

Western Views of Islam in Medieval and Early Modern Europe

Perception of Other

Edited by

*David R. Blanks
and Michael Frassetto*

St. Martin's Press
New York



CHAPTER FOUR

Muslims as Pagan Idolaters in Chronicles of the First Crusade

John V. Tolan

In the *Chronicles of the Archbishops of Salzburg* we find the story of Archbishop Thiemo, who died in the crusade of 1101.¹ Thiemo, we are told, along with Duke Welf of Bavaria, led a group of Bavarians and Swabians toward Jerusalem (already under Christian rule). As they approached the holy city, these crusaders were surrounded and defeated "by an innumerable multitude of gentiles (*ethnici*)."² These pagans were led by three brothers from Corosan "who in their ferocity were more tyrannical and in their cult more pagan than [the Roman Emperor] Decius"—an emperor best known for his brutal persecutions of Christians. These "pagans" were angered by the recent victory of the crusaders and eager to wreak vengeance on Christian pilgrims.³ They led Thiemo and other pilgrims away into slavery. One day their king discovered that Thiemo had been trained as a goldsmith, so he asked him to repair a golden idol. Thiemo asked for a hammer and approached the idol. He addressed the demon inhabiting the idol, ordering it in the name of God to leave the statue.³ When the demon uttered blasphemies, Thiemo smashed the idol with his hammer. This led to his martyrdom: he was thrown into prison, brought out the next day, put on an ass, whipped, and brought to an arena before the throngs; there the king accused him of sacrilege. Thiemo replied that the idols were not gods but demons,

and preached that the king should desist from the worship of Saturn, Jove, and the obscene Priapus. The king responded by ordering that all Thiemo's fingers be cut off, as well as those of his followers, and that their limbs then be lopped off. As the king drank the martyrs' blood, Thiemo commended his soul unto God, and the crowd saw a choir of angels descend to take up the souls of the martyrs. Nearby, we are told, was an idol named Machmit, whom the pagans were wont to consult as an oracle. A demon began to speak through Machmit, saying that this had been a great victory for the Christians, "whose glory grows against us daily."⁴ He warned the pagans not to attempt to stop the Christians from celebrating the saint's funeral. Thiemo was buried in a church and miracles ensued: he healed the blind, deaf, lepers, and possessed, both among Christians and among pagans. Woe to those who attempt to violate his sanctuary; they face immediate death. For this reason, we are told, the pagans held Saint Thiemo in respect and did not pester any of his pilgrims.

The story of Thiemo gives us a vivid portrait of the enemy that the crusaders went off to fight, as they imagined him, or at least as their chroniclers imagined them. The picture shocks us both for its hostility and for its wild inaccuracy. If earlier medieval texts imagined that the Saracens were pagans,⁵ none of them developed the caricature in such detail, none portrayed such technicolor horror: a king who worships golden idols, seeks out Christian pilgrims, and delights in ripping their limbs off and drinking their blood. This portrait is pieced together with images from the stories of the early martyrs of the church, stories very familiar to clerical authors through the daily monastic reading of the martyrologies.⁶

While few of the Latin chroniclers of the First Crusade will imagine their Saracen enemies in as quite vividly hostile terms, they will not present them in ways that contradict this malicious caricature. Almost all of these chroniclers describe Saracens as pagans, and most of them present the crusaders' victory as part of the age-old struggle with paganism, as part of the culminating events that will result in the eradication of paganism and—for some—the Second Coming of Christ. Their idols are at times called Jupiter, Apollo, or Mahomet; chroniclers of the First Crusade occasionally refer to their adversaries as "Mahumicolae": "Muhammad-worshippers."⁷ The terms "Muslim," "Islam," and their equivalents are never used.

To make sense of the crusade, the twelfth-century chronicler placed it in the context of the age-old struggle between Christianity and paganism. Earlier writers described Muslims as pagans, at times basing their descriptions on biblical or Roman descriptions of pre-Muslim Arabs. Only at the turn of the twelfth century, however, is this supposed "paganism" described in vivid detail, its fictive contours clearly delineated. The epic descriptions of battles against the Saracens demanded a vivid and colorful enemy, one against

whom war was justified and victory was glorious. Fighting against pagans, crusaders could claim to be wreaking vengeance for the pagans' crucifixion of Christ and their usurpation of His city; when they fell in battle, they could claim the mantle of martyrdom. The fight against paganism had a long history, one in which Christianity was sure to emerge victorious.

Many scholars have described how the First Crusade represented a radical new form of piety, a strange mixture of pilgrimage and military ardor: humbly submitting to God's will while aggressively attacking one's enemy.⁸ The paradoxical nature of the crusade is perhaps best captured in the image of the barefoot knights in procession around the walls of Jerusalem, days before they capture it. In the words of crusader and chronicler Raymond d'Aguilers:

it was ordered that . . . the priests prepare themselves for the procession, with crosses and relics of the saints and that the knights and all strong men follow them with trumpets and banners and barefoot, and that the armed men should march barefoot.⁹

If this strange hybrid, this armed pilgrimage, needed justification in the eyes of Christians back home in Europe, its success was a resounding vindication: clearly the Christian knights had been right to cry out "Deus lo volt"; clearly it was God's will that the crusaders take Jerusalem back from the "pagans." Yet the novelty of the endeavor, and its very success, forced Christian writers to contemplate how the crusade fit into the divine plan. If the crusade is indeed a working out of God's will, how does one fit it into the context of divine history?

