical and theological opposite of Jerusalem has a powerful resonance in the minds of twelfth-century scholars.¹¹⁸¹ But the use of *Babylonia* and *Babylonii* is too consistent throughout and between the various accounts to be solely a metaphorical usage: the authors were clearly using it as a literal term. One is thus left searching for a rationale that might explain why so many authors apparently thought the term was accurate and not simply an apt comparison. The allegorical association may have drawn them to the term, but why (aside from Guibert who did offer an explanation) did they think it was accurate? The use of the term by unrelated authors seems too much of a coincidence for the reason to be purely allegorical. Furthermore the use of the term by Albert, who was entirely independent from the *Gesta Francorum* and whose sources were the returning crusaders (and perhaps the early poetic works composed by participants) suggests that the term was used by the crusaders themselves. Tolan and Louchitskaja both note that there was a fortress near Cairo that was also called Babylon.¹¹⁸² This does not seem to be the strongest possible connection, but with the weight of allegorical meaning that could be brought to bear by referring to Fatimids as Babylonians, this may have been enough for the crusaders.

¹¹⁸¹ Jerusalem and Babylon are the 'two cities' of Otto of Freising (†1158)'s *Chronica de Duabus Civitatibus*, for example, itself influenced by St Augustine's *De Civitate Dei contra Paganos*. See Adolph Hofmeister (ed.) *Ottonis episcopi Frisingensis Chronica: Sive, historia de duabus civitatibus* MGH Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum Scholarum separatim editi, (Hannover: Bibliopolii Hahniani, 1912); St Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, ed. and trans. P. G. Walsh (Warminster: Aris and Phillips, 2005).

¹¹⁸² Tolan, 'Muslims as Idolaters in Chronicles of the First Crusade', 101 n. 25; Louchitskaya, 'The Muslim Political World as Mirrored in the First Crusade Chronicles', 1418.8.

9.4 Muslim beliefs

As alluded to above, the authors of the various crusade accounts all also had interpretations of what Muslims believed that varied to a greater or lesser extent. The *Gesta Francorum* apparently firmly believed Muslims were polytheists, as did many of the other authors.¹¹⁸³ Tudebode differed in his interpretation of the identity of Mohammed, as will be discussed further below, but agreed with the *Gesta* in this regard.¹¹⁸⁴ As discussed above, Robert the Monk seems to have avoided use of the term *pagani* to describe Muslims, but remained convinced they were polytheists. Baldric too wrote of Muslims as polytheists, on one occasion suggesting direct continuity between the beliefs of the *Turci* and *Sarraceni* and the pre-Christian beliefs of the people of the region. He may not have been consistent in his account of what form that polytheism took, suggesting on one occasion that Muslims worshipped one god and thought of the god of the Christians as an equally real rival with whom they had no relationship; and on another that they worshipped multiple gods. He may have been applying a classical model, assuming Muslims worshipped multiple gods but had one in particular as their special patron (as Athena for the Athenians, for example); or he may have applied an Old Testament model in the first instance and simply not applied it consistently to the second.¹¹⁸⁵

Neither Fulcher nor Ralph made any explicit statements indicating a belief that Muslims were polytheist or monotheist. Fulcher's accusation of Muslim idolatry, however, should probably be taken as indicating a belief that Muslims were polytheists.¹¹⁸⁶ Ralph makes the same accusation, though in his case the greater knowledge of Mohammed he displayed could also be taken as evidence against his having believed Muslims were polytheists.¹¹⁸⁷ In both cases, whatever their own thoughts, the authors simply did not make explicit poly- or monotheism part of their depiction of Muslims. Albert, on the other hand, explicitly referred to one Muslim god on one occasion and multiple gods on another; his depiction was not consistent and his personal thoughts on the matter are unclear.¹¹⁸⁸

¹¹⁸³ See above, 3.2.2.

¹¹⁸⁴ See above, 3.2.2; 2.4..

¹¹⁸⁵ See above, 4.2.2.

¹¹⁸⁶ See above, 8.2.2.

¹¹⁸⁷ See above, 7.2.1.

¹¹⁸⁸ See above, 6.2.2.

Of the sources considered in detail here, Guibert was the only one to consistently and explicitly refer to Muslims as monotheists, applying a model based on heresy to his interpretation of Islam. He was unique among contemporary First Crusade historians in applying this model in detail, though it is also found in both earlier and later sources (though there does not seem to be a direct relationship). Raymond of Aguilers also referred to a single *deus* of the Muslims.¹¹⁸⁹ Though his depiction was not as detailed as Guibert's, he did include some information about Sunni/Shia religious divisions that was unique among First Crusade historians, discussed further below.

The authors were also generally divided in their understanding of the identity of Mohammed. It has been assumed that contemporaries believed Mohammed was one of the gods worshipped by Muslims.¹¹⁹⁰ The *Gesta* author knew his name but mentioned little else. It has been assumed that the author believed Mohammed to be one of the gods of the Muslims, but the author's phrasing does not make this clear. Comparison with Tudebode's revision throws this into starker relief: where the *Gesta* referred to *Machomet et omnia deorum nomina/numina*; Tudebode referred to *Malphumet et nostris aliis diis*. It is possible that Tudebode's phrasing is a clarification rather than an emendation of the *Gesta* writer's thoughts, but it is by no means clear that the latter thought of Mohammed as a Muslim god – though it is notable in its own right that Tudebode did. None of the other authors can be shown to have definitely thought of Mohammed as a god. Robert the Monk did refer to Muslims creating shrines dedicated to idols of Mohammed once, but he more frequently referred to him as the *praeceptor* of the Muslims. This suggests at least vague awareness of Mohammed's position as the Prophet and founder of Islam, and indicates that Robert had access to some (albeit apparently very little) extra source of knowledge about Muslims outside the *Gesta*. The slight details Fulcher provided about Mohammed are similar to Robert's use of *praeceptor*. He knew the name of Mohammed (perhaps from the *Gesta Francorum* but likely independently) and imparted a clearer idea of who he was by identifying Mohammed as

¹¹⁸⁹ Raymond of Aguilers, 118.

¹¹⁹⁰ This view has been most recently espoused by Morton, *Encountering Islam on the First Crusade*, 210, 212. Munro may have been among the first to suggest it, 'The Western Attitude toward Islam during the Period of the Crusades', 331-2. Munro noted that Humbert of Romans referred to people incorrectly thinking Muslims worshipped Mohammed as a god as late as 1274: the idea did circulate, but it is by no means clear that any of the authors of accounts of the First Crusade except Tudebode and possibly Ralph of Caen thought this.

their *advocatus*. This seems on the surface merely to hint at some additional knowledge, but with the understanding that this was a reference to 1 John 2:1 it becomes clear that Fulcher thought Muslims saw Mohammed as a figure with a role equivalent to Christ's as the founder of their religion and their protector

Guibert gave the most detailed depiction of Mohammed of any of the sources considered here. He wrote that Mohammed was the man who founded Islam, a religion which saw Christ as human and rejected the Trinity. In Guibert's account, an embittered heretical monk, on being denied the patriarchate of Alexandria, sought vengeance and was guided to Mohammed by the devil. Using Mohammed as his pawn, the monk secured him a wealthy wife and Mohammed began to have influence as a prophet, using fake miracles to impress his followers. His doctrine was lax, allowing all manner of sinful things that were forbidden to Christians (though Guibert's focus was on sexual permissiveness). Eventually, Mohammed suffered an epileptic fit and was eaten by some pigs that were nearby when he lost consciousness. This account of the foundation of Islam was distorted and polemical, clearly owing a lot to stereotypical depictions of heresiarchs. Nevertheless, some real Muslim tradition was also detectable, and Guibert had the clearest idea of the identity of Mohammed as the founder and prophet of Islam of any of the authors considered here. Guibert attributed his knowledge to some unspecified type of publicly performed oral source, lamenting his inability to find a book on the subject. This nature of this source is elusive, but some oral source must have been circulating.¹¹⁹¹

Raymond of Aguilers was less explicit than Guibert, but hinted at a similar understanding of the role of Mohammed. Indeed, in Ní Chléirigh's analysis, he attributed a parallel relationship of Muslims to the Prophet as Christians had with God: during the siege of Jerusalem, Christians laboured in the siege for God while the defenders worked *pro legibus Mahumeth*; and at Djibleh, a group of *Sarraceni* chose to convert and denounced (*anathematizare*) *Mahumeth*.¹¹⁹² His apparently unique knowledge of the Sunni-Shia divide suggests his understanding of Islam was quite deep, but he did not include very much detail in his account.

¹¹⁹¹ See above, 5.2.2.

¹¹⁹² Raymond of Aguilers, 218, 341; Ní Chléirigh, 181.

Ralph's conception of Mohammed is less clear. In one passage of *oratio recta*, he had Kerbogha refer to Mohammed as a god, but he may well not have intended this to be taken literally. In another *oratio recta* passage Tancred wished for the opportunity to fight Mohammed, with Ralph in this instance apparently taking his existence seriously. Both passages are heightened so it is difficult to be certain which Ralph believed to be the case, though it is possible that he intended both to be taken literally: he may have thought Muslims believed Mohammed was a god, but that in reality he was just a man.¹¹⁹³ Certainly, Ralph's construction of the word *Mahummicola* indicated his awareness that Mohammed was a central figure to Muslims, essentially equating his position to that of Christ for Christians, but it is less clear if he understood his role to be that of a god or a prophet. Ralph may, like Tudebode, have thought that Muslims saw Mohammed as a god, but it is by no means certain.

Baldric, however, removed the name Mohammed from his revision of the *Gesta*. The other *Gesta* revisers all had additional knowledge of the identity of Mohammed to contribute, having clearly confirmed his importance by reference to other sources of information (for better or worse, as in Tudebode's case). It may then be the case that Baldric did not find any information confirming the identity of Mohammed (however vaguely) and so removed the references to him to avoid embarrassment.¹¹⁹⁴ Albert also did not mention the prophet Mohammed himself, but he was clearly aware that it was a common Muslim name. Writing in Aachen on the basis of oral sources, it is possible that he was unaware of the deeper significance of the name. Given that all the other writers but Baldric seemed to know something of the Prophet, however, it is likely but unprovable that Albert did understand more than he chose to mention.¹¹⁹⁵

Accusations of Muslim idolatry were common but not universal. Norman Daniel saw a split between the 'academic or intellectual' convention in the middle ages, which interpreted Islam in ways similar to Guibert of Nogent, and the convention in which Muslims were seen as polytheists and idolators which was believed only by the uneducated.¹¹⁹⁶ This simply was not true of the writers of First Crusade histories. As noted above, most did

¹¹⁹³ This was the explanation Isidore of Seville offered for the origins of the gods worshipped in the classical era. *Etymologiae*, VII.xi.1.

¹¹⁹⁴ See above, 4.2.2.

¹¹⁹⁵ See above, 6.2.2.

¹¹⁹⁶ Daniel, *Islam and the West*, 341-2.

indeed believe Muslims were polytheists. Furthermore, several of the writers did claim that Muslims were idolators. Fulcher of Chartres, Ralph of Caen and Baldric of Dol all specifically claimed that an idol was set up in what they believed to be the Temple of the Lord (actually the Dome of the Rock, built on the site formerly occupied by the temple). None could fairly be described as uneducated, least of all Baldric. It has been suggested that Ralph had access to Fulcher of Chartres' account, which would explain their agreement on the question if true.¹¹⁹⁷ They do not mention the idol at the same point in their narratives, though they are close (a description of Jerusalem before its capture in Fulcher, Tancred's looting of the Dome of the Rock in Ralph). Ralph's treatment of the incident is considerably more elaborate, but might possibly have been prompted by Fulcher if there was a link. Baldric, however, is not likely to have had access to either source, and his mention of an idol in the Temple comes at the beginning of his narrative. It is possible that the resemblance is due to their having heard oral reports that were circulating (in Ralph's case possibly in addition to reading Fulcher's account, if indeed he did). It is also possible that these references to an idol in the Temple were influenced by Josephus's *Antiquitates Judaicae*. In this work, Josephus mentioned Caligula's failed attempt to install a statue of himself in the Temple. Both Baldric and Fulcher can be seen to have read the works of Josephus from other references which they made (Bachrach and Bachrach also suspected that Ralph may have read

¹¹⁹⁷ There is no strong verbal resemblance between the three passages; Ralph and Fulcher do not even use the same term for 'idol':

Baldric of Bourgueil, 7: '*Sed quid templum Salomonis immo Domini pretermisimus, in quo **simulacra** sua barbatae nationes contra ius et fas modo collocata uenerantur?*'

Fulcher of Chartres, 290: '*Hoc Templum dominicum in ueneratione magna cuncti Saraceni habuerant, uni preces suas lege sua libentius quam alibi faciebant, quamvis **idolo** in nomine Mahumet facto eas vastarent, in quod etiam nullum ingredi Christianorum permittebant.*'

Ralph of Caen, 695-6: '*Stabat in excelso **simulacrum** fusile throno, / Scilicet argentum grave, cui vix sena ferendo / Dexterâ sufficiat fortis, vix dena levando. / Hoc ubi Tancredus prospectat: "Proh pudor! Inquit, / Quid sibi vult praesens, quae stat sublimis, imago? / Quid sibi vult haec effigies? Quid gemma? Quid aurum? / Quid sibi vult ostrum?" Nam gemmis totus et ostro / Mahumet redimitus erat, radiabat et auro. / Forsitan hoc Martis vel Apollinis est simulacrum: / Numquid enim Christus? Non hic insignia Christi / Non crux, non sertum, non clavi, non latus haustum. / Ergo neque hic Christus: quin pristinus Antichristus, / Mahumet pravus, Mahumet perniciosus. / O si hujus socius nunc afforet, ille futurus! / Jam meus hic ambos pes supprimat Antichristos. / Proh pudor! Arce Dei potitur conviva baratri; / Vernaque Plutonis Deus est operi Salomonis! / Cerruat ergo citus, jam dudum corruiat iste! / Statne superbus adhuc quasi nos quoque sorpserit ipse?" / Vix jussum fuerat, videas jam stare peractum, / Milite nil jusso complente libentius isto. / Abripitur, trahitur, dirumpitur, obtruncatur. / Materia carum, sed forma vile metallum: / Ergo diffictus de vili fit preciosus.*'

Josephus, suggesting further investigation could be carried out).¹¹⁹⁸ This may be nothing but coincidence, but it is possible that Josephus was an influence. If, indeed, they did use Josephus, it is unlikely that the intended message was that Muslims were like Caligula: they probably would have been more explicit if this were the case. It is more likely that they used Josephus as a model for the likely behaviour of conquerors of Jerusalem.

Robert the Monk probably intended to suggest idolatry by Muslims in his account, having al-Afdal mention 'ornate shrines and *imagines*' of Mohammed. While *imago* can carry value-neutral meanings such as 'image' it was the same term Ralph used for his unambiguous reference to an idol.¹¹⁹⁹ Either way, the context is highly indicative of idolatry. Likewise, the anonymous continuator of Frutolf of Michelsberg mentioned Muslims believing they had been assured of victory by their idols at one point (*idolorum responsis de victoria certificati*).¹²⁰⁰ Peter Tudebode's possible reference to idolatry is less clear. He referred to *Machomet in quadam hasta deferentes uno panno coopertum*, carried by the defenders of Jerusalem as they followed and mocked the crusaders' barefoot procession around the city bearing crucifixes. This phrasing is ambiguous and may simply refer to an image of Mohammed that was not an object of worship, as inaccurate as that would also have been – though Hill and Hill's interpretation of the phrase as meaning 'insignia of Mohammed' is a stretch.¹²⁰¹ The other sources considered in detail here did not suggest Muslims worshipped idols, nor did Raymond of Aguilers. Albert even referred to evidence of Muslim iconoclasm, though he did not explicitly identify it as such.

Other elements of supposed Muslim beliefs were less common. Albert and the *Gesta Francorum* independently referred to Muslim books, but it is not at all clear that they knew of and were referring to the Koran rather than simply making an accurate assumption. In Guibert's highly distorted and polemical account of the foundation of Islam, he referred to a falsified miracle in which Mohammed used a trained cow with a book tied to its horns to make it appear as if the new laws he brought had appeared through divine intervention. In whatever its original form, it is likely that the

¹¹⁹⁸ Ralph of Caen, trans. Bachrach and Bachrach, 5.

¹¹⁹⁹ 'Images' was the translation favoured by Sweetenham, *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade*, 210. Ralph mentioned the idol at Ralph of Caen, 695.

¹²⁰⁰ *Frutolfi et Ekkehardi Chronica necnon Anonymi Chronica Imperatorum*, ed. Franz-Josef Schmale and Irene Schmale-Ott, (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1972), 176.

¹²⁰¹ See above, 2.4.

writer or composer of the account which Guibert heard was referring to the Koran here, but Guibert himself may not have understood the context of the story in this much detail. Similarly, Ralph had clearly heard the Arabic phrase *Allahu ackbar* (*allachibar* in his transcription), but gave no indication of understanding it. The *Gesta* revisers all reproduced its account of the robbery of some Muslim graves, which, in the anonymous author's interpretation, had contained grave goods. Several explanations based in reality have been suggested for this, so it may not have been intended to carry polemical force by association with non-Christian practice. Nevertheless the choice to mention the grave goods at all was clearly at least due to their exotic interest, emphasising the otherness of Muslims if not any particular message about their beliefs. On balance it is likely that either exaggeration or misunderstanding of what was found on the anonymous author's part cemented this impression. If indeed it was deliberate exaggeration, a polemical message probably was intended.

Morton believed the crusaders distinguished between the *Turci* and *Saraceni* on religious as well as ethnic grounds.¹²⁰² There is little evidence for this in the sources considered here, however. Only Raymond of Aguilers can definitively be shown to have recognised it. Discussing diplomacy between the crusaders and the Fatimids, Raymond claimed that the latter were also entertaining offers of alliance from the Turks. The Turks supposedly promised to convert to the Fatimids' form of Islam in return for an alliance against the crusaders. In explaining this, Raymond showed his understanding that the Fatimids (Shiite Muslims) worshipped the Prophet's cousin Ali (an exaggeration, but the only acknowledgement of a religious distinction between Shia Fatimids and Sunni Turks among the first generation of crusade histories), and that the Sunni Abbasid caliphs of Baghdad claimed descent from the family of Mohammed himself.¹²⁰³ Such indications of religious differences between the Turks and the 'Saracens' are conspicuous by their absence from the accounts of the other authors.

9.5 Violence by Muslims

The authors were unanimous in their depictions of Muslims as savage and violent, though how vivid and graphic their accounts of violence committed by Muslims varied. In the *Gesta Francorum* and the accounts of

¹²⁰² Morton, *Encountering Islam on the First Crusade*, 141.

¹²⁰³ Raymond of Aguilers, 209, 212.

its revisors, violence by Muslims was situated in the past relative to the main narrative. Muslim violence was described more vividly and in more detail during the People's Crusade in the *Gesta*. With the arrival of the main crusading armies, this decreased, allowing the crusaders to appear far more effective. This tendency was reinforced by the Northern French *Gesta* revisors, who used the opportunity provided by the additional introductory material and the accounts of the Council of Clermont which they added to explain the suffering of pilgrims and Eastern Christians at the hands of their Muslim oppressors – but tended not to add to the *Gesta*'s accounts of violence by Muslims later in the narrative. In his prologue, Baldric asserted his intention to depict the abilities of the Muslims fairly lest it appear that the crusaders had fought an unwarlike enemy and their great achievement would therefore be diminished. On balance, however, Baldric does not seem to have managed this. The effects of the crusaders' attacks on Muslims are depicted in much more vivid and graphic detail than vice versa. Despite Baldric's protestations, Muslims do not appear as effective as crusaders – though it is possible that his claim to depict their abilities fairly was never sincere, and he intended only to assert that the crusaders had fought a warlike enemy and still soundly defeated them.

Albert and Fulcher did not follow this tendency, though this may have been due to the narrative demands of their longer accounts, which would have lost all tension in later years if they had not depicted Muslims as an effective threat throughout. Albert was considerably more inclined than Fulcher to depict Muslims as savage through vivid descriptions of violent acts. For Albert's part, this probably owes something to his use of oral sources which would have been more epic in tone; but Fulcher included fewer and less detailed descriptions of violence than any of his contemporaries. This may stem from an aversion to violence caused by his own experiences in the East; he himself noted at least one occasion on which he had been caught up in a battle and feared for his life.¹²⁰⁴ Ralph of Caen, by contrast, usually depicted Muslims as cowardly and ineffective in battle: they were rarely the perpetrators of extreme violence, and even more rarely a threat to the crusaders. For the other sources, depicting Muslims as threatening served to emphasise the achievement of the crusaders. In his focus on the deeds of his hero, Tancred, Ralph apparently chose not to use this narrative tactic.

¹²⁰⁴ Fulcher of Chartres, 360.

Depictions of violence committed by Muslims helped justify the crusade itself; by reinforcing the idea that Muslims were threatening and dangerous, the necessity for an armed pilgrimage was implicitly asserted. This was reflected in the way many of the sources structured their accounts. The *Gesta* revisors, as noted, but also Albert of Aachen, began their narratives with accounts of the violent oppression of pilgrims and Eastern Christians by Muslims. This framed everything that followed in this context, situating the crusade as a defensive action. Fulcher did this to a lesser extent, though Ralph did not. Robert the Monk took this furthest, introducing a consistent and elaborate program to depict the crusade as an act of divine vengeance carried out by God through the crusaders. This was asserted outright, but also suggested by the structure of Robert's *Historia* beginning with an account of Clermont centred on an exposition of the crimes of the Muslims attributed to the pope.

9.6 Violence against Muslims

The authors of the first generation of histories of the First Crusade were almost universal in their attitude of indifference to, if not celebration of, their graphic depictions of extreme violence against Muslims. The *Gesta* author included vivid representations of the crusaders' victories. This served to emphasise their effectiveness in battle and the scope of their achievements, but the callous attitude displayed also dehumanised Muslims. Robert brought his depiction of violence against Muslims in line with the harsher treatment demanded by his vision of the crusade as divine vengeance. Robert's account ended with the luridly violent massacres of Muslims at Jerusalem and Ascalon, significantly intensified compared to the *Gesta*, and he added detail to many of the massacres that occurred along the way from Antioch to Jerusalem. At Albara and Jerusalem, Robert specifically justified these massacres in terms of past Muslim persecution of Christians; at Albara he even referred to this as *judicium Domini*.¹²⁰⁵ This vision of the crusade as vengeance was built into the very framing of the narrative: Robert added an account of Urban II's sermon at the council of Clermont at the beginning of his narrative, taking the opportunity to describe the appalling persecution of Christians by Muslim ruling powers in a speech attributed to the pope. All that followed was thus presented in the context of this persecution, described by Urban II himself at the very inception of the

¹²⁰⁵ Robert the Monk, p. 82 (840).

crusade. Guibert and Baldric were also inclined to embellish the *Gesta*'s descriptions of violence against Muslims, correspondingly adding to the *Gesta*'s tendency to dehumanise Muslims by its callous attitude to such extreme violence against them. All three increased the impression of imbalance the *Gesta Francorum* had established between the effectiveness of the crusaders in battle and that of the Muslims.¹²⁰⁶

The sources which were not a part of the so-called 'Gesta family' treated violence against Muslims differently. Ralph's vivid depictions of violence were focused on the impressive deeds of individual crusaders, mostly Bohemond and Tancred.¹²⁰⁷ This displays the same callousness towards Muslims, but in Ralph's case it was more clearly the result of a side-effect of his narrative focus. Albert seems to have had a very ambivalent, not to say inconsistent, attitude to violence against Muslims. For the most part he was indifferent to the suffering of Muslims, at times presenting attacks on them as justified for reasons of vengeance or other reasons. In the case of the massacre in Jerusalem however, he seems to have felt very conflicted. He described the massacre in horrific terms, at times showing sympathy for its victims – though he concluded in the end that the massacre was desired by God and a practical necessity, even if this was cause for some regret.¹²⁰⁸ Fulcher has been described as rejoicing in accounts of violence against Muslims. In fact he did not, and did not depict such events in very great detail. This may just be a personal preference, however. As noted above, he seems to have been averse to violence, perhaps due to his own traumatic experiences. Fulcher did not display any ambivalence, however: he was still clearly indifferent to suffering of Muslims.¹²⁰⁹

This attitude of indifference contributed to establishing the Otherness of Muslims, dehumanising them and inherently depicting them as beneath concern. Violence against Muslims must also be considered in the context of depictions of Muslims as savage. This was, to some extent, hypocritical, but not necessarily to the point of incoherence. Extreme violence perpetrated against Muslims in the context of violent acts committed by them was implicitly justified by their own actions. Muslims

¹²⁰⁶ As discussed below (9.11) the *Gesta Francorum* and its revisers all wrote that the Turks were great warriors, but this statement was not reflected in their overall depiction.

¹²⁰⁷ See above, 7.2.3.

¹²⁰⁸ See above, 6.2.5.

¹²⁰⁹ See above, 8.2.3-4.

were the legitimate objects of extreme violence because they themselves perpetrated it. Many of the accounts interpreted the crusade as an act of vengeance for Muslim mistreatment of Christians. This has been examined in detail by Susanna Throop, as discussed in my introduction.¹²¹⁰ Throop found that the idea of crusading as vengeance is barely to be found in the *Gesta Francorum* or the works of Peter Tudebode and Fulcher of Chartres and only twice in the work of Raymond of Aguilers. It was an idea explored more thoroughly by the writers who were not eyewitnesses: the *Gesta* revisers, Albert and Ralph. Even in their work, Throop found that the idea of crusading as vengeance was not the predominant theme presented.¹²¹¹ As shown in the chapter on Robert the Monk's *Historia*, this study has found that the theme was more prominent in his work than Throop appreciated, forming one of the central themes of his revision.¹²¹² With respect to the subject at hand, the concept of the crusade as revenge plays a role in the depiction of Muslims. It suggests a reason other than simple rhetorical embellishment for the more vivid depictions of violence by the *Gesta* revisers: to conceive of the crusade as vengeance demanded a higher level of hostility. In particular, it demanded of those authors who thought in those terms an exposition of the injuries which must be avenged, and a correspondingly heightened treatment of the acts of the crusaders that were seen as vengeance. This is indeed what we find in the *Gesta* revisers and to some extent in Albert of Aachen's account, although Ralph's preoccupation with celebrating the deeds of his heroes superseded this tendency in his account. Albert, as we have seen, was not entirely consistent in his attitude to violence against Muslims, but some of his accounts of violence fit this pattern. The justificatory power of such an interpretation was strengthened all the more by the frequent interpretation of the crusade as not just human vengeance but God's vengeance, enacted through the crusaders.

9.6.1 The Massacre in Jerusalem

There is a great deal of agreement among the sources in their descriptions of the massacre that occurred in Jerusalem. In particular, the massacre that took place in the al-Aqsa Mosque – which the crusaders believed to be the Temple of Solomon – was described in remarkably similar terms in all of the accounts considered here. The *Gesta Francorum* wrote

¹²¹⁰ See Introduction 1.1.

¹²¹¹ Throop, *Crusading as an act of Vengeance*, 46-9.

¹²¹² See above, 3.1.2; 3.2.5.

that the crusaders waded up to their ankles in blood in the Temple. This was often exaggerated by accounts which used the *Gesta*. Guibert at first wrote that the blood reached their ankles, but added a second reference to it submerging their boots. Baldric placed the level of the blood at the crusaders' calves, while Robert introduced the rather excessive image of so much blood being spilled that the severed limbs and torsos of the dead floated in it. Fulcher, who also used the *Gesta* for this part of his narrative, did not exaggerate the level of blood, but used the same imagery as his source. Ralph, who might have used Fulcher (and thus have been indirectly influenced by the *Gesta*), raised the level of blood to knee-height. But the general similarity of these accounts is not solely due to the influence of the *Gesta Francorum*. Even Albert of Aachen, the author who is most firmly considered to be independent of the *Gesta*, used the same image of ankle-deep blood (and his independence of the *Gesta* demonstrates that Ralph's use of this imagery need not necessarily itself be evidence for his use of Fulcher). This agreement can of course be taken as corroboration. But Madden has shown that this image – the blood running up to the ankles of the crusaders or higher – must be exaggerated, even in the *Gesta* and Albert (and particularly in Robert's case – severed limbs do not float). It is true that in one case, Biblical imagery was used. Raymond of Aguilers wrote that the blood in the Temple reached the bridles of the crusaders' horses, a reference to Revelation 14:20.¹²¹³ Raymond was probably inspired by the *Gesta*'s wording, but took the opportunity to include a more erudite reference. The common phrase is *usque ad frenos equorum*, whereas all of the other accounts mentioned blood flowing up to a certain level on the human body, so it is clear that only Raymond was making a reference to Revelation. Nor has a classical model ever been suggested, though it is perhaps a possibility that one existed which has yet to be identified. Madden suggests that the exaggeration which even the *Gesta* author and Albert must have made was due to the massacre which took place in such a confined space producing an intensely disturbing sight; eyewitnesses may have genuinely formed the impression that blood flowed as high as their ankles even if it could not have.¹²¹⁴ This may help to explain the agreement between the *Gesta* and Albert (and Ralph if indeed he was not indirectly influenced by the *Gesta* through Fulcher). Discussion of the incident in the crusader camp afterwards may have led to a consensus that influenced Albert's oral sources as well as

¹²¹³ Raymond of Aguilers, 346.

¹²¹⁴ Madden, 'Rivers of Blood', 35-6.

the *Gesta* author directly. This is not even necessarily to say the latter author did not personally witness this massacre (though he might quite easily have been elsewhere in Jerusalem that day); his own memory may have been influenced by the retellings of the events of the day that were shared among the crusaders.

The accounts of the slaughter of the inhabitants of Jerusalem, of which this incident was only a part, are the most vividly described and often the most intense instances of violence against Muslims to be found in the crusade histories. This thesis is not directly concerned with the reality of events and it is not intended to dispute the intensity of the massacre that occurred in Jerusalem here.¹²¹⁵ Nevertheless, as discussed above, at least one part of the conventional narrative was exaggerated even in its most basic version – and this image of blood flowing in the Temple was heightened further to increase its rhetorical effectiveness by most of the authors that used the *Gesta Francorum*. Albert also used Biblical imagery when describing a later part of the massacre which the other sources described in less detail. He accused the crusaders of dashing the heads of Muslim infants against walls and lintels, a frequent motif in Biblical prophecies and as such probably not something that had actually occurred.¹²¹⁶ Aside from this and Raymond's reference to Revelation, however, a Biblical model does not seem to have been used. Madden suggested that the exaggeration of the level of blood that could have been shed in the Temple was probably in large part the result of an impressionistic account of genuinely horrific sights they saw, rather than deliberate exaggeration.¹²¹⁷ It is also probably the case, however, that the massacre in Jerusalem was depicted in such vivid detail because it was the natural climax of most accounts. This applies even to Albert and Fulcher (and to a lesser extent Guibert), who continued their accounts considerably longer – it is generally agreed that they originally intended to record the story of the crusade with the capture of Jerusalem as the climax and only later decided to continue them. This is arguably true even of Ralph: although Tancred's life continued and his achievements in his career were

¹²¹⁵ Conor Kostick considered the descriptions of the sources to be relatively reliable in his account of the massacre: Kostick, *The Siege of Jerusalem*, 123-131. Morton did question whether the massacre was greater than an ordinary sack of a city, citing the relative silence of the contemporary Arabic sources. He concluded, however, that a massacre of such intensity that it shocked the crusaders themselves did occur, even if they were probably not literally wading in blood. Morton, *Encountering Islam on the First Crusade*, 175-9.

¹²¹⁶ See above, 6.2.5.

¹²¹⁷ Madden, 'Rivers of Blood', 35-6.

great on a personal level, none of his later deeds really rivalled the capture of Jerusalem in importance. It is particularly true of Robert the Monk, in which he explicitly referred to the massacre as the result of divine vengeance for the suffering inflicted by Muslims on Christians, structuring his account such that the violence by Muslims described in his version of Urban II's speech at Clermont was balanced by this great massacre in Jerusalem. All this is not to deny that the sack of Jerusalem was a singularly thorough and terrible massacre, but even so the level of detail and vividness compared to others which occurred on the crusade was probably in part for these other reasons. The effect, however, was to diminish these other massacres rather than exaggerate the one that occurred in Jerusalem, even if it was described in heightened ways.