A number of participants in the First Crusade wrote firsthand accounts of the crusade that were soon read and reworked by monastic writers in Europe.¹⁰ The anonymous *Gesta Francorum*, believed by many scholars to be the earliest of these chronicles, consistently refers to the crusaders' foes as "pagans" and twice has its leaders swear oaths by their God "Machomet."¹¹ Yet, other than this, it has little to say about who these pagans are, what their religious rituals are, or why the Christians are justified in taking land from them. Other Christian writers felt a need to explain the crusades, to place them in Christian history and eschatology as a key part of the long, hard fight against paganism: a fight, however, that the Bible promises will in the end result in Christian victory.

Only one of the chroniclers of the First Crusade, Guibert of Nogent, acknowledges that the Saracens are monotheists and that Muhammad is their prophet, not their God. For the rest, it is pagans that the crusaders went off to fight, in order to take Jerusalem back from them and to wreak vengeance on them for the crucifixion—as well as for their subsequent

blasphemies against Christ. Time and again, the chroniclers of the First Crusade cite the eradication of paganism as one of the key motives behind the crusade. Raymond d'Aguilers, for example, says that by God's mercy His army "stood forth over all paganism."¹² Raoul de Caen, in the preface to his *Gesta Tancredi* (which is both a narrative of the crusade and a poetic eulogy of the crusader Tancred), says that his subject is "that pilgrimage, that glorious struggle, which added to its inheritance our holy Mother Jerusalem, which extinguished idolatry and restored the faith."¹³

To understand how the image of Islam as paganism helps justify the crusade, let us look in detail at one account written by a participant in the First Crusade, Petrus Tudebodus. Tudebodus asserts (as do most of the chroniclers of the crusade) that the crusaders' amazing victory against enormous odds was the work of God, not man: that Christ awarded the fidelity and valor of His army by granting it victory over innumerable pagans. This victory over paganism is part of the divine plan and a signal that the end of time is near. Tudebodus frequently compares the army of God with the Apostles, implicitly and explicitly: both spread the Christian faith, fought paganism, and received the palm of martyrdom. To a modern reader these appear as drastically different behaviors: preaching the Gospel and passively accepting execution on the one hand, waging war on the other. Tudebodus will present these as essentially similar acts: the crusaders are the new apostles and martyrs, ushering in a new age for Christ and His church.

This purpose is clear from the first sentences of Tudebodus's *History*:

In the year of our lord [1095], 14 when that end grew near which the Lord each day shows to his faithful, and which He particularly shows in the Gospel, saying "If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me" [Matt. 16:24] there was a great commotion in all the regions of Gaul. If anyone wished zealously and with pure heart and mind to follow God and to faithfully bear the cross after him, he should not hesitate to quickly set out on the way to the Holy Sepulchre (via Sancti Sepulchri).¹⁵

Tudebodus here puts the crusade in an eschatological context: the end, he says, was drawing near (though he is careful to avoid saying exactly *how* near); he connects that end with the injunction to take up one's cross and follow Christ. God's command, which before could be understood only in its spiritual sense, was now literally being fulfilled before Tudebodus's eyes, as crusaders sewed on the cloth crosses that symbolized their pilgrimage vow, and literally followed Christ by setting off for His city.¹⁶

Throughout his *History*, Tudebodus in this way describes the crusaders in language taken straight from the Gospels, implicitly likening them to the

Apostles and martyrs. He has Pope Urban II, at the Council of Clermont, say that "anyone who wishes to save his soul should not hesitate humbly to set off on the way of the Lord and the Holy Sepulchre [via Domini et Sancti Sepulchri]."¹⁷ He puts in Urban's mouth words of scripture, urging his listeners to follow the injunctions that Christ gave to his disciples:

Brothers, it is proper that you suffer many things in Christ's name, that is to say misery, poverty, persecution, poverty, illnesses, nudity, hunger, thirst and other things of this kind, as He himself said to his apostles: "It is proper that you suffer many things in my name. And do not be ashamed to speak before men; I myself will give you a mouth and eloquence and a great reward will follow you."¹⁸

Won over by Urban's eloquence, Tudebodus tells us, these new apostles flock to Constantinople from all over Europe.

Those who die will be described as martyrs, and here again descriptions of their martyrdom—like that of Thimo—will often be modeled on those of the Apostles and early martyrs of the ancient church, who refused to offer sacrifice to Roman idols and were subsequently put to death, and whose death stories (*passiones*) were part of the daily reading of these clerical writers.¹⁹

At Nicaea, Tudebodus tells us, a bishop preaches to a band of crusaders besieged by Turks, again using words from the Gospels that Jesus directed to the Apostles:

Be everywhere strong in the faith of Christ, and fear not those who persecute you. As the Lord said: Fear not those who kill the body; indeed they cannot kill the soul.²⁰

This "persecution" lasts eight days, after which the Turks take the castle. We are told, in language redolent of the martyrologies, that "Those who refused to renounce God were given the capital sentence . . . these first happily accepted martyrdom for Christ's name."²¹ Throughout the remainder of his narrative, Tudebodus emphasizes that the Christian dead are martyrs.²²

If the crusaders are the new apostles, the Saracens play the familiar role of the pagan Roman persecutors: their paganism and barbarism are a necessary counterpart to the steadfast devotion of the crusaders/apostles. They are "Our enemy and God's . . . saying diabolical sounds in I know not what language."²³ The geographical and ethnic distinctions between these enemies are confused; at one point Tudebodus describes a castle "full of innumerable pagans: Turks, Saracens, Arabs, Publicans, and other pagans."²⁴ Many of the place names are familiar from the Bible; Tudebodus and other chroniclers associate the pagans with the places where Antichrist is born and raised: Babylon and Corosan.²⁵

Nothing illustrates Tudebodus's attitudes better than the scenes that come from his imagination, those he could not have seen. In the midst of a battle outside Antioch, for example, when the momentum turns in favor of the crusaders, Tudebodus tells us, "The women of the city came to the windows of the wall; the Christian women, seeing the miserable fate of the Turks, secretly clapped their hands, as was their custom."²⁶ They clapped their hands to show that they were on the Christians' side; they did so "secretly" so that their glee would not be noticed by the Turks inside the city or out. What someone secretly clapping her hands looks like I don't know; but if her clapping could not be seen by the Turks, it presumably could not be seen by Tudebodus below, in the heat of battle. The scene is imagined by Tudebodus, and is meant to dramatize the solidarity (real or imagined) between the Christians inside and their self-appointed liberators outside.