9.6.2 Cannibalism

Another particular incident of violence which warrants specific discussion here is the cannibalism said to have occurred at Ma'arrat an-Nu'man. A shortage of food either during or after the siege (the sources differ on this point) led some on the expedition to turn in desperation to eating the corpses of Muslims killed in the fighting. All of the accounts agree that this took place, so it is very likely that it did. Guibert's treatment of the incident was the most distinctive. He initially took the incident at face value, though he wrote that no one could be certain that it had taken place, before adding an alternate explanation at the end of his account. In this explanation the basis for the incident was a form of psychological warfare aimed at terrorising Muslims: he claimed that a fanatical group of impoverished crusaders called the *Tafurs* put on a show of pretending to eat the Muslim dead during the siege. Aside from this, the crusade authors vary only in the details of their accounts – how publicly and when exactly they said that the cannibalism occurred. As mentioned in the introduction of this thesis, Rubenstein concluded on the basis of reports of cannibalism earlier in the crusade in other sources and his analysis of the Latin narratives that cannibalism occurred as a response to famine on several occasions. By the time of the siege of Ma'arrat an-Nu'man the utility of the act as psychological warfare to terrify Muslims was recognised, and so this incident was the most public and memorable, which is why it was so much more widely recorded. Rubenstein also argued that cannibalising Muslims was justifiable to the crusaders as an element of Holy War: 'The soldiers could eat their enemies because they, the Franks, were not seekers after

God's justice but were the embodiment of God's will – the wrathful God described in the Apocalypse.¹²¹⁸ It is true that the idea of the crusaders as instruments of God's wrath and vengeance had some currency, at least among the authors who wrote later, as discussed above. Nevertheless the Latin narrative sources do not support Rubenstein's argument for the most part. As Rubenstein noted, Baldric did argue that the cannibalism constituted no sin, partly because it was done out of desperate hunger, but partly also 'because they were fighting their enemies with their hands and with their teeth.'¹²¹⁹ Nevertheless almost all of the authors revealed deep discomfort with the incident, which does not suggest that they, at least, viewed it as a legitimate extension of Holy War. Though he made this statement, Baldric took pains to emphasise that the cannibalism was done primarily because of hunger, which no man can resist.¹²²⁰ The *Gesta* author was brief and blunt, saying only that some cooked the flesh of dead bodies to eat; this does not indicate any particular interpretation of the incident.¹²²¹ Guibert, as indicated, initially claimed there was no evidence it had definitely occurred and then claimed it had indeed been faked, denying the incident entirely.¹²²² Fulcher, Albert and Robert were all clear in their revulsion: Albert called it 'horrifying to the ears (*auribus horrendum*)' and added as an excuse that *non est acutior gladius quam a longo contracto fames*.¹²²³ Fulcher 'shudder[ed]' to relate the story (*Dicere perhorreo*) and described those who did this as 'tormented by the madness of starvation (*famis rabie nimis vexati*)'.¹²²⁴ Robert too wrote that it was 'horrible to say' but done 'with hunger and suffering driving them'.¹²²⁵ Ralph, too described it as 'shameful to report (*pudet referre*)' and added that those who participated looked like wild beasts or dogs.¹²²⁶ Raymond, too, though he wrote that this was done *avidissime*, wrote that it 'terrified as many of our countrymen as it did strangers' and emphasised that it was done because of food shortages.¹²²⁷ For these authors, it seems that rather than a legitimate manifestation of Holy War, this incident represented a limit to their dehumanisation of Muslims:

¹²¹⁸ Rubenstein, 'Cannibals and Crusaders', 551.

¹²¹⁹ Baldric of Bourgueil, 93; Rubenstein, 'Cannibals and Crusaders', 542.

¹²²⁰ Baldric of Bourgueil, 93.

¹²²¹ *Gesta Francorum*, 80.

¹²²² See above, 5.2.4.

¹²²³ Albert of Aachen, 374.

¹²²⁴ Fulcher of Chartres, 226-7 (112).

¹²²⁵ Robert the Monk, 850.

¹²²⁶ Ralph of Caen, 675.

¹²²⁷ '*Terrebant ista multos tam nostrae gentis homines quam extraneos.*' Raymond of Aguilers, 181.

though extreme violence against them may have been justified, to eat them was still horrifying.

9.7 Political Structure of Muslim society

Details of the political structure of Islamic society tended not to be a site for polemical depictions of Muslims. Rather, the images of political structures included represent a mixture in varying proportions of relatively accurate details the authors encountered and assumptions, based either on the workings of contemporary western Christian societies or in a few instances on their classical literary heritage. As discussed under the heading of terminology, most authors distinguished between Turks on the one hand (*Turci*) and subjects of the Fatimid Caliphate and semi-independent Arab rulers in Syria on the other (*Sarraceni*). Ralph did not use *Sarraceni* or an equivalent term to encompass all non-Turkish Muslims, but did make a distinction by using the word *Turcus* exclusively for Turks and various other terms for other Muslims. The other authors indicated there was a difference at least through their terminology, with some adding further detail. This includes Raymond of Aguiler's references to the difference between Sunni and Shia Islam and the Fatimid and Abbasid Caliphates as mentioned under the heading of Muslim beliefs above.

All of the authors seem to have presumed that Turkish society was organised along feudal lines. Muslims swore fealty to one another, and many of the authors mentioned lands or cities being granted to their rulers by the favour of more powerful rulers. The rulers of the Turks and the 'Saracens' were often called *reges*, and sometimes their subordinates were given titles such as *dux*. The writers seem to have simply filled in gaps in their knowledge about Muslim society by assuming it matched their own. In other words, although this was a noticeable tendency, there was no polemic significance to their talk of Muslim knights, kings, and fealty. Even references to the Abbasid Caliph as the *papa* or *apostolicus* of the Turks were, as Morton points out, more explanatory than polemic in tone.¹²²⁸ The crusaders were interpreting unfamiliar political institutions with reference to their own, rather than depicting these as the evil mirror-versions of the papacy and the rulers of Christendom. As Louchitskaja noted, they also

¹²²⁸ Morton, *Encountering Islam on the First Crusade*, 122.

sometimes used classical terms such as *prefectus*.¹²²⁹ These too were probably used because they were familiar, but thought to be equivalent, rather than to convey any message.

These contortions of Turkish political society into familiar frameworks were accompanied by some accurate details which must have been learned on crusade. The title of emir was widely known to the crusade authors, and broadly understood. The authors also knew the title of the Seljuk Sultan Berkjaruq, though they apparently did not realise the title Sultan of Rûm was claimed by Kilij Arslan. Guibert sought to explain the term as derived from the name of Sogdianus, a Persian emperor whose name was adopted as a title in the manner of Caesar. The authors of the '*Gesta* family' knew the title of the (Abbassid) Caliph as well, and that his role was roughly equivalent to that of the pope, as they often specified. Guibert omitted the term but still mentioned the *papa Turcorum*, perhaps because he could not find an explanation for it that satisfied him as he had for the title of the sultan. The other authors considered in detail here did not mention the caliph, though as noted above Raymond of Aguilers knew of both the Fatimid and Abbassid Caliphs, and was the only author to distinguish them. Fulcher and Albert, writing with the benefit of many more years' worth of contact with Muslims by their informants (and perhaps sometimes directly in Fulcher's case), both included evidence of further divisions among the Turks in the later parts of their accounts. Despite this, however, there is little indication that they understood these signs of the independence of Damascus (for example) for what they were. They tended to see personal disputes rather than local geopolitics behind the events they recorded.

The sources differed somewhat in regard to the homeland of the Turks. The *Gesta* mentioned Khorosan in this regard very frequently.¹²³⁰ Robert, however, almost completely replaced mentions of Khorosan with Persia, and the one mention of Khorosan (*Corozaim*) which remained in his account was only one of a number of places with which he associated the Turks on that occasion. As discussed above, the association of the Turks with Persia may have been partially allegorical, although it was true that the

¹²²⁹ Svetlana Lutchitskaya, 'The Muslim Political World as mirrored in the First Crusade chronicles', 1422.0 [ebook].

¹²³⁰ *Gesta Francorum*, pp 4, 5, 15, 39, 50-2, 67. Morton suggested that this too may have been learned from Eastern Christians; it was 'routinely' used as a toponym to refer to the Turkish hearlands by Armenian, Coptic, Byzantine and even Muslim writers. Morton, *Encountering Islam on the First Crusade*, 124-5.

Seljuk Empire was centred on Persia and the crusaders may have learned to associate Turks and Persians from contact with Byzantines.

Robert is alone in apparently not recognising the division between the Seljuk Turks and the Arabs and Fatimids. He seems to have thought that the 'Emir of Babylon' was subject to the sultan, apparently failing to recognise the distinction which was reflected in the *Gesta*, but never spelled out by the anonymous author. The other authors at least tacitly acknowledged the distinct political structure of the Fatimid Caliphate, albeit not by name, as discussed in the relevant chapters. For reasons that are not entirely clear they tended to refer to the Caliph, who ruled the 'Saracens', as the *rex* or *amiravisus Babyloniae*, and the land he ruled as *Babylonia*. The authors all tended to describe the political structures of the 'Saracens' less accurately and in less detail. This lower level of detail is part of a general tendency in the Latin narrative sources for the First Crusade to offer more vivid and detailed depictions of the Turks than other Muslim peoples, as discussed above. The assumption of feudal institutions was less true of Fatimid society, but this is probably only an effect of the lower level of detail with which 'Saracen' political structures were usually depicted. The Fatimid Caliph was often referred to as a *rex*, however, as was the case with the Sultan. All of the authors considered in detail here seem to have assumed he was a secular ruler. Even Raymond of Aguilers, who recognised the Sunni-Shia division to some degree, mentioned only the caliph of the Turks and the *rex Babyloniae*.¹²³¹ Some seem to have conflated the Fatimid Caliph with his vizier al-Afdal (whom the crusaders fought at Ascalon), though they may simply not have known there were two powerful figures in the Fatimid political leadership.¹²³² Albert, on the other hand, did distinguish the two.¹²³³ Below the level of the caliph and his vizier, the authors continued to refer to local rulers sometimes as emirs and sometimes as *reges* as they had with Turkish rulers.

9.8 Negative Muslim Character Traits

The sources considered here were unanimous in attributing some degree of savagery to Muslims, as shown in the discussion of violence above. They varied in the degree to which they emphasised this, but it was universally accepted that Muslims were a violent and often frightening

¹²³¹ Raymond of Aguilers, 39, 208, 210.

¹²³² See above, 2.2.4; 3.2.8; 4.2.4; 5.2.5.

¹²³³ See above, 6.2.6.

enemy. This depiction served a number of purposes, from simply creating a more entertaining narrative to helping justify the crusade itself. Other character traits attributed to Muslims in varying degrees by some or all authors included cowardice, deceitfulness, lust, arrogance and the tendency to be too concerned with the material world.

In contrast with the *Gesta*'s depictions of Muslims as effective and terrifying fighters and its explicit statement that the Turks in particular were excellent warriors, the author frequently depicted Muslims as cowardly. At first glance contradictory, viewed in context together the depictions of Muslim cowardice and the martial prowess discussed in other sections give an impression of an immensely powerful foe whom (with God's help, as frequently emphasised), the crusaders comprehensively defeated. This serves one of the author's over-arching narrative purposes well: readers were given the impression that Muslim society was martial and powerful, but no match for the righteousness of the crusaders' cause.¹²³⁴ Other authors varied in their treatment of this subject. The *Gesta* revisers tended to follow the example of their source. Guibert included many incidents taken directly from the *Gesta*, but rewritten with more polished rhetoric. He also added incidents which occurred after the end of the *Gesta*'s narrative, but overall he did not expand a great deal on the theme of Muslim cowardice.¹²³⁵ Baldric was similar, often retaining the *Gesta*'s depiction of Muslims as cowardly and stupid, adding some remarks emphasising this on occasion. Following the *Gesta* in this tendency, and adding to it, does somewhat undermine Baldric's efforts to emphasise the crusaders' achievement. Essentially, despite setting out a more coherent programme in his introduction, he preserves some of the *Gesta*'s inconsistency with regard to how threatening Muslims appear in his account.¹²³⁶ This inconsistency in the *Gesta* and these two of its revisers is also reflected in their tendency to describe the violence Muslims committed against crusaders less vividly than violence perpetrated by the crusaders, as discussed above. Robert, however, depicted Muslims as cowardly and stupid much more consistently than the *Gesta* author. He omitted the *Gesta*'s praise of the Turks as warriors and added many more examples of cowardice, making the image of Islam presented by the *Gesta* more consistent. Much of the animal imagery he introduced to the *Gesta* supported this image of them as cowardly. They were frequently compared to timid prey animals like

¹²³⁴ See above, 2.1.5, 2.2.10.

¹²³⁵ See above, 5.2.7.

¹²³⁶ See above, 4.1.3, 4.2.8, 4.2.9.

doves, hares or deer; although on some occasions he used animal imagery to depict them as wild, subhuman or verminous.¹²³⁷

Among the other sources, the treatment of this theme was more varied. It was not a major theme in Albert of Aachen's account. Similarly, although it was the characteristic Fulcher ascribed to Muslims most often, even this was rare.¹²³⁸ An impression of Muslim cowardice is given by gathering all of these references together, but would have been considerably weaker for a contemporary reader of Fulcher's work. Occurring as rarely as they do, Fulcher's depictions of Muslim forces fleeing in terror may simply have reflected the fact that battles in the medieval period sometimes ended with one side or the other being routed. Finally, Ralph did depict Muslims as cowardly as a general rule. There is little of the *Gesta Francorum's* ambiguity: Ralph did not alternate between depicting Muslims as extremely threatening and cowardly and ineffective as the anonymous author does. Ralph also frequently reinforced Muslim cowardice with comparisons to animals, similarly to Robert. Ralph drew attention to the Turks' traditional feigned retreat tactics on a number of occasions, but did not depict this as an inherently cowardly tactic in itself, perhaps respecting its proven efficacy. At the battle of Harran in 1104, Ralph even went so far as to write that the Turkish forces 'simulated flight with adroitness'.¹²³⁹

On a number of occasions the authors of the *Gesta* family depicted Muslims as highly materialistic; that is, as having been overly concerned with the physical world in comparison to the crusaders. Muslim leaders in the *Gesta* were often either overconfident of victory on the basis of their superior numbers or equipment; or baffled in defeat for the same reason. This was the case when Kerbogha ridiculed the weapons of the Christians he was shown, when he dismissed his mother's warning that God fought for the crusaders, and when al-Afdal struggled to understand how he had been defeated by the poor and ill-equipped crusaders.¹²⁴⁰ Guibert and Baldric retained these passages, albeit in paraphrased form; as did Robert, who also added some instances of his own in which he referred to Muslims placing undue trust in their superior numbers.¹²⁴¹ This attitude attributed to Muslims was implicitly – and sometimes explicitly, especially in the various versions

¹²³⁷ See above, 3.2.3-4.

¹²³⁸ See above, 8.2.7.

¹²³⁹ '...astutia fugam simulant...' Ralph of Caen, 710 (164).

¹²⁴⁰ See above, 2.2.7

¹²⁴¹ See above, 3.2.6, 4.2.6, 5.2.8.

of Kerbogha's conversation with his mother – contrasted with the reality (as perceived by the authors) that God was assisting the crusaders, or even enacting his own will through them. This theme was not developed in any great detail by the authors who used the *Gesta* less or not at all; Fulcher, Ralph and Albert do not place much emphasis on this theme.

On other occasions, some of the sources simply depicted Muslims as being overly concerned with material wealth. In the speech the *Gesta* author attributed to Kerbogha in which he laid out his peace terms, all the rewards he promised for conversion to Islam were worldly, material ones: wealth, land, horses and wives. This offer was, of course, emphatically rejected by Peter the Hermit on behalf of the crusaders. The offer was retained by the *Gesta* revisers.¹²⁴² In the various versions of his letter to the Muslim faithful in the *Gesta* family, Kerbogha not only encouraged them to procreate (a point to which we shall return below), but to enjoy their wealth and luxuries – another implicit contrast to the frequently-emphasised suffering of the crusaders. Guibert included two instances of Muslims who had swallowed gold for safe-keeping, at Ma'arrat an-Nu'man and Caesarea. Guibert took the former incident from the *Gesta Francorum* (it was also mentioned by Robert), and adopted the latter from Fulcher's account. In addition to Caesarea, Fulcher claimed that some Muslims had swallowed their gold before the capture of Jerusalem¹²⁴³. This common accusation of swallowing gold may have been something of a *topos*. Nevertheless, it suggests particularly materialistic obsessions on the part of the accused. The belief on the part of the *Gesta* and its revisers that Turks were buried with grave goods may also have owed something to their attribution of this attitude to Muslims.¹²⁴⁴ In some instances, however, the wealth of Muslims mentioned was simply wealth. It did not necessarily serve to convey a strong message about Islam itself beyond a certain level of exoticism, though when it was mentioned in the context of spoils won in battle, it did assist the authors' narratives by underscoring the crusaders' triumph.

The supposed deceitfulness of Muslims was only a major theme of the *Dei Gesta per Francos* of Guibert of Nogent, though one incident was reported by all of the *Gesta* family: Kilij Arslan's forces, fleeing Dorylaeum, supposedly pretended to have defeated the crusaders at every town they

¹²⁴² Baldric of Bourgueil, 78-9; Robert the Monk, 71; Guibert of Nogent,

¹²⁴³ See above, 8.2.7.