In many of Tudebodus's fictive scenes, we see most clearly how he conceives of his pagan enemies: how they worship, how they see the Christian crusaders, how they see (or fail to see) their place in God's plan. Other chroniclers also indulge in such imaginary dialogues in the enemy camp; indeed, some of these passages are almost identical to those in Tudebodus.²⁷ Unrestrained by facts, these authors can let their imaginations paint a vivid caricature of their adversaries. Tudebodus, in particular, uses these scenes to show the continuity of pagan resistance to Christianity—and to the crusader/apostles; yet he has the pagans acknowledge that their days are numbered, that their ultimate defeat at the hands of God and his warriors is swiftly approaching.

Tudebodus, like the anonymous hagiographer of Thiemo, portrays the deaths of crusaders in terms taken from the martyrologies and *passiones*. This is easiest to do, of course, for the deaths he did not witness: he can imagine them as they *should* have happened. Rainaldus Porchetus, a crusader taken captive by the Turks of Antioch, Tudebodus tells us, is taken to the top of the city walls and told to implore the crusaders to pay a large ransom for his return. Instead Rainaldus urges the crusaders to persist, telling them to value his own life as nothing and that the city's defenders will be unable to hold out much longer. This advice earns him the praise of his comrades and death at the hands of his captors. After Rainaldus' exhortation to the crusaders from atop the walls of Antioch, the "Amiralius" who has him brought back down into the city bids him:

Renounce your god whom you worship and in whom you believe, and believe in Malphumet and our other gods. If you do this, we will give you anything you ask: gold and silver, horses and mules, and many other trappings (*ornamenta*) which you might desire. And we shall give you wives and land, and much honor.²⁸

Rainaldus responds by praying fervently to God, the angry Turkish admiral has his head cut off, and angels take the martyr's soul up to heaven. Still furious, the admiral has all the pilgrims (i.e., crusader captives) in the city rounded up, stripped naked, and burned in a mass martyrdom. The crusade, for Tudebodus, makes historical, theological, and moral sense as part of a continuing struggle against paganism; the response of the good Christian—in the eleventh or twelfth century as in the third or fourth—is to resist the temptations of this world and steadfastly to face martyrdom.

Martyrs, of course, are saints who produce miracles. While the *Passion of Thiemo* described standard miracles of cures and protection, Tudebodus's martial martyrs produce a military miracle. After the Christians capture Antioch, they find themselves besieged in the city by a Muslim relief army led by Kerbogha, the Atabeg of Mosul (whom Tudebodus calls Curbaan). One night during the siege, Tudebodus tells us, a priest named Stephen has a dream in which Christ comes to him, complains of the sins of the crusaders (who, in particular, are sleeping with pagan women) and urges penance on them. In return, Christ promises, he will send to the aid of the crusaders "blessed George, and Theodore, and Demetrius, and all the pilgrims who have been killed in this voyage to Jerusalem."²⁹ Sure enough, when the battle ensued:

innumerable armies came out of the mountains, on white horses, with white insignia (*vexilla*). Seeing this army, [the crusaders] did not know who they were, until they recognized that this was the aid from Christ, as He ordered them according to the priest Stephen. Their leaders were saint George, and blessed Demetrius, and blessed Theodore.³⁰

The martyrs get to have their cake and eat it too: through death at the hands of pagans, they earn the palm of martyrdom; through a military miracle, they come back to rout the pagan host. And what more appropriate general for this celestial army than the knightly Saint George, who himself, as Tudebodus reminds us elsewhere, also "in the name of Christ accepted martyrdom from perfidious pagans?"³¹ While intervention by celestial armies is a common topos in both Muslim and Christian accounts of the crusades, only Tudebodus uses it to prove the sanctity of the new martyrs.³²

The most vivid depictions of the pagan foe come from the scenes imagined inside the enemy camp. Just before this battle, Tudebodus describes a military council in which Curbaan proclaims that the Christian soldiers plan to expel the pagans from Asia Minor and Syria, beyond Corosan and the (fictive) Amazon river.³³ He dictates a letter, describing his plight to "the Caliph our bishop, our king and sultan and most strong soldier" in Corosan, swearing "by Machomet and by the names of all the gods," that he will defeat the Christians and conquer all the lands from Antioch to Apulia.³⁴

At this point Tudebodus indulges in high melodrama. He has Curbaan's mother arrive in tears, begging him, "in the names of the gods," not to fight with the Franks.³⁵ When Curbaan replies that his army is bigger and stronger than that of the Christians, his mother retorts that their God fights for them; as proof she cites King David (i.e., the Psalms): "disperse the nations that do not invoke Your name."³⁶ She goes on to explain that

These Christians are called the sons of Christ, and by the mouths of prophets are called "children of promise" [Galatians 4:28] and by the apostles "heirs of Christ" [Romans 8:17]; they are those to whom Christ already granted his promised inheritance, saying: "From where the sun rises to the west will be your borders; no one will dare to stand against you."³⁷

If Curbaan obstinately insists on fighting God's army, he will lose, she says in tears, and he will die within a year. Here we have a pagan woman who cites scripture to try to dissuade her son from fighting against God's army, a prominent pagan testifying to the superior power of Christ over the pagan gods. When Curbaan is still not convinced, she brings in arguments from pagan wisdom:

Dearest son, over a hundred years ago it was discovered in our pages, and in all books of the pagans, that the Christian nation would be over us and would everywhere defeat us, and reign over pagans, and our nation would everywhere be subject to them; but I do not know if it is to be now or rather in the future. And I, sorrowing, did not desist from following you to Aleppo, that beautiful city, where, pointing and acutely investigating, I looked at the stars in the sky, and sagaciously deliberating and with sedulous mind observing the planets, and the twelve signs of the zodiac, and innumerable lots, in all these things I saw that the Christian nation would be victorious everywhere.³⁸

Curbaan, incredulous, says that he thought Bohemund and Tancred were the crusaders' gods, and that they each consume 2,000 cows and 4,000 pigs for lunch. His mother responds that they are mere mortals, but that the God who protects them is the invincible creator of heaven and earth, whose will no one may oppose. But Curbaan will not be deterred, and his mother leaves in grief.³⁹

This melodramatic scene has been largely overlooked by historians of the crusades: it is, after all, useless if we seek to reconstruct the events of the crusade. It is crucial, however, for seeing how Tudebodus makes sense of the crusade: unobstructed by mere facts, he can construct the enemy he desires. The passage brings together several key elements in his justification of the crusade. One is the apocalyptic element: the time has come for Christians to take back the holy land and defeat pagans everywhere. This apocalypticism is evident

not only through careful exegesis of the prophets, but even through the pagan arts of astrology and necromancy. In addition, Curbaan's mother emphasizes God's protective relationship with His army. She describes them in biblical language, as both the new apostles coming into Christ's inheritance and as the army of Israel, whose enemies the Lord disperses.

A key scene in all of the chronicles of the First Crusade, of course, is the siege of Jerusalem itself, in which several chroniclers describe a confrontation between Christ and Machomet. When the Christians laid siege to Jerusalem, as we saw above, they made a penitential pilgrimage around the city, armed and barefoot. According to Tudebodus, when the Muslims of Jerusalem beheld the procession, they brought onto the city wall an idol of Machomet on a lance (or perhaps some sort of stick—*asta* is the Latin word), covered with a cloth.⁴⁰ How the Christians knew this was Machomet is not explained. The crucifix, confronted with the idol of Machomet, began to bleed miraculously. Here the idol Machomet combats Christ on the crucifix, and the crucifix will win. The Amiravissus (apparently the ruler of Jerusalem) subsequently laments the imminent fall of his city and twice invokes Machomet and the other gods.⁴¹

Far from being gratuitous window dressing, Petrus Tudebodus's descriptions of Saracen paganism form a key element in his justification of the crusade. Christianity has from the beginning been locked in a struggle with paganism: now the time has come—predicted both in scripture and in the stars—when Christ will vanquish the idols once and for all, and His people will come into His inheritance. The army of God is painted in the colors of the Bible, described both as the righteous army of Israel⁴² and as the new apostolate. The confrontation between God's army and the pagan army, like that between the crucifix and the idol of Machomet, can have only one outcome: victory. Themes essential to Christian history—pilgrimage, martyrdom, and the fight against idolatry—combine to form a powerful apology for the crusade.

Raymond d'Aguilers also makes Saracen paganism a central element in his chronicle; he depicts the crusade as vengeance against pagan blasphemies. He describes a series of truces and alliances with Muslim leaders as if they implied that the rulers recognized the superiority of Christianity. Thus, when legates come from the King of Babylon (the Vizir of Egypt), "seeing the marvels that God worked for his followers, they glorified Jesus, son of the Virgin Mary, who treads potent tyrants underfoot for His poor followers."⁴³ Similarly, the King of Caesaria, as he provides a market for the crusaders, acknowledges "I see that God has chosen this people."⁴⁴

Almost all of the chronicles place great importance on the crusaders' barefoot procession around Jerusalem days before they capture it. Tudebodus, we saw, has a crucifix bleed when confronted with an idol of Machomet. We

have already seen Raymond d'Aguilers' version of this procession; this is how he describes the Saracens' reaction to it:

The Saracens and Turks went around inside the city, ridiculing us in many ways, putting many crucifixes on yokes [*patibulis*] on top of the walls, inflicting upon them lashes and insults.⁴⁵

The pagans, according to Raymond, are reenacting the passion, retorturing Christ. Here is a striking parallel to the accusations made against Jews in the later Middle Ages: that they torture and mutilate crucifixes, icons, the Eucharist, or even Christian children; the Jews are accused of ritually reenacting the Passion. Those stories, like this one, will be used to sanction acts of horrible violence: many a pogrom, from the thirteenth century to the twentieth, will be justified by such trumped-up accusations.⁴⁶ For Raymond, this torturing of crucifixes, it seems, provides a justification for the terrible vengeance the crusaders are about to wreak on them. When he describes the massacre of Jerusalem's inhabitants after his capture, it is as a glorious, if perhaps overzealous, revenge:

We came to the temple of Solomon [i.e., the Dome of the Rock mosque], where they [the Saracens] used to sing their rites and festivals. But what happened there? If we speak the truth, we will be beyond belief. Suffice it to say that in the temple and porch of Solomon one rode in blood up to one's knees, and up to the horses' reins. This was truly a judgment [of God], that that place should receive their blood, since it endured for such a long time their blasphemies against God. . . . I say that this day saw the weakening of all paganism, the confirmation of Christianity, and the renovation of our faith.⁴⁷

For Raymond d'Aguilers, the crusade—in all its bloodiness—is justifiable first and foremost as *vengeance*. The pagans, who crucified Christ, who continue to crucify him in effigy, and whose rites pollute the sacred places of Jerusalem, deserve to have the wrath of God fall on them in the form of the crusaders' sword. For Raymond as for Tudebodus, the Saracens supposed paganism is a key element in vindicating the crusade.