¹²⁴⁴ See above, 2.2.2.

encountered and used the fear this provoked to gain access and loot the towns.¹²⁴⁵ Guibert attributed a number of tricks and stratagems to Muslims, and interpreted some incidents also mentioned in other sources in this light.¹²⁴⁶ Some of Guibert's claims were repeated by other authors. Guibert attributed the death of Godfrey of Bouillon, the first ruler of Jerusalem, to poisoning by a Muslim ruler whom he naively trusted. This was also heavily implied, though not stated outright, by Albert of Aachen; though the anonymous continuator of Frutolf of Michelsberg attributed Godfrey's death to pestilence caused by the still-unburied bodies of the Muslims massacred in Jerusalem.¹²⁴⁷ Guibert's account of the betrayal of a group of crusaders by Pirrus was also echoed in a variant manuscript of Baldric of Bourgueil's account to which a number of anecdotes were added. One such concerned an unnamed Muslim who used the same trick Guibert attributed to Pirrus to lure some crusaders into an ambush.¹²⁴⁸ Other authors included a few other incidents of treachery, though none emphasised this to the degree that Guibert did. Robert the Monk, for example, in recording a temporary truce that was called during the siege Antioch, noted that it was broken when a certain crusader was killed by Muslims whom he called *armati canes*.¹²⁴⁹

The idea that Muslims were particularly prone to licentiousness or lust was most prominent in Albert and Guibert's accounts, but it does appear to some degree in many of the other accounts. Guibert connected this directly to the foundation of Islam, claiming it was the central doctrine of the religion. As he summed up the teachings of Mohammed: 'having decreed circumcision, he gave them free rein for every kind of shameful behaviour.'¹²⁵⁰ This led them to allow and practice polygamy, as Guibert repeatedly noted; yet nevertheless their lust was so great, he believed that this could not satisfy them and they raped Christians, both men and women.¹²⁵¹ In Albert's case, the supposed lust of Muslims manifested itself almost exclusively in sexual violence. While this also contributed to a depiction of Muslims as savage and barbaric, Albert frequently emphasised that these were acts of lust. He did not connect the behaviour so directly to the beliefs of Muslims (a subject on which he had little to say), but the

¹²⁴⁵ Robert the Monk, 30-1 (766); Baldric of Bourgueil, 35; Guibert of Nogent, 161.

¹²⁴⁶ See above, 5.2.9.

¹²⁴⁷ See above, 5.2.9; *1106 Continuation*, 160.

¹²⁴⁸ See above, 4.4.

¹²⁴⁹ Robert the Monk, 50.

¹²⁵⁰ '...ut breviter eius dogma concludam, circumcisione quidem decreta totius eis impudicitiae laxavit habenas.' Guibert of Nogent, 94 (32).

¹²⁵¹ See above, 5.2.6.

frequency with which he reinforced the impression of the enemies of the crusade as full of lust and prone to rape conveyed the same message that this was a prominent element of their character.¹²⁵²

The *Gesta* did not develop this as a theme to any great extent. The anonymous author mentioned Kerbogha's promise of wives to the crusaders if they would convert and become his liegemen, and his letter to the Muslim faithful urging them to take pleasure in procreation and their worldly luxuries. These were not necessarily intended to scandalise: in the former case it is by no means clear that Kerbogha was offering more than one wife each (presumably to those who did not already have one), and the latter was connected to procreation as much as to luxury. Those who used the *Gesta* as a source would sometimes change or recontextualise these, however. Tudebode reproduced Kerbogha's offer to the crusaders in which it is inherently unclear if multiple wives were meant, but also added an incident in which another Muslim figure, Yaghi-Siyhan, offered multiple wives to a single crusader if he would convert.¹²⁵³ Even if the *Gesta* author was not, Tudebode certainly was aware of Muslim polygamy, and wrote that it was used to tempt a man who would go on to choose martyrdom.¹²⁵⁴ Similarly, Guibert altered Kerbogha's letter to add his encouragement to the Muslim faithful to procreate with *coniuga* and *scorta*, conforming to his depiction of Muslims as polyamorous and licentious.¹²⁵⁵

Finally, returning to a theme detectable in all of the accounts, arrogance was a characteristic the authors attributed to Muslims. In particular, the sources were almost unanimous in their depiction of Kerbogha as an arrogant figure. This may have been derived from a genuine impression of him that the crusaders received. Peter the Hermit was sent as an ambassador to negotiate with Kerbogha as he laid siege to the crusades inside Antioch. According to both Albert and the *Gesta* author, upon his return Peter gave a public report of his meeting: perhaps this report gave all who listened a common impression of Kerbogha as arrogant.¹²⁵⁶ Ralph of Caen did not include very much characterisation of other Muslims as arrogant, though it is likely that he intended Kerbogha to be a representative figure. A relatively common motif which Ralph mentioned, handled slightly

¹²⁵² See above, 6.2.4.

¹²⁵³ Peter Tudebode, 59, 62.

¹²⁵⁴ See above, 2.4

¹²⁵⁵ See above, 5.2.6.

¹²⁵⁶ Albert of Aachen, 320; *Gesta Francorum*, 67.

differently by different authors, was the story that Kerbogha was playing chess as the crusade armies left Antioch. Ralph attributed this to his arrogance, claiming that he allowed the crusaders to deploy fully instead of attacking them because he did not want to end his game. Raymond of Aguilers simply mentioned that this was what Kerbogha was doing when he heard of the crusaders' manoeuvre, whereas Fulcher of Chartres presented this and his exchange with his advisor Amirdalis in a way that makes him seem incompetent.¹²⁵⁷ It probably arose from efforts by the authors to explain why Kerbogha did not immediately attack the crusaders in the bottleneck created as they marched out from the city (which may itself have contributed to an impression of him as arrogant). Baldric of Bourgueil attempted to offer an alternate explanation, for example, suggesting that Kerbogha wished to allow all the crusaders to leave the city so they could be surrounded and defeated all at once.¹²⁵⁸

Aside from Ralph, the authors did tend to characterise other Muslim leaders or even Muslims in general as arrogant. The attribution to Muslims of supreme confidence in their numbers and equipment discussed above was also indicative of their supposed arrogance. Fulcher depicted Muslims as arrogant the least of any author considered here, only depicting Al-Afdal and Kerbogha as arrogant on one occasion each. Albert referred more frequently to the *superbia* of Kerbogha, depicting leaders such as Kilij Arslan and Danishmend Ghazi as arrogant as well (although after introducing Kilij Arslan as an arrogant figure, Albert would later contrast him with Kerbogha, casting him as the more reasonable figure)¹²⁵⁹. The *Gesta Francorum*, in addition to frequently depicting Muslims as trusting in their numbers, noted on several occasions that they had come to battle equipped with ropes and chains expecting to take great numbers of captives and enslave them. Baldric and Robert adopted many of these incidents, and added some statements of their own which further emphasised Muslim arrogance. Baldric further emphasised Muslim pride, attributing their desire to fight to their pride (as contrasted with the crusaders' fighting for love of their brothers).¹²⁶⁰ Raymond of Aguilers similarly referred Kerbogha as arrogant (*superbus*), and included an account of the arrogant dismissal of the threat of the

¹²⁵⁷ Raymond of Aguilers, 124; Fulcher of Chartres, 253 (105).

¹²⁵⁸ Baldric of Bourgueil, 80.

¹²⁵⁹ See above, 6.2.7.

¹²⁶⁰ See above, 4.2.7.

crusaders by the rulers of Tripoli.¹²⁶¹ Finally, in addition to such depictions of Muslim arrogance he adopted from the *Gesta* as Kerbogha's claim to have more generals in his army than all the crusaders put together, Guibert of Nogent also added a number of references of his own. He described Kerbogha as possessing *tantus gentium fastus*, and referred to the *superbia gentilium* which God punished in his exegesis of Zechariah 12.¹²⁶²

Kerbogha and his correlative religionists may have appeared a genuinely arrogant figure to the crusaders, but they would also have been primed by the Bible to expect to encounter the *superbia infidelium* (Isaiah 13:11).¹²⁶³ Such arrogance on the part of Muslims also usually preceded defeat – indeed, in the context of the ultimate success of the crusade, it always preceded defeat. This may in part have had a narrative purpose, rendering the defeat of the enemy more satisfying and entertaining. It may also have been the result of Biblical influence, however: the defeat of the arrogant was promised by God in the same passage from Isaiah: '*Arrogantiam fortium humiliabo*'.

9.9 The Association of Muslims with Evil

The sources varied considerably in the extent to which they associated Muslims with the Devil, hell, or other demonic forces. Some made such connections repeatedly and prominently, others only occasionally, and some not at all. Baldric and Albert did not use this method of denigrating Muslims. Fulcher did only once, referring to Muslims as a race 'enslaved by demons (*daemonum ancilla*)'.¹²⁶⁴ Guibert only mentioned such a connection to the Devil twice, but these references were very prominent. He gave the Devil a central role in his account of the foundation of Islam, explaining how once the hermit who had lost his chance to become Patriarch of Alexandria had decided to seek revenge in the manner of Arius, the Devil approached him and suggested that Mohammed would be a useful tool in this. Guibert emphasised this involvement, noting that the hermit filled Mohammed's head 'with profane teaching drawn by the devil's

¹²⁶¹ Raymond of Aguilers, 120, 258.

¹²⁶² Guibert of Nogent, 209, 303.

¹²⁶³ Moab and Chaldea in particular were associated with *arrogantia* and *superbia* (Isaiah 16:6, 13:11; Jeremiah 48:29)

¹²⁶⁴ Fulcher of Chartres, 135 (66)

piping'.¹²⁶⁵ These were his only references to the Devil or to demonic forces, but they were central to his conception of Islam as a religion. The *Gesta Francorum*, Robert the Monk and Ralph of Caen made connections between Muslims and the forces of hell much more frequently. The *Gesta* wrote of the 'demonic' voices of Muslims, referred to a Mosque as a *diabolicum atrium* and claimed that a group of Muslim soldiers killed at Antioch 'received eternal burial with the Devil and his angels' (the latter being a direct inversion of his reference just before this to some crusaders who were killed in battle as martyrs who ascended directly to heaven).¹²⁶⁶ Robert the Monk expanded on this in his revision of the *Gesta*, adding a number of his own references. The Turks who marched against Peter the Hermit and the People's Crusade were a *diabolica legio*, and Nicaea was liberated from *diabolica captivitas*, and some Muslim soldiers from Harim, near Antioch were *fili diaboli*.¹²⁶⁷ Robert had Herluin refer to 'your infernal gods' when addressing Kerbogha, and a Turkish soldier killed at the final battle for Antioch 'yielded his soul to the infernal deities'.¹²⁶⁸ Connections to the devil were particularly prominent in Robert's account of the battle of Ascalon, in which he claimed that the devil, 'stirred up the Emir of Babylon' and was thus behind the Fatimid attack on the crusaders. Robert further described al-Afdal himself as 'the emir of the Devil's Babylon', whose defeat by 'the Lord... through his followers' mirrored the way in which Christ defeated the Devil by dying on the cross.¹²⁶⁹ Finally, Ralph also associated Muslims with the devil on several occasions. After Antioch was captured, the Christians '[were] raised from humility to the stars and the others became submerged in Hell because of their luxury and drunkenness'.¹²⁷⁰ Similarly when Tancred was ambushed on the Mount of Olives, he killed the first of his attackers and

¹²⁶⁵ 'Interea per hereticum heremitam ad prophana dogmata homo ille diaboli fistula imbuebatur ipsius quaquaversum preeunte preconio propheta ab universis creditur...', Guibert of Nogent, 97 (34).

¹²⁶⁶ '...receperunt sempiternum interitum cum diabolo et angelis eius.' *Gesta Francorum*, 41; their words and voices as demonic: 18; *diabolicum atrium*: 42.

¹²⁶⁷ Robert the Monk, 11 (734), 24 (759), 43 (784).

¹²⁶⁸ *Infernales Dii*, Robert the Monk, 70 (825); *diis infernalibus animum commendavit*, Robert the Monk, 75 (831).

¹²⁶⁹ '...ille tortuosus serpens et lubricus anguis... Et Clementem, immo dementem, admiravisum Babiloniae, contra ipsos felle commovit, et cum ipso omnem Orientem excitavit. Speravit etenim totius malitiae praesumptor omnes illos et urbem delere..'. Robert the Monk, 102 (871).

'Erat autem feria VI in qua Salvator generis humani Diabolum, regem Babiloniae, trophaeo crucis prostravit, et nunc iterum admiravisum suae Babiloniae per satellites suos Dominus superavit'. Robert the Monk, 103-4 (874).

¹²⁷⁰ '...alios ab humili ad sidera extulit, alios sub Tartara a luxu et crapula summersit...'. Ralph of Caen, 674 (114).

his soul went to hell.¹²⁷¹ Along similar lines, Ralph referred to Mohammed as ‘Pluto’s slave (*verna Plutonis*)’¹²⁷², but it is clear that he used Pluto as a poetic stand-in for the Christian devil rather than literally meaning that Mohammed worshipped the Roman god of the underworld. Referring to the Muslim occupation of Jerusalem, Ralph lamented that ‘the fellowship of Hell drinks in the Tower of God.’¹²⁷³ This had meaning for their message about the crusade itself as well simple invective against the enemy: as Flori observed of Guibert, but applicable to all these examples, this association with Satan served not only the (literal) demonisation of Muslims, but also the corresponding sacralisation of the expedition and its participants.¹²⁷⁴ A related association more rarely made was that between Muslims (or Mohammed in particular) and the Antichrist. Robert the Monk hinted at this, but did not make much of it. He tended to change the *Gesta*’s references to *Corossanum* (Khorosan) to Persia, but on the one occasion he did refer to the former, he changed the spelling to *Corozaim*. As discussed in more detail in Chapter One, *Corozaim* was a town cursed by Christ in the Gospels and the supposed birthplace of the Antichrist in medieval apocalyptic tradition. But this possible association with the Antichrist was not developed any further by Robert, and in context the connection he made to *Corozaim* was weak – it was only one of a number of places he associated with Muslims, not as central as *Corrosanum* in the *Gesta*. Indeed, given that he usually replaced the term with Persia, he might just have thought the *Gesta* author had meant *Corozaim* as it was a familiar place name, but not one which he considered to have any importance for the subject at hand. In this light, his reference to Muslims in general as *satellites Antichristi* was probably nothing more than invective.¹²⁷⁵

The association of Muslims with the Antichrist formed a much more prominent part of Ralph of Caen’s account. Ralph referred to Mohammed as the *socius* of the Antichrist. Indeed he referred to the Prophet himself as the first Antichrist. He did not think of Mohammed as ‘the’ Antichrist, the one who would arise and bring about the end of days: he quite clearly could not be, as this had not happened. Contemporary writers demonstrated a number of ways of thinking about antichrists: Ralph’s statement could have been

¹²⁷¹ ‘...et quem primum reperit in montem advolasse, primi cogit spiritum sub Styga, corpus in vallem corruere.’ Ralph of Caen, 686 (131).

¹²⁷² Ralph of Caen, 695 (144).

¹²⁷³ ‘Arce Dei potitur conviva baratri...’ Ralph of Caen, 695 (144).

¹²⁷⁴ Flori, *Chroniqueurs et Propagandistes*, 154.

¹²⁷⁵ See above, 3.2.8-9.

pure invective with no deeper meaning; a reference to Mohammed as literally acting against Christ; or he may have thought of Mohammed as one (the first, in fact) of a series of lesser antichrists who would prefigure the real Antichrist. Most of the other authors simply did not mention the Antichrist. Guibert of Nogent, however, explicitly rejected the association of Muslims with the Antichrist. As he made clear in his exegesis of the prophecy of Zachariah, he did not see the crusade as part of the struggle with Antichrist directly, merely a prerequisite for subsequent events to unfold as they had been predicted.¹²⁷⁶

Another supernatural aspect commonly attributed to Muslim society was the use of astrology, divination, and more rarely, magic. As Morton noted, there was a long-standing association of astrology with the East – indeed Guibert himself prefaced one of his discussions of astrology by noting that astrology had originated in the East and was more widely practised there than in the West.¹²⁷⁷ In the *Gesta Francorum*, Kerbogha's mother attributed the prophecy that the Christians would defeat him and dominate the Muslims not only to the Bible and the books of the Muslims, but also to her careful use of astrology. Kerbogha's mother is a complicated figure in the *Gesta*, depicted as being familiar with Scripture and (in the author's view) correct about the crusaders' relationship with God and the inevitability of their victory. Her concern with astrology in addition to the Bible was probably intended to reinforce her non-Christian nature, however. The *Gesta* revisers varied in their treatment of this passage. Baldric removed any references to the source of her knowledge, either biblical or astrological – although she correctly warned Kerbogha that the crusaders would win, he did not mention how she knew. Both Guibert and Robert, on the other hand, removed the claim the *Gesta* author attributed to her that she had seen a prediction of the success of the crusade in the Bible. Although in their accounts she still quoted from the Bible, she nevertheless attributed her certainty that the crusaders would win solely to supernatural means (in Robert's case) or to astrology and non-Christian books of prophecy. They both thus emphasised the role astrology played, Guibert especially: he added an account of an elderly 'saracen' who had told Count Robert I of Flanders that he had foreseen the triumph of the Christians in his study of astrology several years before the crusade, when the count had made a pilgrimage to

¹²⁷⁶ See above, 5.2.10.

¹²⁷⁷ Morton, *Encountering Islam on the First Crusade*, 206-7; Guibert of Nogent, 158.