I have focused on Perrus Tudebodus and Raymond d'Aguilers because theirs are the two chronicles of the First Crusade (along with the *Chanson d'Antioche*, which we shall look at presently) in which Saracen paganism is such a central element of defense. If less central in the other chronicles, it is nonetheless omnipresent (except, as I mentioned earlier, in the chronicle of Guibert de Nogent). Even Anna Comnena, the Byzantine princess whose *Alexiad* chronicles the reign of her father, the emperor Alexius Comnenus, purveys the same image of Saracens as pagans. For Anna, the barbarians of

Egypt and Libya "worship Mahumet with mystic rites" while the "Ismaelites" worship Chobar, Astarte, and Ashtaoth.⁴⁸ Anna, who is able to describe in detail the theological errors of Bogomils and other Christian heretics, and whose work bristles with citations of Homer and Thucydides, is completely in the dark when it comes to the religion of the Turks.

Many of the Latin chronicles contain differing versions of Tudebodus's fictive scenes of the enemy in colloquy (it is unclear which if any of the existing chronicles is the original source of these stories). One fictive scene common to several of these chroniclers is a poetic lament put in the mouth of the "Amiravissus," who is supposed to be the pagan ruler of Jerusalem, when he sees that his city is about to fall to the crusaders. Robert the Monk, for example, has the Amiravissus grieve:

We used to vanquish, and now we are vanquished; we used to be happy of heart, and now we are afflicted with sadness. Who can hold back the tears from his eyes and hold back the sobs breaking out of his heart? How long I have taken great pains to bring together this army; I have spent much time in vain. At great cost I brought together the most powerful soldiers in all the Orient, and led them to this battle; and now I have brought them and their price to the end. . . . O Mathome, Mathome, who worshipped you with greater magnificence, in shrines of gold and silver, with beautifully decorated idols of you, and ceremonies and solemnities and every sacred rite? But here is how the Christians often insult us, because the power of the crucifix is greater than yours: for it is powerful on heaven and earth. Now it appears that those who confide in it are victorious, while those who venerate you are vanquished. But it is not the fault of our lack of care, for your tomb is more adorned than his with gold, gems, and precious things.⁴⁹

One can see why this would make satisfying reading for the Christians back in Europe. Not only does the fictive lament insert melodrama and pathos into the narrative, but it drives home the superiority of Christianity to paganism: the pagans are doomed to defeat against God, no matter how many armies they assemble or how much gold and precious stones they lavish on their idols. The idol is again confronted by the crucifix, and the crucifix wins. Once more, we see a powerful pagan brought low as he acknowledges the awesome power of God.

Another equally fictitious but equally important event in several chronicles of the First Crusade is the discovery of an idol of Mahumet in the temple of the Lord, or temple of Solomon (where, as we saw, Raymond d'Aguilers gruesomely described knights riding in blood up to their knees).⁵⁰ Raoul de Caen wrote his *Gesta Tancredi*, in mixed prose and verse, sometime between Tancred's death in 1112 and Raoul's before 1131. Raoul glorifies (and exaggerates) Tancred's military achievements during and after the First Crusade.⁵¹ He describes

Tancred encountering a huge silver idol of Mahummet in a mosque in Jerusalem, piously destroying it, and confiscating the silver:

On a high throne sat a cast idol
 of heavy silver, . . .
 Tancred saw this and said: "For shame!
 "What does this mean? What is this sublime image?
 "What does this effigy mean, these gems, this gold?
 "What does this royal purple mean?" Now Mahummet
 Was crowned in gems and dressed in royal purple, and he glowed
 with gold.
 "Perhaps this is an idol of Mars or Apollo:
 "Is it Christ? These are not the insignia of Christ,
 "Not the cross, not the crown of thorns, not the nails, not the water
 from his side.
 "Therefore this is not Christ: rather it is ancient Antichrist,
 "Mahummet the depraved, Mahummet the pernicious.
 "O if this companion is here now, he will be here in the future!
 "Now I will crush both Antichrists with my foot!
 "For shame! The companion of the Abyss holds sway in the Arc of God.
 . . .
 "It will tumble down quickly, without doubt it will yet tumble!"
 . . .
 Immediately it was ordered, you will see it already done,
 Each soldier gladly fulfilling the order
 It was broken, dragged down, smashed, cut down.
 The material was precious but vile; the form
 Thus destroyed, the vile was made precious.⁵²

The Temple of Solomon has become the center of the cult of the pagan idol of Mahummet; we saw that, for Raymond d'Aguilers, the "blasphemies" that the Saracens performed in the Temple (in fact, the Dome of the Rock Mosque) called down the righteous vengeance of God in the form of a bloody massacre. But Raymond did not say what these "blasphemies" were; Raoul provides a vivid image of them: a silver idol of the pagan God Mahummet. Tancred, first thinking the statue might be one of Mars or Apollo, finally realizes that it is Mahummet, whom he also calls Antichrist. The destruction of this profane image, intruder into the Temple of the Lord, provides a dramatic, vindictive climax to the First Crusade.

The fight against paganism had long meant the destruction of idols; chroniclers such as Raoul de Caen had no foibles about ascribing such exploits to the crusaders. This places the crusade in a clear historical context, the culmination of the struggle that was begun by the infant Jesus himself; did he not destroy idols during the flight into Egypt, according to the apocryphal Gospels?⁵³

Such continuity is explicit in the *Chanson d'Antioche*, which makes the crusade central to Christian eschatology by having Christ himself predict it. In this twelfth-century epic (which claims to be the work of a crusader)⁵⁴ the narrative opens with the crucifixion: Christ himself, speaking to the good thief crucified at his side, predicts the eventual arrival of the crusaders. He foretells that a "new people," the Franks, will avenge the crucifixion, liberate the holy land, and eliminate paganism:

Friends, said Our Lord, know
 That from across the sea a new people will come
 They will exact vengeance for the death of their Father
 No pagans shall remain from here to the East
 The Franks will liberate all the earth
 And for those who were taken and killed in this manner
 Material weapons will secure our salvation⁵⁵

Here again, the paganism of the Saracens is a key element in the theological justification of the crusade: the pagans killed Jesus, and the crusaders will wreak vengeance on the pagans for the murder of their "father." The Jews were frequently blamed for the crucifixion, and it is during the First Crusade that the call for vengeance will lead crusaders to massacre Jews in Europe⁵⁶, but the pagans were blamed for the crucifixion as well, and vengeance against them was sought. Through this vengeance, the crusaders will "save" Jesus and his followers. The Saracens must be pagans in order to be appropriate objects of vengeance.⁵⁷

Unsurprisingly, the *Chanson* gives us a vivid picture of Saracen idolatry, along with a glowing account of the idols' destruction, heralding the imminent demise of paganism. As in other texts concerning the conversion of idolaters, the ultimate and most satisfying testimony to the impotence of the idols is their repudiation and destruction by their own devotees (or in the story of Thiemo, the recognition of Christian superiority by the idol Machmit itself).

The center of the pagan cult, for the *Chanson d'Antioche*, is Mahomet, an idol held in mid-air by magnets.⁵⁸ A defeated Saracen general, Sansadoines, strikes the idol, knocking it down and breaking it after it has shown itself powerless to secure victory for its devotees. Here again, the pagan enemy himself realizes the powerlessness of his idols and destroys them with his own hand. Sansadoines then predicts to the Saracens that they will be defeated by the Christians who will "break the walls and palisades of Mieque [Mecca], will take Mahomet down from the pedestal where he is placed, [and will take] the two candelabra that sit there."⁵⁹ At the end of the poem the crusader Godfrey of Bouillon vows to take "Mahomet of Mieque" in virtually the same

words.⁶⁰ The conquest of Mique, the Saracens' cultic center, will mark the ultimate defeat of paganism.

The *Chanson d'Antioche* describes, in vivid detail, an embassy to Mique, which is ruled over by three brothers⁶¹: hymns are sung to the golden idol Mahomés, the "Apostle Caliph of Bauda" (presumably Baghdad) presides over a grand "parlement." The Saracens, through enchantment, have caused a demon, Sathanas, to inhabit the idol of Mahomés, which now speaks to them. "Christians who believe in God," says Sathanas/Mahomés, "this lost people, have no rights on earth, they have taken it in great error. Let God keep heaven; the earth is in my fieldom [*baillie*]."⁶² The Caliph then announces a "rich pardon that Mahons will give us," a sort of inversion of the indulgences that Urban II granted the crusaders: Mahons will allow every man who fights the Christians to have 20 or 30 wives, or as many as he wishes. Those who die in battle will bring to the gates of heaven two bezants in one hand and a rock in the other: with the bezants they can buy their way into heaven, or if that fails, with the rock they can force their way in.⁶³ Again an inversion or parody, this time of the hope of martyrdom proffered to the Christian crusader. The pagan enemy, it seems, is a deformed mirror image of the righteous crusader, devoted to the Devil rather than God, granted indulgences by the Caliph of Baghdad/Mecca rather than the pope, hoping to buy or fight his way into heaven.

As with Petrus Tudebodus and the *Pasion of Thiennois*, the pagan adversaries are themselves made to acknowledge—both before and after the conflict—the inevitability of their defeat at the hands of the Christians. Sansadoines, as we have seen, predicts that the Christians will take Mecca. Later in the poem, his fears are confirmed by a dream, which he narrates to Corbarans (i.e., Kerbogha): he stands before Antioch and sees "Out of Antioch issued a leopard and a boar, a snake, bear, and dragon, to devour our people."⁶⁴ Solimans, one of Corbarans's men, responds that Mahons is very powerful and would never let this happen to his people. As in Tudebodus, Corbarans is warned but heeds not the warnings. Corbarans's mother soon arrives and (as in Tudebodus) warns him to desist: his defeat is predicted by the stars.⁶⁵

Corbarans himself, as he sees his defeat, calls one last time on Mahmet, this time to curse and threaten him:

"Oh, Lord Mahmet! How I used to love you
And to serve and honor you with all my might!
If ever I may return one day to my country
I will burn you and reduce you to powder
Or I will have you trampled by horses."⁶⁶

Once again, Christian victory over paganism culminates in the pagan leader's rejection and destruction (even if, as here, only threatened) of his

idols. In the *Conquête de Jérusalem*, the Caliph himself decapitates the idol Mahon.⁶⁷

The First Crusade, if we are to believe these chroniclers, is as much a fight over time as it is over space: the struggle is to reestablish the age of Christ and His Apostles in the land in which they lived, preached, and died. The crusaders win over the pagans by reenacting the struggles of the Apostolic age, by staining—or purifying—the holy soil with the blood of new martyrs, thus causing, once again, the destruction of the idols. The patent falseness of this image of the Muslim enemy is obvious to anyone with a rudimentary knowledge of Islam. It was anything but obvious, however, to those who read these stories: to them (as, perhaps, to many of the crusaders themselves) the image rang true. The stories helped them make sense of the struggles they faced, the risks they ran, the death they or their comrades faced. They helped glorify the enterprise of the crusade and put it solidly in the context of Christian history, of the divine plan.