Jerusalem. Robert attributed Kerbogha's mother's knowledge to all kinds of supernatural means of prophecy (perhaps quite literally all the ones he knew): as well as astrology, the victory of the crusaders was predicted by the responses given by the oracles of the 'gods' of the Muslims; the casting of lots; and examination of the entrails of animals, divination with shoulder blades. The lots were cast and entrails examined by *magi*, *arioli* and *aruspices* – a reference to the Book of Daniel, in which Daniel admonishes Nebuchadnezzar that his *sapientes*, *magi*, *arioli et aruspices* cannot reveal anything to him, and that God alone has the knowledge he seeks (Daniel 2:27-8). It is striking, however, that despite the dubious sources of her knowledge Kerbogha's mother's prediction was accurate. The wife of Pontius Pilate (and even Balaam's ass) provided biblical precedent for the granting of accurate knowledge of the future to non-Christians by God: perhaps assuming their readers did not need to be reminded of this, Robert and Guibert felt they could safely use the practice of astrology and divination to emphasise the alterity of Kerbogha's mother, without having to explain how these discredited arts could have produced an accurate prediction. Robert in particular, evoking Daniel's rebuke of Nebuchadnezzar, may have been thinking in these terms.

Albert of Aachen did not have to thread this particular needle. Although he too attributed to Muslims a belief in divination, directly invoking the same passage from Daniel as Robert, he wrote that the *magi*, *arioli* and *aruspices* consulted by the *rex Corruzana* produced a false prediction of victory for the Turks. Albert referred also to books belonging to the Muslims, containing the *nefanda carmina* of *arioli* and *aruspices*. This suggests that (for Albert if not also for Robert) these terms also implied broader use of magic arts. Indeed, Isidore of Seville's definitions of the terms strongly suggest that they were interpreted in these terms by Albert and his contemporaries, with such diviners connected to magic and consorting with demons. Although this can be seen as a theme in later sources, only one of the authors of contemporary accounts of the First Crusade mentioned the use of magic in more certain terms than this.¹²⁷⁸ Raymond of Aguilers included an account of two Muslim women who stood on the walls of Jerusalem and attempted to cast spells on the crusaders' siege engines. In what Raymond would have seen as poetic justice, however, they

¹²⁷⁸ Anonymous, 'The Old French Continuation of William of Tyre,' trans. Peter W. Edbury, in idem, *The Conquest of Jerusalem and the Third Crusade: Sources in Translation* (Farnham: Ashgate, 1996), 11-145, 40.

were killed by a rock from the very catapult they had tried to sabotage. Such an explicit mention of magic in the sense of the casting of spells as opposed to divination and astrology only appears in Raymond's work, however.¹²⁷⁹

9.10 The Futility of the Muslim Cause

In various ways the authors frequently emphasised the futility of the Muslim cause. This was likely an outgrowth of their belief that the crusade was God's will. All authors mentioned divine assistance at some point, the idea was 'so ubiquitous as to be almost banal.'¹²⁸⁰ More specifically, Guibert interpreted the crusade as the fulfilment of the prophecy in Zechariah 12. Others did not develop the point as far as Guibert, but did include references to Bible that supported the inevitability of Christian victory. The conversation between Kerbogha and his mother was a common site for such assertions in the *Gesta* family.

This was often mirrored by a sense of the inevitability of their own defeat to Muslims themselves. Kerbogha's mother is the primary example of this in the *Gesta* family, predicting the success of the crusade through a variety of means – both Biblical and supernatural. Guibert included another passage with a similar purpose in which an unnamed 'Saracen' man in Jerusalem predicted the crusade to Count Robert I of Flanders when the latter was there on pilgrimage. Ralph similarly added a supposed letter from Emperor Alexios I Komnenos to Bohemond at the beginning of the crusade in which the emperor informed the future prince of Antioch that even the Turks' own prophets foretold the success of the crusade. Baldric did not add further predictions of Muslim defeat, but repeatedly emphasised that they had entered a 'Golden Age' of decadence and would easily be defeated by the more martial Christians. He described them this way himself, but also attributed this worldview based on classical thought to Muslims themselves. This theme is not found to a great extent in the accounts of Fulcher, Raymond or the anonymous continuator of Frutolf of Michelsberg, however. Albert is unique in making the opposite claim: the *magi*, *arioli* and *aruspices* which he claimed were consulted by the Sultan predicted victory for the Turks.

¹²⁷⁹ Raymond of Aguilers, 342.

¹²⁸⁰ Morton, *Encountering Islam on the First Crusade*, 190.

9.11 More Tolerant Attitudes to Muslims

None of the authors offered depictions of Muslims that were exclusively denigratory and hostile. The extent to which they included other perspectives varied considerably, and it must be acknowledged that in some cases more positive appraisals of Muslims – especially their military capabilities – may primarily have been a device intended to reflect well on the achievement of the crusaders in defeating them. Other authors seem to have gone further in their capacity for – or willingness to display – tolerance or even more active admiration of Muslims.

The *Gesta Francorum* famously included a passage praising the prowess of the Turks as warriors. This sentiment was echoed in most of the accounts: as was shown, the authors were generally willing to give credit to Muslims when their military abilities posed a particular challenge – even if their main aim in doing so may have been to emphasise the achievement of the crusaders in defeating them. Although the degree of prominence which they gave to this theme varied, Ralph of Caen is notable for being the only author not to include any praise of Muslims.

In the famous passage praising the Turks, the *Gesta* author mentioned a belief which he attributed to them that they shared ancestry with the Franks. As discussed in Chapter One, although modern authors have assumed that the *Gesta* author endorsed this, he seems in fact to have been somewhat wary of the idea, and treated it cautiously. If indeed it was based on the myth of the *Thorci*, the *Gesta* author seems not to have heard it from a source he considered authoritative (which seems all the more likely if it in fact had some other basis). Nevertheless, that he entertained the notion at all indicated high regard for the Turks, and his intention may have been to offer it as a possible explanation for their prowess despite their lack of assistance from God. This passage was reproduced by Guibert and Baldric, but omitted by Robert. Nevertheless, Robert, as well as Fulcher and Albert, attributed military prowess to Muslims elsewhere.

Morton attributed the capacity to recognise Muslim virtue to a firm distinction the crusaders made between the people and their beliefs.¹²⁸¹ While their beliefs were evil, Muslims themselves were creatures of God, and if their misbelief left them susceptible to evil influence, they were

¹²⁸¹ Morton, *Encountering Islam on the First Crusade*, 162-3.

nevertheless capable of recognising moral behaviour and were drawn to it by their innate sense of Natural Law. There is no direct evidence of such a complete theological approach having been at the forefront of the minds of the authors considered here; indeed it may have been beyond the level of education of some of them. Nevertheless, it is true that most authors were capable of identifying and willing to note examples of virtue among Muslims. That they did to some extent distinguish between Muslims as people and their religion is also indicated by their attitude to conversion, although Guibert of Nogent may have been an exception to this tendency.¹²⁸² Ralph of Caen was also a broader exception in that he included no praise of Muslims at all, but this is most likely due to his tight focus on the deeds of his hero, Tancred.¹²⁸³

Almost the authors regarded conversion favourably, contrary to Birk's argument that most other than the *Gesta* author were uncomfortable with the fluidity of religious belief this implied.¹²⁸⁴ Indeed this is not a likely response to conversion by Christian authors. Christ commanded his disciples to convert the whole world with their preaching in Mark 16:15; the conversion of non-believers was to be expected and sought after. The approval of conversion often manifested in the various accounts of Pirrus, the tower guard who betrayed Antioch to the crusaders. The *Gesta* author mentioned his interest in and intention to convert, but never actually returned to the subject. Robert the Monk and Baldric of Bourgueil both strongly emphasised desire for conversion as his primary motivation for agreeing to work with the crusaders; Robert even attributing this to Pirrus having been granted a vision. If they felt discomfort, it was probably with the *Gesta* author's nonchalant reference to Bohemond bribing Pirrus, which they must have felt undermined the glory of the capture of Antioch. Conversion was central to Pirrus's decision to work with the crusaders in Baldric's account, he directly rejected the idea that bribes or threats or anything other than genuine desire to convert to Christianity motivated the guard. It is clear that Baldric felt no discomfort with the idea. Robert went on to use Pirrus as an example of faithfulness whom Christians should seek to emulate; clearly he too entirely approved of the conversion. Other authors treated Pirrus differently. Fulcher did not mention Pirrus (whom he did not name) converting, though he did also claim Pirrus was motivated by a vision. He

¹²⁸² See above, 5.2.11.

¹²⁸³ See above, 7.2.9.

¹²⁸⁴ Birk, 'The Betrayal of Antioch', 463-87.

did not add any comment indicating disapproval of Pirrus, however, and showed himself to be in favour of conversion in general elsewhere. The same is true of Albert, who did not mention Pirrus himself converting but attributed a role in his negotiations with Bohemond to a Muslim convert who acted as interpreter. Guibert was indeed hostile to Pirrus, although not at first. He took Pirrus's conversion at face value, though he attributed it to a desire for reward, and seems to have more or less approved at first. However, he later encountered and added a story of Pirrus's subsequent betrayal of the crusaders. This left his account hostile to Pirrus overall, and appearing less sanguine about the chances of successful conversion. He also encountered and dismissed Fulcher's account of Pirrus receiving a vision. However, he clearly had not disapproved as strongly, if at all, at first. Guibert may simply have encountered a story of Pirrus's later actions that could hardly have been interpreted in a positive light. His willingness to believe this story may reflect a more hostile attitude to Muslims, a hostility which assumed inherent evil tendencies beyond their religion, or it may simply be that he was the only author to encounter it (with the exception of the writer who added a similar story concerning a different, unnamed character to Manuscript G of Baldric's *Historia*).

Other examples of conversion often appeared. Several, though not all, of the authors also mentioned the conversion of Ahmed ibn Marwan, the commander of the citadel of Antioch, after the defeat of Kerbogha's army. Robert again attributed this to a vision, but this served to emphasise God's direct role in the crusade rather than to allow Robert to be comfortable with the idea of conversion. He made it clear that this outcome was celebrated among the crusaders.¹²⁸⁵ Ibn Marwan and the other *castellani* of Antioch who converted received more perfunctory treatment in the *Gesta* itself and in Baldric and Guibert's accounts, but all seemed to approve of this turn of events, or at least gave no sign of disapproval.¹²⁸⁶ Albert and Ralph did not mention him, but this does not necessarily indicate disapproval on their parts. Ralph was probably too focused on Tancred and Bohemond, and Albert mentioned Shams-ad-Daula at this point in the narrative – he clearly had not even heard that the latter had surrendered control of the garrison to Kerbogha's appointee ibn Marwan. Albert claimed that many Muslim Antiochenes were thoroughly demoralised by the defeat of one of the relief

¹²⁸⁵ See above, 3.2.10.

¹²⁸⁶ See above, 4.2.9; 5.2.11.

forces during the siege of Antioch, and began to flee from the city to the crusaders' camp asking to convert. He also claimed the emir of Ramla was persuaded to convert, and mentioned Walter Mahumeth, a real figure known from witnessing charters of the Kingdom of Jerusalem. Albert did not specifically say he was a convert, but he most likely was. Fulcher of Chartres mentioned conversion only once, but his approval was clear. In the midst of a passage extolling the virtues of life in the East, he mentioned that some settlers had even married converted Muslims and lived together with their extended families.¹²⁸⁷

This attitude to conversion conclusively proves that, for most authors, the rationale for hostility to Muslims and depictions of them emphasising their 'otherness' was rooted in religion and not other aspects such as race or ethnicity.¹²⁸⁸ Converts were embraced; their former religion only counted against them if they proved later to have had false intentions. The evidence of these histories suggests that the otherness of Muslims was virtually exclusively concentrated on the issue of religion. Indeed, Justine Firnhaber-Baker noted that this attitude applied to Medieval France generally, highlighting the religious dimension as the primary dissimilarity between medieval and modern reactions to alterity: 'While Jews, Muslims, pagans and heretics were debarred from this overarching Community [of Christians], the possibility of conversion meant that opportunities to incorporate a formerly excluded individual were always open.'¹²⁸⁹ Among the authors of First Crusade accounts, Guibert and Ralph may be exceptions to this tendency, but even this is not certain. Ralph was above all concerned to glorify Tancred and may simply have taken no interest in this issue. In Guibert's case, although he later added a story which cast Pirrus personally in a bad light and reflected pessimistically on the possibility of conversion, he seems to have approved of this conversion before encountering the story and had no issue with ibn Marwan's conversion. On the other hand, his omission of the *Gesta* author's statement that there could have been no

¹²⁸⁷ See above, 8.2.8.

¹²⁸⁸ Jubb noted a tendency in some later epics for the skin colour of 'pagans' to change from black to white on their baptism: this seems to be a more elaborate working-out of similar ideas. While the emphasis on their skin colour seems to modern eyes to be deeply racial, the fact that it was said to transform after conversion shows it was actually quite the opposite: even physical difference could be tied to religion. See Jubb, 'The Crusaders' perceptions of their opponents', 227.

¹²⁸⁹ Justine Firnhaber-Baker, 'Introduction', in Meredith Cohen and Justine Firnhaber-Baker (eds), *Difference and Identity in Francia and Medieval France*, (Farnham, 2010), 1-12, 5.

greater warriors than the Turks if only they had been Christian, in addition to his clear hostility to Easterners in general, may also indicate a more ethnic basis to his attitude.

Most of the authors discussed here also had little issue with the peace agreements and alliances made between Muslim rulers and the crusaders (and in the early years of the kingdom of Jerusalem). This runs contrary to Daniel's assessment, based on later sources, that negotiation with foreign Muslim powers was 'liable to be suspected as treasonable to the Western Church'.¹²⁹⁰ For the churchmen who wrote these accounts, at least, while their attitude to diplomacy varied somewhat, there was never any suspicion of treason. Adam Knobler demonstrated a tendency which appears frequently in later sources to claim that potential Muslim allies had either converted, considered conversion or had Christian ancestry, ideas which allowed Christians unaccustomed to seeing Muslims represented as anything other than the enemy to make 'a distinction between bad Muslims and good Muslims'.¹²⁹¹ This appears only sporadically in the sources for the First Crusade: it is clear that the authors did not consider this necessary for alliances to be permissible. Some of the rulers of the semi-independent Arab cities encountered on the way to Jerusalem did promise to convert if the crusaders defeated the Fatimids as part of the peace agreements they made (most frequently the 'Emir' of Tripoli), and Albert of Aachen claimed that the governor of Ramla chose to convert to Christianity after allying with the crusaders, but on most occasions the prospect of conversion was not raised.¹²⁹²

Hill observed in her introduction to the *Gesta Francorum* that the crusaders did not understand the willingness of the Byzantines to treat with Muslims as a foreign power on equal terms and saw it as 'rather treacherous'.¹²⁹³ This does not actually seem true of the *Gesta*, however, which recorded a series of treaties with the rulers of Muslim cities as the crusade made its way south towards Jerusalem. Shaizar and Maraclea made treaties with the crusaders; the latter admitting them to the city and the

¹²⁹⁰ Daniel, *Islam and the West*, 135.

¹²⁹¹ Knobler, 'Pseudo-Conversions and Patchwork Pedigrees', 197.

¹²⁹² The *Gesta Francorum* and its revisers claimed the ruler of Tripoli promised to convert as part of a peace agreement: *Gesta Francorum*, 85-6; Guibert of Nogent, 260; Baldric of Bourgueil, 100; Robert the Monk, 93-4. Albert and Raymond did not mention conversion as a condition, however, and Ralph and Fulcher skipped over the incident entirely. Albert of Aachen, 388-90, Raymond of Aguilers, 198.

¹²⁹³ Hill, *Gesta Francorum*, xxiii.

former assisting the crusaders in raiding their neighbours.¹²⁹⁴ Godfrey of Bouillon and Robert of Flanders quickly made a treaty with Djibleh, a town they were besieging, when Raymond of Toulouse called for their aid. The rulers of Homs and Tripoli were told that they would have to convert to Christianity, but this condition was not always demanded.¹²⁹⁵ In all of these cases, the *Gesta*'s author presented the treaties neutrally and without comment.

Robert, Guibert and Baldric all reported the agreements with Shaizar, Maraclea, Djibleh and Tripoli without suggesting disapproval or adding references to potential conversion.¹²⁹⁶ Albert of Aachen mentioned more alliances than any of the other authors, including an alliance with Omar of Azaz: the first such alliance to be made, but one mentioned only by Albert and Raymond of Aguilers. Neither suggested that Omar converted.¹²⁹⁷ During the crusade and the early years of the Kingdom of Jerusalem Albert mentioned peace agreements with Tripoli, Caesarea, Acre, Tyre and Ascalon, and alliances with Ramla, Aleppo and Damascus. Albert also described personal alliances between Bohemond and Danishmend Ghazi; Baldwin I and a son of Tughtegin of Damascus; Joscelin of Edessa and Cawli Sagawu; and between Tancred and the deposed ruler of Apamea. Albert only claimed that the ruler of Ramla had any sincere interest in conversion. Fulcher, who continued his account longer than Albert, did not mention as many alliances and does seem to have approved of the idea less.¹²⁹⁸

In his account of the journey of the First Crusaders from Antioch to Jerusalem, Fulcher mentioned none of the agreements that were made with cities such as Caesarea and Tripoli.¹²⁹⁹ On some of the later occasions when Fulcher did mention such arrangements, he assessed them cynically. During Baldwin I's journey to Jerusalem to be crowned in late 1100, Fulcher wrote that the emir of Beirut sent food to Baldwin when he camped near the city, but that this was done 'more from fear than from love.'¹³⁰⁰ Likewise, when Tyre, Sidon and Acre also sent tribute, 'They feigned friendship but had

¹²⁹⁴ *Gesta Francorum*, 81, 84.