Notes

1. The crusade of 1101, launched to support and defend the new Crusader states in the Levant, was an unmitigated failure. Welf, Thienno, and their men were ambushed by the Seljuks near Ereghli: many died, many (including Thienno) were taken captive, and Welf managed to escape. See Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading* (Philadelphia, 1986), 120–34.
2. *Pasio Thiennois archiepiscopi* (MGH SS 11:51–62) §11, 58; see Karl Morrison, *Understanding Conversion* (Charlottesville, 1990), 137–38.
3. Such confrontation is a common trope in texts about conversion of pagans to Christianity. In some cases missionaries destroy idols, in others the new converts destroy their former idols; most dramatic are stories in which divine power (at times invoked by missionaries) causes the idols to crumble and fall. See Michael Camille, *The Gothic Idol: Ideology and Image-making in Medieval Art* (Cambridge, 1989), esp. the discussion of Saracen idols, 129–64.
4. *Pasio Thiennois*, §15, 61.
5. See John V. Tolan, Introduction, in *Medieval Christian Perceptions of Islam: A Book of Essays* ed. John V. Tolan (New York, 1995); Benjamin Z. Kedar, *Crusade and Mission: European Approaches toward the Muslims* (Princeton, 1984), 86ff.
6. The *Martyrologium*, which in the early Middle Ages had been a simple calendar of saints' feast days, by the eleventh century often contains brief narratives of the passions of the various martyrs; these were to be read daily. See Bernard Gaiffier, "De l'usage et de la lecture du martyrologe," *Anlecta Bollandiana* 79 (1961): 40–59; Bernard Gaiffier, "A propos des légendiers latins," *Anlecta Bollandiana* 97 (1979): 57–68.

7. The term occurs six times in Raoul de Caen's *Gesta Tancredi* (*Recueil des historiens des croisades: historiens occidentaux*), 5 vols. (Paris, 1844–95), hereafter abbreviated RHC occ. 3:620, 670, 679, 691, 698, 705). The anonymous *Tudebodus imitatus et continuatus* contains the term “machumicolae” twice (RHC occ. 3:220, 227).
8. The bibliography on the First Crusade is vast. For a good introduction to both the events of the crusade and cultural and social forces that shaped it, see Jean Flori, *La première croisade* (Paris, 1992). The most recent general work in English is John France, *Victory in The East: A Military History of the First Crusade* (Cambridge, 1994); the best introduction to the subject in English remains that of Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading*. See also Bernard McGinn, “*Iter Sancti Sepulchri: the Piety of the First Crusaders*,” in *The Walter Prescott Webb Lectures: Essays in Medieval Civilization*, ed. Richard E. Sullivan (New York, 1978). For bibliography on the crusades, see Kenneth Setton, gen. ed., *History of the Crusades*, vol. 6 (Philadelphia, 1984).
9. Raymond d'Aguilers, *Libei*, eds. John H. & Lorita L. Hill (Paris, 1969), 145.
10. The relations between these texts, and the scholarly disputes surrounding them, are too complex for me to give justice to them here. The best introduction to the subject is Jean Flori, “Des chroniques à l'épopée . . . ou bien l'inverse?” *Perspectives médiévales* 20 (1994): 36–43. See also Riley-Smith, *First Crusade*, 135–52; Suzanne Duparc-Quoioc, *La Chanson d'Antioche: Étude critique* (Paris, 1978). J. and L. Hill's introduction to their edition of Petrus Tudebodus, *Historia de Hierosolymitano itinere* (Paris, 1977) and John France, *Victory in the East*, 374–82.
11. *Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolymitanorum*, ed. and trans. Louis Bréhier (into French), *Histoire anonyme de la première croisade* (Paris, 1924), 118 and 216.
12. Raymond d'Aguilers, *Libei*, 35.
13. Raoul de Caen, *Gesta Tancredi*, prefatio (RHC occ. 3:603).
14. Tudebodus erroneously gives 1097.
15. Petrus Tudebodus, *Historia de Hierosolymitano itinere*, 31.
16. Both Robert the Monk and Gilbert of Nogent also saw the crusades as literal fulfillments of biblical prophecies that had previously been understood in the spiritual or allegorical senses; see Riley-Smith, *First Crusade*, 142–43. The passage (along with many others, some of which I will draw attention to in the notes) is almost identical to *Gesta Francorum*, 2. This could mean that Tudebodus is using the *Gesta* or vice versa, or that they have a common source (now lost) that they both employ. For the scholarly debate on the primacy of these various sources, see above, note 10.
17. Petrus Tudebodus, *Historia*, 32.
18. Petrus Tudebodus, *Historia*, 32.
19. On the idea of martyrdom in the chronicles of the First Crusade, see Flori, “Mort et martyre des guerriers vers 1100,” *Cahiers de Civilisation Médiévale*