¹²⁹⁵ *Gesta Francorum*, 82-3.

¹²⁹⁶ Robert the Monk, 89 (851), 91 (854), 92 (855), 93-4 (857); Guibert of Nogent, 257, 259, 260; Baldric of Bourgueil, 96, 98, 100.

¹²⁹⁷ Raymond of Aguilers, 148-9; see also above, 6.2.8.

¹²⁹⁸ See above, 8.2.8.

¹²⁹⁹ Fulcher of Chartres, 266-281.

¹³⁰⁰ '...plus causa timoris quam amoris...' Fulcher of Chartres, 365 (142).

none at heart.¹³⁰¹ When Baldwin I captured Caesarea in 1101, Fulcher wrote that he spared the emir and the qadi of the city, but ‘for a ransom rather than for love’.¹³⁰² Of the more active alliances mentioned by Albert, Fulcher mentioned only two: the alliance of Joscelin of Edessa and some unnamed Seljuks against Tancred, and the later alliance of Tughtegin of Damascus with Baldwin I and Roger of Antioch against the forces of Bursuk ibn-Bursuk of Hamadan, the commander of the Seljuk Sultan Muhammad ibn Malik-Shah’s forces in 1115. While Fulcher may thus have disapproved to some extent, he neither concealed all references to alliances and peace agreements nor attempted to provide them with a figleaf of promised conversion.

Ralph is alone among the authors under consideration for omitting any mention of treaties and alliances made with Muslims. Ralph’s reticence may not necessarily indicate disapproval, however: his account focussed closely on the actions of Tancred, and then only those which occurred before 1108. The only alliances which involved Tancred personally (as recorded by Albert) occurred from 1108 on, after the end of Ralph’s account.

The attitudes discussed here cannot always be reconciled with the other attitudes to Muslims of the authors. In some cases, individuals were recognised for their distinct qualities, even if these qualities were not attributed to all Muslims (this is especially true of Albert). In other cases, such as when authors emphasised both the cowardice and the prowess of Muslims, they may simply not have been trying to present a consistent portrayal of Muslims but rather allowed consistency to be subsumed beneath narrative and literary concerns. Even taken as individuals, most authors clearly had more complex ideas than viewing Muslims as an undifferentiated mass of evil inhuman aliens (to sum up the worst they tended to see in Muslims). Authors could recognise individual virtue, prowess, and even in some cases show sympathy. They hoped for conversion and had little objection to peaceful coexistence, nor even to active alliances. As always, opinion could vary considerably, where opinion is distinguishable from narrative and literary pressure. Even individually, the authors had complex

¹³⁰¹ ‘...*fingentes amicitiam, sed cor habentes nequam.*’ Fulcher of Chartres, 366 (142).

¹³⁰² ‘*Admiratum ipsius urbis et episcopum, quem archadium praenominant, rex vivos habuit, quibus plus pro pecunia quam pro amicitia pepercit...*’ Fulcher of Chartres, 402 (154).

and nuanced depictions of Muslims, which were not necessarily always consistent.

9.12 Mirroring

The depiction of Islam as the direct opposite, the evil mirror-image, of Christianity was a device used frequently but not exclusively. It has been identified by a number of authors, but while it was used it is possible to exaggerate the degree to which the depiction of Muslims can always be described this way. Indeed, Morton argues against so clear a division between the crusaders and the Muslims. Rather than defining themselves against the negative Muslim 'other', Morton argues, the crusaders defined themselves against the ideal of Christ as a kind of 'positive other'. They saw many of the negative qualities they ascribed to Muslims in themselves, as a failure to live up to this ideal.¹³⁰³ While Morton makes a convincing case that the interpretation of Islam as the evil opposite of Christianity was not central to the self-definition of the crusaders, it is clear that the authors of crusade accounts did sometimes use mirroring as a way of either interpreting or polemically depicting Muslims as the evil opposites of Christians.

In the cases of the political structures mentioned above, the writers seem to have simply filled in gaps in their knowledge about Muslim society by assuming it matched their own. In other words, although this was a noticeable tendency, there was no polemic significance to their talk of Muslim knights, kings, and fealty. Even references to the Abbassid Caliph as the *papa* or *apostolicus* of the Turks were, as Morton points out, more explanatory than polemic in tone: rather than an evil mirror of the pope, the authors simply intended to explain what a caliph was.¹³⁰⁴ An exception to this is Guibert of Nogent, who in referring to the Abbassid caliph as *summum sui erroris pontifex*, added that he was 'their own pope, in the likeness of ours', thus directly contrasting the *pontifex erroris* with the true pope.¹³⁰⁵ On most other occasions like this, however, as discussed above the crusaders were interpreting unfamiliar political institutions with reference to their own, rather than depicting these as the evil mirror-versions of the papacy and the rulers of Christendom.

¹³⁰³ Morton, *Encountering Islam on the First Crusade*, 149-154.

¹³⁰⁴ Morton, *Encountering Islam on the First Crusade*, 122.

¹³⁰⁵ '...habent enim et papam suum, ad instar nostri...' Guibert of Nogent, 208.

In other cases, however, it is clear that a deliberate contrast was set up by the authors. The *Gesta Francorum* author's claim that some Muslims killed at Antioch were buried for eternity *cum diabolo et angelis eius* was clearly a direct contrast to some Christians who were killed in the same battle and ascended straight to heaven as martyrs. Similarly, Guibert's depiction of Islam as a licentious religion was directly opposed to Christian virtue. He described Islam as a doctrine in which 'all of Christian morality was condemned by a thousand reproofs, and whatever examples of goodness and strength the Gospel offered were called cruel and harsh.'¹³⁰⁶ As Kangas noted, Guibert's account of Mohammed's life was also structured like a hagiography, but deliberately inverted to produce a parody of enemy with counterfeit miracles and a humiliating death which only his followers believed was a direct ascent to heaven.¹³⁰⁷ Luchitskaya has also drawn attention to oppositions in the terminology of the crusader accounts, between *milites* and *inimici Christi*, for example, to which could be added Ralph of Caen's opposition of *mahummicolae* to *christicolae*.¹³⁰⁸ Housley suggested by analogy with this that 'Saracen' polytheism thus served as the 'other' to Christian monotheism, and even provided 'a wicked "other"' for the saints. This may have been an influence upon the thinking of the authors who depicted Muslims as polytheist, but it implies a degree of deliberate distortion which the available evidence cannot prove.¹³⁰⁹ Blanks and Frassetto summed up the medieval image of Muslims as 'a photographic negative of the self-perception of an ideal Christian self-image, one that portrayed Europeans as brave, virtuous believers in the one true God and the one true faith.'¹³¹⁰

9.13 Interest in Muslims

An argument advanced by both Housley and Morton was that the authors lacked interest in accurately depicting Muslims, having been far

¹³⁰⁶ '...tota Christianitatis censura convitiis mille dampnatur et quicquid olim honestatis ac vigoris ex evangeliorum tenore constiterat, crudelis vocatur acerbitas...' Guibert of Nogent, 98 (34).

¹³⁰⁷ Kangas, 'Inimicus Dei et Sanctae Christianitatis?', 135.

¹³⁰⁸ Svetlana Luchitskaya, 'L'Image des musulmans dans les chroniques des croisades', *Le Moyen Age*, 105 (1999), 717-35.

¹³⁰⁹ Housley, 'The Crusades and Islam', 197-8.

¹³¹⁰ David R. Blanks and Michael Frassetto (eds.), *Western Views of Islam in Medieval and Early Modern Europe: Perception of Other* (Basingstoke and London, 1999), 3.

more concerned with the crusade as an instrument of salvation for the crusaders. Housley argued that the focus of the writers on the salvation of crusaders left the Muslim enemy comparatively marginalised in accounts of the crusades, and explains why the authors were content with so much imprecision and contradiction.¹³¹¹ Morton argued that rather than the defeat of Islam being central to the crusaders' purposes, they were primarily concerned with their own efforts to live up to the example of Christ. They saw themselves in the midst of a great war between God and the Devil, as part of which monasteries and churches were being built across Europe and the church was seeking to reform itself and rid itself of sin. This is the context Morton argues was crucial for contemporary attitudes towards non-Christians: to contemporary Christians, Turks and Arabs were marginal to this struggle, distant peoples to be feared for their limited means to resist 'the urgings of demonic will that hurled them against Christendom's ramparts', but pitied because their 'God-given humanity was deemed so deeply subverted that they had only a slight chance of escaping the clutches of evil.'¹³¹²

This is not a fair assessment of the attitude of the authors of the sources considered here. It is clear from the detail and variation in their accounts discussed above that the authors did indeed give a considerable amount of thought to Muslims. Some authors were more interested than others, certainly, but it is particularly telling that no author who used another written source which still survives adopted the depiction of Islam in his source without changes. This is especially true of the *Gesta* revisers. As discussed above, though they did not specifically acknowledge this it is clear that the depiction of Muslims was one of the reasons the revisers of the *Gesta Francorum* found it deficient. It is also true of Raymond of Aguilers, Peter Tudebode, and, assuming that he did use Fulcher's account, Ralph of Caen. It is even true of Fulcher of Chartres, whose interest in Muslims was certainly the most limited of the authors discussed here, but who nevertheless did not simply adopt the depiction of Islam in the *Gesta Francorum*, his source for much of the events of the First Crusade.

It is true that the interest of the authors in Muslims had its limits. They were concerned with being 'correct', as they saw it: they all presented different depictions of Islam for this reason. They were not, however,

¹³¹¹ Housley, 'The Crusades and Islam' 191-4, 196.

¹³¹² Morton, *Encountering Islam on the First Crusade*, 149-50, 270-1, 274-5.

concerned with presenting a full picture or questioning the truth behind the information they had (or assumed). The distinction is illustrated by Guibert of Nogent, who wrote that while he could not confirm the details of what he had heard about Mohammed, he was confident that his information bespoke a broader truth about the character of the prophet and his religion. Guibert acknowledged that his oral sources might not have had entirely accurate details about the life of Mohammed, but nevertheless it was 'correct' in the sense that it conveyed a sense of his 'evil', and nothing could have been invented that was worse than the truth.¹³¹³ Housley and Morton may indeed be correct that overriding concern with questions centred on the crusaders themselves are part of the reason why none of the authors but Guibert of Nogent sought to provide a systematic explanation of Islam, and why their interest in Muslims was ultimately limited to a degree. Other authors had additional preoccupations; Ralph was primarily concerned with the deeds of his heroes and Raymond was primarily concerned with the miracles and visions that attended the crusade, in particular the *inventio* of the Holy Lance.¹³¹⁴ Nevertheless their lack of interest in Islam should not be overstated.

Housley and Morton both applied their arguments to the depiction of Muslim religion in particular; yet as seen above it is here that the authors were most distinctive.¹³¹⁵ While there was often consensus on broad ideas such as Muslim polytheism and the applicability of the word *paganus*, these were not universal. The authors were even more divided on whether or not they depicted Muslims as idolators, or the extent to which they showed awareness of the identity of Mohammed. The authors wrote a great deal which was not true, and may indeed have made no effort to find the truth (this is not entirely provable, but it is true that more accurate information should not have been hard for many of the authors to come by). Nevertheless, all must have taken some interest in explaining the religion of Muslims to bring about the variety that is so clearly seen above. Even Baldric, who most closely relied on a classical pagan model clearly did this out of interest, contrary to Housley's assertion that this model was used by default because it was easy. Even if perhaps Baldric's interest was primarily in the intellectual challenge of constructing a model of classical pagan thought to apply to Muslims, he added all of this to the *Gesta*. He thus made

¹³¹³ Guibert of Nogent, 94.

¹³¹⁴ See Appendix I.

¹³¹⁵ Housley, 'The Crusades and Islam', 191-4, 196.

additional effort, whether he thought his knowledge of classical thought was the best evidence for how non-Christians thought or just used of his depiction of Muslim philosophy as a vehicle for his erudition. Arguments that the authors were interested primarily in questions of Christian salvation may explain why the authors did indeed marginalise an explanation of Islam and the character of Muslims in their account to some extent, but they underestimate the degree to which the authors were indeed concerned with providing distinctive and varying depictions of Islam to their readers.

10 Appendix I: Raymond of Aguilers, *Historia Francorum qui Ceperunt Iherusalem*

The *Historia Francorum qui Ceperunt Iherusalem* of Raymond of Aguilers is discussed in the conclusion of this thesis, providing a further point of comparison to the sources covered in detail in the chapters. Raymond had relatively little to say about Muslims, being apparently considerably more interested in the miracles and visions associated with the crusade – especially the *inventio* of the Holy Lance. He devoted particular attention to defending the authenticity of the latter. Raymond did include some unique (in the context of the crusading sources) and important ideas regarding Muslims, but these are too few in number to warrant an entire chapter devoted to his *Historia*. These were discussed in the conclusion; the essential information regarding authorship and dating of the *Historia* is presented here.

The *Historia Francorum* is almost exclusively the work of Raymond of Aguilers. Raymond also gave credit to a certain *Pontius Baladuno*, attributing to him the idea to write the *Historia*, but France regarded this as Pontius's only major contribution. From the consistency of style and standpoint, the work can be clearly seen to be that of one man. Pontius died at Arqa and the *Historia* was completed after end of crusade; the author must therefore have been Raymond.¹³¹⁶ Raymond gave relatively few personal details but did mention he was a canon of the cathedral church of St Mary of Le Puy. He was elevated to the priesthood during the second siege of Antioch, and seems to have become chaplain to Count Raymond of St Gilles at around that time. His full name is not given in the text of any manuscripts, only in titles added later in the tradition. *Aguilers* is probably a latinisation of Aguilhe, a village just north of Le Puy.¹³¹⁷ Raymond was an eyewitness, but certain passages indicate that he had access to and made use of the *Gesta Francorum*. France compared the texts closely, concluding that Raymond

¹³¹⁶ John France, *Critical Edition of the Historia Francorum of Raymond of Aguilers*, (Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Nottingham, 1967), iv-vii, 200. (hereafter Raymond of Aguilers).

¹³¹⁷ Raymond of Aguilers, ix-x.

borrowed from the *Gesta* less than had previously been believed, but did use it.¹³¹⁸

Raymond's account is incomplete, ending in the middle of an account of Count Raymond sending a Turkish convert named Bohemond into Ascalon. We never actually find out why; as France notes, it is clear from the context that something further was intended. France believed Raymond did complete the work, however, and that either his autograph or the archetype of all surviving copies was damaged.¹³¹⁹ Raymond began writing after the end of the crusade, referring to events after the capture of Jerusalem and the battle of Ascalon throughout his text.¹³²⁰ It is not possible to say exactly how long after, but France believed it was soon: Raymond seems to have believed that Count Raymond would indeed return to the Languedoc after being frustrated in his efforts to become ruler of Jerusalem. He did not refer to the acts of the count after the battle of Ascalon, or his role in the Crusade of 1101.¹³²¹ Fulcher of Chartres made some use of Raymond's account before 1105, which provides a more certain date by which the work must have been available, although internal evidence suggests it was earlier.¹³²²

¹³¹⁸ Raymond of Aguilers, ccxxvii-ccxxxvii. France discussed the textual relationship between the *Gesta Francorum* and the *Historia Francorum* in detail in J. 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 of the First Crusade' in John France and William G. Zajac (eds), *The Crusades and their Sources: Essays presented to Bernard Hamilton* (Farnham, 1998), 29-70.

¹³¹⁹ Raymond of Aguilers, cxxxvi-vii.

¹³²⁰ Raymond of Aguilers, cxxxviii, 249, 210.

¹³²¹ Raymond of Aguilers, cxxxviii-cxxxix.

¹³²² Raymond of Aguilers, cvvviv.

11 Appendix II: The Anonymous Continuation of the Chronicle of Frutolf of Michelsberg.

A final early source for the First Crusade is the material included in the Chronicle of Frutolf of Michelsberg and its continuators. Like the other sources described in these appendices, this chronicle included some important material about Muslims which is compared to the other sources in the conclusion of this thesis, but the quantity of this material (as opposed to its quality) is too low to warrant separate discussion. For reference, the essential details of authorship and date are presented as an appendix here.

Frutolf was prior of the abbey of Michelsberg in Bamberg. Among other works including a treatise on music and a liturgical treatise, Frutolf composed a world chronicle, recording events from creation to 1099. His death in 1103 is recorded in the necrologies of Michelsberg, Tegernsee and Fulda.¹³²³ Thomas McCarthy, who has recently produced a new translation, judged that the purpose of the chronicle was to provide a reference work which would give a monk historical context for works he would encounter as part of *lectio divina*; and also to offer moral instruction with both good and bad examples to emulate or avoid.¹³²⁴ Frutolf's chronicle was a compilation based on many sources, including a report on the success of the First Crusade taken directly from the letter of Daimbert of Pisa, Godfrey of Bouillon and Raymond of Toulouse to the pope, written in Laodicea in September 1099.¹³²⁵

Multiple continuations of Frutolf's *Chronicle* have obscured the question of authorship, the complicated nature of which has slowly been teased out in over a century of scholarship. From the mid-twelfth century

¹³²³ Thomas J. H. McCarthy, *Chronicles of the Investiture Contest: Frutolf of Michelsberg and his Continuators* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2014), 15-17. McCarthy's introduction is used for source criticism purposes here as it is the most up-to-date scholarship on the question of the authorship of the various continuations of Frutolf's *Chronicle*. The most recent edition of the Latin text, however, remains that of Schmale and Schmale-Ott, which is used for references in the conclusion of this thesis. *Frutolfi et Ekkehardi Chronica necnon Anonymi Chronica Imperatorum*, ed. and trans. Franz-Josef Schmale and Irene Schmale-Ott, (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1972).

¹³²⁴ McCarthy, *Chronicles of the Investiture Contest*, 19-20.

¹³²⁵ McCarthy, *Chronicles of the Investiture Contest*, 31-4. The 1106 Continuation of Frutolf's *Chronicle* reports that a copy of this letter was brought to Bamberg by Count Robert II of Flanders on his way home from the crusade.

until the late nineteenth century, the entire body of work – original chronicle and continuations – was attributed Abbot Ekkehard of Aura (†1126). Such was the opinion of Georg Waitz, who produced an edition of the Chronicle and its continuations for the *Monumenta Germanica Historica* attributed entirely to Ekkehard in 1884. He classified the manuscripts in six groups which he believed were all by Ekkehard at different stages in his career. In 1896 Harry Breslau recognised Frutolf as the author of the pre-1099 material, and attributed all of the post-1099 material to Ekkehard. In a series of studies between 1956 and 1971, Josef Schmale and Irene Schmale-Ott reclassified the continuations into four distinct recensions, most of which they attributed to Ekkehard, but also an anonymous *Kaiserchronik*. These recensions were a minor revision of Frutolf's *Chronicle* and a continuation to 1106 (Recension 1); a lost recension for which a dedicatory letter from Ekkehard to Henry V provides evidence (Recension 2); a *Chronicle* compiled by Ekkehard at the request of Abbot Erkembert of Corbey (Recension 3); and a final continuation extending the text to 1125, compiling the earlier works and the anonymous *Kaiserchronik*. They believed the anonymous *Kaiserchronik* (which corresponded to one of Waitz's six recensions) was a separate work composed in the circle of Bishop Otto of Bamberg, evincing very different political attitudes to those of Ekkehard in regard to the Investiture Contest.

Most recently, in an extensive introduction to his translation of the works, Thomas McCarthy partially accepted this classification of the works into four recensions, but cast doubt on the existence of the second recension and the idea that the earliest of them was the work of Ekkehard.¹³²⁶

McCarthy refers to Recension 1 as the *1106 Continuation*. Schmale and Schmale-Ott believed that it was written by Ekkehard, but McCarthy argues that content and palaeographical evidence suggest it may in fact have been written by the same author as the anonymous *Kaiserchronik*. The case for identifying the author as Ekkehard is indeed weak; there is nothing in the manuscript to identify him as the author and no firm evidence that he was ever at Michelsberg. The outlook of the *1106 Continuation* with regard to the Investiture Contest is distinct from the later recensions. The author did identify himself as a monk (probably of Michelsberg) and a participant in the

¹³²⁶ McCarthy, *Chronicles of the Investiture Contest*, 41-3. 'Recension 2' is no longer extant, but was proposed by Schmale and Schmale Ott on the basis of a dedicatory letter to Henry V written by Ekkehard; McCarthy believed instead that this letter was the prologut to Book V of Ekkehard's *Chronicle*.

1101 Crusade. His comment about reading a *libellus* on the history of the First Crusade in Jerusalem and references to conversations he had with churchmen may indicate he was already a cleric at the time, but the nature of his participation is otherwise unknown.¹³²⁷ Ekkehard of Aura *did* produce a *Chronicle*, after a request from Abbot Erkembert of Corvey. This *Chronicle* was a compilation of the works of Frutolf, the *1106 Continuation* and the *Kaiserchronik*, or possibly an intermediate source which had already abbreviated these. It was continued to 1116, and extracted the long crusading passages of the *1106 Continuation* and moved them to an appendix entitled *Hierosolimitana*.¹³²⁸ A dedicatory letter identifies Ekkehard as the author and Erkembert as the commissioner, and shows that Ekkehard stopped writing in 1116. All of the surviving manuscripts contain annals for 1117-1125, however, which is identical to the material in the *1125 Continuation* (Recension 4). The significance of this is not fully understood; the only available conclusion is Waitz's suggestion that the surviving manuscripts transmit a version that was somehow combined with the later continuation and not the version that was given to Erkembert.¹³²⁹ Finally, the *1125 Continuation* (Recension 4), the most widely disseminated, compiled Frutolf's *Chronicle* and the *1106 Continuation* from the creation of the world to 1105, from 1106-16 resembled the *Kaiserchronik* and Ekkehard's *Chronicle*, and from 1117 to 1125 was virtually identical to the same part of Ekkehard's *Chronicle*. The presumed author is also Ekkehard.¹³³⁰

The *Hierosolimitana* has been seen as Ekkehard's own account, but this is based on the belief that he also wrote *1106 Continuation*. If, as McCarthy argues, he did not, then *Hierosolimitana* is not substantially his work but his rearrangement of a previous account (with the addition of some short connecting passages, a 'confused' account of the marriage of Baldwin I and a concluding defence of the crusading movement). In turn this implies that Ekkehard's involvement with crusading movement was much less extensive than hitherto believed.¹³³¹ The vast majority of the material relevant to the crusades in the *Chronicle* and its continuations is thus the work of the *1106 Continuator*, as well as Frutolf's own reproduction of the letter of Daimbert of Pisa. The First Crusade and its aftermath filled most of the 1106 continuator's annals for the years 1099-1101. Frutolf added the

¹³²⁷ McCarthy, *Chronicles of the Investiture Contest*, 45-7.

¹³²⁸ McCarthy, *Chronicles of the Investiture Contest*, 66-9.

¹³²⁹ McCarthy, *Chronicles of the Investiture Contest*, 67.

¹³³⁰ McCarthy, *Chronicles of the Investiture Contest*, 74-5.

¹³³¹ McCarthy, *Chronicles of the Investiture Contest*, 73.

letter of Daimbert to his annal for 1098, interrupting his chronology; the continuator objected to this and moved the material from the letter concerning events in 1099 to his annal for that year. He also added material of his own, including especially an account of the Crusade of 1101 to which he was an eyewitness.¹³³² In this material, the 1106 continuator demonstrated a distinct attitude to Muslims, which is drawn on for comparative purposes in the conclusion of this thesis. In total, however, the amount of material is relatively small, and as such there is not enough concerning Muslims to warrant an entire chapter.

¹³³² McCarthy, *Chronicles of the Investiture Contest*, 45, 49-52.

12 Bibliography

12.1 Primary sources

Adso of Montier-en-Der, *De Ortu et Tempore Antichristi*, CCCM 45 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1976).

Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, ed. and trans. Susan B. Edgington (Oxford, 2007).

Anonymous, *Annales Romani*, ed. G. H. Pertz, Monumenta Germaniae Historica Scriptores V, 470-471.

Anonymous, *Chronicle of the Third Crusade: A Translation of the Itinerarium Peregrinorum et Gesta Regis Ricardi*, trans. Helen Nicholson (Farnham: Ashgate, 1997).

Anonymous, *Gesta Francorum et Aliorum Hierosolimitanorum*, ed. and trans. Rosalind Hill (London, 1962).

Anonymi Gesta Francorum et Aliorum Hierosolimitanorum, ed. Heinrich Hagenmeyer (Heidelberg, 1890). Anonymous, 'The Old French Continuation of William of Tyre', trans. Peter W. Edbury, in idem, *The Conquest of Jerusalem and the Third Crusade: Sources in Translation*, (Farnham, 1996), pp 11-145.

Anonymous, *Passio Tiemonis Archiepiscopi Iuvanensis*, MGH Scriptores II

Anonymous, *Ruodlieb: The Earliest Courtly Novel (after 1050)*, ed. and trans. Edwin H. Zeydel, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1959, rpr New York: AMS Press, 1969).

Ibn al-Athir, *al-Kamil f'il-Ta'rikh*, trans. D.S. Richards (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), 2 vols, I.13-14.

St Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, ed. B. Dombart and A. Kalb, CCSL 48 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1964).

- *Enchiridion ad Laurentium de Fide, Spe et Caritate*, ed. J. G. Krabinger (Tuebingen, 1861).

Baldric of Bourgueil, *The Historia Ierosolimitana of Baldric of Bourgueil*, ed. Steven Biddlecombe (Woodbridge, 2014).

- *Carmina*, ed. Jean-Yves Tilliette (Paris: Société d'édition Les Belles Lettres, 2002)

Fredegari, *Fredegari et Aliorum Chronica. Vitae Sanctorum. Monumenta Germaniae Historica Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum* 2.

- 'Die Chronikae des Sogenannte Fredegari', *Neues Archiv* 7, ed. Bruno Krusch.
- *The Fourth Book of the Chronicle of Fredegari*, ed. J. M. Wallace-Hadrill (London: Nelson, 1960).

Fulcher of Chartres, *Historia Hierosolymitana*, ed. Heinrich Hagenmeyer (Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitaetsbuchhandlung, 1913).

- *A History of the Expedition to Jerusalem, 1095-1127*, Trans. Frances Rita Ryan, Edited and with an introduction by Harold S. Fink, (Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1969).

Gilo of Paris, *The Historia Vie Hierosolimitanae of Gilo of Paris and a Second, Anonymous Author*, ed. and trans. C. W. Grocock and J. E. Siberry (Oxford, 1992).

Guido Maria Dreves (ed.) *Analectica Hymnica Medii Aevi* (Leipzig, 1895).

Guibert of Nogent, *Dei Gesta per Francos*, ed. R. B. C. Huygens, *Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Medievalis* 127a, (Turnhout: Brepols, 1996).

- *The Deeds of God through the Franks: A Translation of Guibert de Nogent's Gesta Dei per Francos*, trans. Robert Levine, (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 1997).
- Guibert of Nogent, *Monodies and On the Relics of Saints*, trans. Joseph McAlhany and Jay Rubenstein (London: Penguin, 2011).

Haimo of Fleury, *Historia Francorum*, MPL 139.

Heinrich Hagenmeyer, *Die Kreuzzugsbriefe aus dem Jahren 1088-1100* (Innsbruck, 1901).

- *Epistulae et Chartae ad Historiam Primi Belli Sacri Spectantes* (New York, 1973), 137.

Isidore of Seville, *The Etymologies of Isidore of Seville*, trans. Stephen A. Barney, W. J. Lewis, J. A. Beach and Oliver Berghof (Cambridge, 2011, first published 2006).

Jerome, *Commentarii in Daniele*, ed. F. Florie, *Corpus Christianorum series Latina* 75A (Turnhout: Brepols, 1964).

John of Salisbury, *Letters of John of Salisbury*, W. J. Miller and C. N. L. Brooke, (Oxford, 1979).

Jordanes, *De Origine Actibusque Getarum*,

<http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/iordanes1.html> (accessed 11 May 2016).

Flavius Josephus, *Antiquitatae Judaicum*

Marcus Junianus Justinus, *Abrégé des Histoires Philippiques de Trogue Pompée*, ed. and trans. Marie-Pierre Arnaud-Lindet, *Corpus Scriptorum Latinorum* (2003),

<http://www.forumromanum.org/literature/justin/texte41.html> (accessed 11 May 2016).

- *Epitome of the Philippic History of Pompeius Trogus*, trans. John Selby Watson (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1853).

Manegold of Lautenbach, *Liber ad Gebehardum*, MGH Libelli de lite 1.

Edmond Martène and Ursin Durand (eds), *Veterum Scriptorum Monumentum Amplissima Collectio*, 6 vols (Paris, 1724-33).

Thomas J. H. McCarthy, *Chronicles of the Investiture Contest: Frutolf of Micklesberg and his continuators*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2014).

Orderic Vitalis, *The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis*, ed. and trans. Marjorie Chibnall, 6 vols (OMT, 1969-80).

Ibn al-Qalansi, *The Damascus Chronicle of the Crusades*, ed. H. A. R. Gibb (London, 1932).

Ralph of Caen, *Tancredus*, ed. Edoardo D'Angelo (Turnhout, 2011), CCCM 231.

- *The Gesta Tancredi of Ralph of Caen: A History of the Normans on the First Crusade*, trans. Bernard S. Bachrach and David S. Bachrach (Aldershot, 2005).
- *Gesta Tancredi in Expeditione Hierosolymitana*, Recueil des Historiens des Croisades: Historiens Occidentaux, 6 vols (Paris, 1866), III.

Raymond of Aguilers, *Historia Francorum qui Ceperunt Iherusalem*, trans. John Hugh Hill and Laurita L. Hill (Philadelphia, 1968)

- *A Critical Edition of the Historia Francorum of Raymond of Aguilers*, ed. John France, (Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Nottingham, 1967).

Robert of Arbrissel, *Les deux vies de Robert D'Arbrissel, fondateur de Fontevraud: légendes, écrits et témoignages*, ed. Jacques Dalarun et al, (Turnhout: Brepols, 2006).

- Robert the Monk, *The Historia Iherosolimitana of Robert the Monk*, ed. D. Kempf and M. G. Bull (Woodbridge, 2013). *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade: Historia Iherosolimitana*, trans. Carol Sweetenham (Aldershot, 2005).
- *Historia Iherosolimitana*, in *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades: Historiens Occidentaux*, 4 vols (Paris, 1866), III.

Franz-Josef Schmale and Irene Schmale-Ott (ed. and trans.), *Frutolfi et Ekkehardi Chronica necnon Anonymi Chronica Imperatorum*, (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1972).

Gaius Iulius Solinus, *De Mirabilibus Mundi*, ed. Theodore Mommsen (1895), <http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/solinus5.html> (accessed 11 May 2016).

Cornelius Tacitus, *Historiae* 5.9, ed. Charles Dennis Fisher, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911). Accessed on www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.02.0079%3Abook%3D5%3Achapter%3D9 8 February 2016.

Peter Tudebode, *Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere*, trans. John Hugh Hill and Laurita L. Hill, (Philadelphia, 1974).

- *Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere*, in *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades: Historiens Occidentaux*, 4 vols (Paris, 1866) III.

William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Regum Anglorum* I, ed. and trans. R. A. B. Mynors, R. M. Thomson and M. Winterbottom, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998).

12.2 Secondary sources

Emily Albu, *The Normans in their Histories: Propaganda, Myth and Subversion* (Woodbridge, 2001).

- 'Probing the Passions of a Norman Crusader: The *Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum*,' in *Anglo-Norman*

Studies 27: Proceedings of the Battle Conference 2004, ed. John Gillingham (Woodbridge, Suffolk, 2005).

T. S. Asbridge, 'The "Crusader" Community at Antioch: The Impact of Interaction with Byzantium and Islam', in *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Sixth Series, vol. 9 (1999), 305-325.

David S. Bachrach, 'Conforming with the Rhetorical Tradition of Plausibility: Clerical Representation of Battlefield Orations against Muslims, 1080-1170', in *The International History Review* 26 (1) 2004, 1-19.

K. S. Beckett, *Anglo-Saxon perceptions of the Islamic World* (Cambridge, 2003).

Matthew Bennett, 'First Crusaders' Images of Muslims: The Influence of Vernacular Poetry?' in *Forum for Modern Language Studies* 22 (2) 1986, 101-116.

Homi Bhabha, 'The Other Question', *Screen* 24 (6) 1983, 18-36.

Joshua C. Birk, 'The Betrayal of Antioch: Narratives of Conversion and Conquest during the First Crusade' in *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 41 (3) (2011), 463-487.

David R. Blanks, 'Western Views of Islam in the Premodern Period: A Brief History of Past Approaches', in David R. Blanks and Michael Frassetto (eds.), *Western Views of Islam in Medieval and Early Modern Europe: Perception of Other* (Basingstoke and London, 1999), 11-54.

David R. Blanks and Michael Frassetto (eds.), *Western Views of Islam in Medieval and Early Modern Europe: Perception of Other* (Basingstoke and London, 1999).

Franz Blatt, 'Aus Der Werkstatt Eines Mitellateinischen Lexicographen', in *Philologus: Zeitschrift fuer Anike Literatur und ihre Rezeption* 115(1), April 1971, 11-15.

C. E. Bosworth, E. Van Donzel, B. Lewis and C. H. Pellat (eds), *The Encyclopedia of Islam*, (Leiden, 1979).

Yan Bourke, *Women on the Third Crusade: Identity, Roles and Perception* (Unpublished M. Phil. Thesis, Trinity College Dublin, 2012).

Anna-Dorothee von den Brincken, *Studien zur Lateinischen Weltchronistik Bis in das Zeitalter Ottos von Freising* (Duesseldorf: Michael Triltsch Verlag, 1957).

- 'Die Ausbildung Konventioneller Zeichen und Farbgebungen in der Universalkartographie des Mittelalters', *Archiv fuer Diplomatik, Schriftgeschichte, Siegel- und Wappenkunde* 16(JG) 1970, 325-349.

Marcus Bull, 'Robert the Monk and his Source(s)' in M. Bull and D. Kempf (eds) *Writing the Early Crusades: Text, Transmission and Memory*, (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2014), 127-139.

- 'The Relationship Between the *Gesta Francorum* and Peter Tudebode's *Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere*: The Evidence of a Hitherto Unexamined Manuscript (St. Catherine's College, Cambridge, 3)', in *Crusades* 11 (2012), 1-17.
- 'The Western narratives of the First Crusade', in David Thomas and Alex Mallett (eds) *Christian-Muslim Relations: A Bibliographical History*, 11 vols (Leiden, 2011), III.15-25.

John Burrow, *A History of Histories: Epics, Chronicles, Romances and Inquiries from Herodotus to the Twentieth Century* (London, 2007, rpr. 2007).

Léan Ní Chléirigh, *The Crusaders and their Enemies: The Latin Terminology of Group Identity in Chronicles of the First Crusade*, (Unpublished PhD Thesis, Trinity College Dublin, 2010).

- 'The Impact of the First Crusade on Western opinion towards the Byzantine Empire: The *Dei Gesta per Francos* of Guibert of Nogent and the *Historia Hierosolymitana* of Fulcher of Chartres', in Conor Kostick, ed. *The Crusades and the Near East*, (Abingdon, 2011), 161-188.
- Ní Chléirigh, 'Anti-Byzantine Polemic in the *Dei Gesta per Francos* of Guibert, Abbot of Nogent-Sous-Coucy', *Sailing to Byzantium: Papers from the First and Second Postgraduate Forums in Byzantine Studies*, (Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2009), 53-74.

Marco Cinnirella, 'Ethnic and National Stereotypes,' in C. C. Barfoot (ed.), *Beyond Pug's Tour: National and Ethnic Stereotyping in Theory and literary Practice* (Amsterdam, 1993), 37- 51.

Meredith Cohen and Justine Firnhaber-Baker (eds), *Difference and Identity in Francia and Medieval France*, (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010).

Penny J. Cole, 'Christians, Muslims and the "Liberation" of the Holy Land', in *The Catholic Historical Review* 84 (1) (1998), 1-10.

Norman Daniel, *Islam and the West: The Making of an Image*, (Oxford, 1993).

Susan B. Edgington, 'Albert of Aachen and the *Chansons de Geste*', in John France and William G. Zajac, *The Crusades and their Sources: Essays Presented to Bernard Hamilton*, (Farnham: Ashgate, 1998), 23-38

- 'Albert of Aachen Reappraised', in Alan V. Murray (ed.) *From Clermont to Jerusalem: The Crusades and Crusader Societies, 1095-1500*, (Turnhout: Brepols, 1998), 55-68.

Carl Erdmann, *Studien zur Briefsliteratur Deutschlands im elften Jahrhundert*, Schriften der MGH 1 (Stuttgart, 1938).

Justine Firnhaber-Baker, 'Introduction', in Meredith Cohen and Justine Firnhaber-Baker (eds), *Difference and Identity in Francia and Medieval France*, (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010), 1-12.

Jean Flori, *Chroniqueurs et Propagandistes: Introduction critique aux sources de la première croisade* (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 2010).

John France, 'The Use of the Anonymous *Gesta Francorum* in the Early Twelfth-Century Sources for the First Crusade', in Alan V. Murray (ed.) *From Clermont to Jerusalem: The Crusades and Crusader Societies 1095-1500*, (Turnhout: Brepols, 1998), 29-42.

- '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 of the First Crusade' in John France and William G. Zajac (eds), *The Crusades and their Sources: Essays presented to Bernard Hamilton* (Aldershot, 1998), 29-70.

Michael Frassetto, 'The Image of the Saracen as Heretic in the Sermons of Ademar of Chabannes' in David R. Blanks and Michael Frassetto (eds.), *Western Views of Islam in Medieval and Early Modern Europe: Perception of Other* (Basingstoke and London, 1999), 83-96.

John Joseph Gavigan, 'The Syntax of the *Gesta Francorum*', *Language* 19 (3), Language Dissertation no. 37 (1943), 10-102.

H. Glaesener, 'Raoul de Caen: historien et écrivain', *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 46 (1951), 5-21.

Antonia Gransden, *Historical Writing in England c. 550-1307*, (London and New York, 1996).

Bernard Hamilton, 'Knowing the Enemy: Western Understanding of Islam at the Time of the Crusades' in *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 7(3) 1997, 373-387.

David Hanlon, 'Islam and Stereotypical Discourse in Medieval Castile and Leon', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 30(3) 2000, 479-504.

Rosalind Hill, 'The Christian view of the Muslims at the time of the First Crusade' in P. M. Holt (ed.) *The Eastern Mediterranean Lands in the Period of the Crusades*, (Warminster, 1977), 1-8

Norman Housley, 'The Crusades and Islam' in *Medieval Encounters* 13 (2007), 189-208.

Natasha R. Hodgson, 'Lions, Tigers, and Bears: Encounters with Wild Animals and Bestial Imagery in the Context of Crusading to the Latin East', in *Viator* 44(1) (2013), 65-94.

C. Meredith Jones, 'The Conventional Saracen of the Songs of Geste', in *Speculum* 17(2) 1942, 201-225.

Einar Joranson, 'The problem of the Spurious Letter of Emperor Alexius to the Count of Flanders', *American Historical Review* 55 (1950), 811-832.

Margaret A. Jubb, 'Enemies in the Holy War, but brother in chivalry: the Crusaders' view of their Saracen opponents', in Hans van Dijk and Willem Noomen (eds) *Aspects de l'Épopée Romane: Mentalités, Idéologies, Intertextualités* (Groeningen, 1995), 251-259.

- 'The Crusaders' perceptions of their opponents' in Helen J. Nicholson (ed.) *Palgrave Advances in the Crusades* (Basingstoke and New York, 2005), 225-244.

Rana Kabbani, *Europe's Myths of Orient: Devise and Rule* (London, 1988).

Sini Kangas, 'Inimicus Dei et Sanctae Christianitatis? Saracens and their Prophet in twelfth-century crusade propaganda and western travesties of Muhammad's life', in Conor Kostick (ed.), *The Crusades and the Near East* (Abingdon, 2011), 131-160.

Axel Kelly, *Charting the Development of Crusading Ideology: An Examination of Proto-Crusade Primary Sources* (Unpublished PhD Thesis, Trinity College, 2015).

Jesse Keskiaho, 'On the Transmission of Peter Tudebode's *De Hierosolymitano Itinere* and Related Chronicles, With a Critical Edition of *Descriptio Sanctorum Locorum Hierusalem*.' *Revue d'Histoire des Textes* 10 (2015), 69-102.

Adam Knobler, 'Pseudo-Conversions and Patchwork Pedigrees: The Christianisation of Muslim Princes and the Diplomacy of Holy War', in *Journal of World History* 7(2) 1996, 181-197.

Peter Knoch, 'Kreuzzug und Siedlung. Studien zum Aufruf der Magdeburger Kirche von 1108', *Jahrbuch fuer Geschichte Mittel- und Ostdeutschlands*, 23 (1974).

Conor Kostick, *The Language of Ordo in the Early Histories of the First Crusade*, (Unpublished PhD Thesis, Trinity College Dublin, 2005).

- *The Social Structure of the First Crusade* (Leiden, 2008).
- 'A further discussion on the authorship of the *Gesta Francorum*', in *Reading Medieval Studies* 35 (2009), 1-14.
- 'Courage and Cowardice on the First Crusade 1096-1099', *War in History* 20:1 (2013), 32-49.
- *The Siege of Jerusalem: Crusade and Conquest in 1099* (London: Continuum, 2009).

A. C. Krey, 'A neglected passage in the *Gesta* and its bearings on the literature of the First Crusade,' in *The Crusades and other historical essays presented to Dana C. Monroe*, ed. L. J. Paetow, (New York, 1928), 57-78.

Gerhart Ladner, *The Idea of Reform: Its impact on Christian thought and action in the age of the Fathers* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1959).

Robert E. Lerner, 'Antichrists and Antichrist in Joachim of Fiore', *Speculum* 60(3) (1985), 553-570.

Robert Levine, 'Satiric Vulgarity in Guibert de Nogent's *Gesta Dei Per Francos*', *Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric* 7(3) (1989), 261-273.

Svetlana Lutchitskaya, 'Barbarae Nationes: Les peuples musulmans dans les chroniques de la Première Croisade' in Michel Balard (ed) *Autour de la Première Croisade* (Paris, 1996), 99-107.

- 'The Muslim Political World as Mirrored in the First Crusade Chronicles', in Adrian J. Boas (ed), *The Crusader World*, (Oxford: Routledge, 2016) [ebook], 1411.0 - 1451.8.

Jonathon Lyons, *Islam through Western Eyes: From the Crusades to the War on Terrorism* (New York, 2012).

Thomas F. Madden, 'Rivers of Blood: An Analysis of One Aspect of the Crusader Conquest of Jerusalem in 1099.' *Revista Chilena de Estudios Medievales* 1 (2012), 25-37.

Max Manitius, *Geschichte der Lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, Handbuchs der Altertumswissenschaft, III Vols, (Munich, C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1923).

Robert Mantran, 'A l'aube de la Première Croisade: le face-à-face des chrétiens et des musulmans' in *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), 339-344.

R. I. Moore, *The Formation of a Persecuting Society: authority and Deviance in Western Europe 950-1250*, (Second edition: Oxford, 2007 (originally published: 1987)).

Joe Ann Hoeppner Moran Cruz, 'Popular Attitudes towards Islam in Medieval Europe', in David R. Blanks and Michael Frassetto (eds.), *Western Views of Islam in Medieval and Early Modern Europe: Perception of Other* (Basingstoke and London, 1999), 55-82.

Colin Morris, 'The *Gesta Francorum* as Narrative History', in *Reading Medieval Studies* 19 (1993), 55-71.

- 'Picturing the Crusades: The Uses of Visual Propaganda, c. 1095-1250' in France and Zajac (eds) *The Crusades and their Sources: Essays Presented to Bernard Hamilton* (Aldershot, 1998), 195-216.
- 'Peter the Hermit and the Chroniclers' in *The First Crusade*, ed. J. Phillips (Manchester, 1997), 24.

Nicholas Morton, *Encountering Islam on the First Crusade* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016).

- 'Encountering the Turks: The First Crusaders' Foreknowledge of their enemy; Some Preliminary Findings.' In Simon John and Nicholas Morton (eds), *Crusading and Warfare in the Middle*

Ages: Realities and Representations. Essays in honour of John France (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014), 47-68

- Nicholas Morton, 'The Saljuk Turks' Conversion to Islam: The Crusading Sources', *Al-Masaq* 27(2) 2015, 109-118.

Dana Carleton Munro, 'The Western Attitude toward Islam during the Period of the Crusades', *Speculum* 6(3) 1931, 329-343.

- 'A Crusader' *Speculum* 7(3) 1932, 321-335.

A.V. Murray (ed.), *The Crusades, an Encyclopedia*, 4 vols, (Oxford, 2006) 4.

- 'Coroscane: Homeland of the Saracens in the *Chanson de Geste* and the historiography of the Crusades', *Aspects de l'épopée romaine. Mentalités, idéologies, intertextualités*, ed. H. Van Dijk and W. Noonan (Groeningen, 1995), 177-84.

James Naus, 'The *Historia Iherosolimitana* of Robert the Monk and the Coronation of Louis VI', in Marcus Bull and Damien Kempf (eds.), *Writing the Early Crusades: Text, Transmission and Memory*, (Woodbridge, 2014), 105-115.

Samu Niskanen, 'The origins of the *Gesta Francorum* and two related texts: their textual and literary character', *Sacris Erudiri* 51 (2012), 287-316.

Hans Oehler, 'Studien zu den *Gesta Francorum*', *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch* 6 (1970), 58-97.

Nicholas L. Paul, 'Crusade, memory and regional politics in twelfth-century Amboise', *Journal of Medieval History*, 31:2 (2005), 127-141.

Jonathan Phillips, *The Second Crusade: Expanding the Frontiers of Christendom* (Yale, New Haven and London, 2007).

Richard Matthew Pollard, 'One Other on Another: Petrus Monachus' *Revelationes* and Islam', in Meredith Cohen and Justine Firnhaber-Baker(eds), *Difference and Identity in Francia and Medieval France* (Farnham, 2010), 25-42.

Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The Crusades, Christianity and Islam*, (New York, 2008).

- *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading* (London, 2009 (2nd edition, first published 1986)).

- 'Crusading as an act of Love' in Constance Hoffman Berman (ed.), *Medieval Religion: New Approaches* (London: Routledge, 2005), 49-67.

Jay Rubenstein, 'Guibert of Nogent, Albert of Aachen and Fulcher of Chartres: Three Crusade Chronicles Intersect' in Marcus Bull and Damien Kempf (eds.), *Writing the Early Crusades: Text, Transmission and Memory*, (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2014), pp 24-37.

- *Guibert of Nogent: Portrait of a Medieval Mind* (New York and London, 2002).
- 'Cannibals and Crusaders', *French Historical Studies* 31 (4) 2008, 525-52
- 'What was the *Gesta Francorum* and who was Peter Tudebode?', *Revue Mabillon* 16 (2005), 157-204.

Jean Seznec, *The Survival of the Pagan Gods: The Mythological Tradition and its Place in Renaissance Humanism and Art*, trans. Barbara F. Sessions, (Princeton, 1995).

Beryl Smalley, *The Becket Conflict and the Schools: A Study of Intellectuals in Politics* (Oxford, 1973).

- 'Sallust in the Middle Ages', in *Classical Influences on European Culture, A.D. 500-1500*, ed. R. R. Bolgar (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971), 165-76.

R. W. Southern, *Western Views of Islam in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, MA, 1962).

Carol Sweetenham, 'Crusaders in a Hall of Mirrors: The Portrayal of Saracens in Robert the Monk's *Historia Iherosolimitana*', in Sarah Lambert and Helen Nicholson (eds) *Languages of Love and Hate: Conflict, Communication and Identity in the Medieval Mediterranean* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2012), 126-146 [Dr Sweetenham kindly provided an electronic copy of this article; however the pagination as cited does not tally with that of the printed volume of essays itself].

Nicholas Thomas, 'Colonial Conversions: Difference, Hierarchy and History in Early-Twentieth Century Evangelical Propaganda', *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 34(2) 1992, 366-89.

R. M. Thomson, 'William of Malmesbury and the Latin Classics Revisited', *Proceedings of the British Academy* 129 (2005), 383-393.

Susanna Throop, 'Combat and Conversion: Interfaith dialogue in twelfth-century crusading narratives.' in *Medieval Encounters* 13 (2007), 310-325.

- *Crusading as an act of Vengeance*, 1095-1216, (Farnham, 2011).

John V. Tolan, 'Muslims as Idolaters in Chronicles of the First Crusade' in David R. Blanks and Michael Frassetto (eds), *Western Views of Islam in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, (Basingstoke and London, 1999), 97-117.

- *Saracens: Islam in the Medieval European Imagination* (New York, 2002).

Christopher Tyerman, 'Were There Any Crusades in the Twelfth Century?' in idem (ed.) *The Invention of the Crusades* (London, 1998), 8-29.

Claire Weeda, 'Ethnic Stereotyping in Twelfth-Century Paris', in Meredith Cohen and Justine Firnhaber-Baker (eds), *Difference and Identity in Francia and Medieval France* (Farnham, 2010), 115-138.

David Whitton, 'The *Annales Romani* and Codex Vaticanus Latinus 1984', *Bulletino dell'Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio evo e Archivio Muratoriano* 84 (1972-1973), 125-143.

Kenneth Baxter Wolf, 'Crusade and narrative: Bohemond and the *Gesta Francorum*' in *Journal of Medieval History* 17 (1991), 207-216.