- 34 (1991): 121–39; Riley-Smith, *First Crusade*, 151–52; and Cowdrey, “Martyrdom and the First Crusade,” *Crusade and Settlement*, ed. P. W. Edbury (Cardiff, 1985), 47–56. On the daily reading of *martyrologia* and *passiones*, see above, note 6.
20. Petrus Tudebodus, *Historia*, 35; Matthew 10:28.
21. Petrus Tudebodus, *Historia*, 35–36. According to J. and L. Hill (see their notes to the text, 35–36) Tudebodus is here using language from martyrologies.
22. For example, see Petrus Tudebodus, *Historia*, 50, 75, in addition to the passages discussed below.
23. Petrus Tudebodus, *Historia*, 51.
24. Petrus Tudebodus, *Historia*, 128.
25. Babylon, conveniently, is the name not only of the city on the Euphrates identified with Antichrist but also of an important fortress outside of Cairo: hence the ruler of the Egyptians, in many crusade chronicles, is referred to as the King of Babylon. See Petrus Tudebodus, 73, 77, 148; Raymond d'Aguilers, 58, 110. Corosana, mentioned in Matthew 11:21 and Luke 10:13, is associated in crusader chronicles with the Turks. See Petrus Tudebodus 36, 37, 49, 73, 89, 91, 92, 113; Raymond d'Aguilers, 56, 87; *Chanson d'Antioche*, ed. Suzanne Duparc-Quoioc (Paris, 1977), vv. 4790, 5080, 9379, 9387. On the association of these places with the Antichrist, see *Li-bellus de Antichristo* (*Parologia cursus completus series Latina* 101:1293). Both Raymond d'Aguilers and Ekkehard of Aura use “Hispania” to refer to the areas under Saracen control; this suggests that they saw a close parallel between the fight against the Saracens in both East and West. See Raymond d'Aguilers, *Libei*; introduction by John and Laurita Hill, 13 and their note at p. 50.
26. Petrus Tudebodus, *Historia*, 76; almost identical is the description in *Gesta Francorum*, 94.
27. On the complex relations between these various texts, see above, note 10.
28. Petrus Tudebodus, *Historia*, 79–80. Rainaldus Porcherus's martyrdom is also described in the *Chanson d'Antioche* vv. 3972–4038; see Duparc-Quoioc, *La Chanson d'Antioche: Étude critique*, 198–99, 212–14. Riley-Smith (*The First Crusade*, 115) takes these descriptions of Rainaldus's martyrdom, it seems, at face value.
29. Petrus Tudebodus, *Historia*, 100. This vision is also described in the *Gesta* (128–30), but their is no mention made of the martyrs; Christ merely promises a “magnum adiutorium.”
30. Petrus Tudebodus, *Historia*, 112. This is almost identical to the passage in the *Gesta*, 154, though there, it will be remembered, there was no mention of the fallen crusader/martyrs participating in the vengeance.
31. Petrus Tudebodus, *Historia*, 134.
32. Raymond d'Aguilers has celestial warriors lead Christians into battle (45) and says that many people saw Ademar of Le Puy lead the crusaders into Jerusalem (151). Ademar, papal legate and leader of the Crusade, had died in Antioch, but was not martyred. Saint George also leads celestial armies

- into battle in the *Gesta* (155), Robert the Monk (RHC 3:832), and *Chanson d'Antioche*, vv. 2179 and 9063.
33. Petrus Tudebodus, *Historia*, 91.
34. Petrus Tudebodus, *Historia*, 92. This same language is used in the later abridgement of his chronicle (the so-called *Tudebodus abbreviatus*) at RHC oc. 3:194.
35. Petrus Tudebodus, *Historia*, 93.
36. Psalm 79:6 (Vulgate 78:6); Petrus Tudebodus, *Historia*, 94.
37. Petrus Tudebodus, *Historia*, 94.
38. Petrus Tudebodus, *Historia*, 95–6.
39. The interview between Kerbogha and his mother is described in almost identical terms in the *Gesta*, 118–24.
40. Petrus Tudebodus, *Historia*, 37.
41. Petrus Tudebodus, *Historia*, 147–48; cf. the *Tudebodus abbreviatus* (RHC oc. 3:163).
42. The parallels between the crusading army and the army of the Israelites is made by other chroniclers of the First Crusade, including Robert the Monk, Baldric of Dole, and Guibert of Nogent; see Riley-Smith, *First Crusade*, 140–42.
43. Raymond d'Aguilers, 58.
44. Raymond d'Aguilers, 103. Robert the Monk and Guibert of Nogent also refer to the Franks as God's chosen people; see Riley-Smith, *First Crusade*, 147–48.
45. Raymond d'Aguilers, 145. Earlier, during the siege of Marra, Raymond tells us, the Saracens, "ut maxime nos provocarent, cruces super muros ponentes multis iniuriis eas afficiebant" (94).
46. See Gavin Langmuir, *History, Religion, and Antisemitism* (Berkeley, 1990), 298–303; Gavin Langmuir, *Toward a Definition of Antisemitism* (Berkeley, 1990), chapters 9, 11, and 12; Joshua Trachtenberg, *The Devil and the Jews: a medieval conception of the Jews and its Relation to Modern Antisemitism* (Philadelphia, 1983); R. Po-Chia Hsia, *The Myth of Ritual Murder: Jews and Magic in Reformation Germany* (New Haven, 1988).
47. Raymond d'Aguilers, 150–51.
48. Anna Comnena, *Alexiad*, trans. E. Sewter (London, 1969), 211–12, and 309–10.
49. Robertus Monachus, chapter 21 (RHC oc. 3:878); cf. the similar treatment in the chronicle by Baudri of Dole (RHC oc. 4:110). In the *Historia et Gesta ducis Gofridi* (RHC 5:501), it is the "miraldus Babiloni" who gives long lament on hearing of the fall of Jerusalem.
50. For example: "Hoc templum dominicum in veneratione magna cuncti Saraceni habuerant, ubi precatones suas lege sua libentius quam alibi faciebant, quamvis idolo in nomine Mahomet facto eas vastarent, in quod etiam nullum ingredi Christianum permittebant. Alterum templum, quod dicitur Salomons, magnum est et mirabile." Fulcher of Chartres, *Historia Hierosolymitana* c. 26 (RHC oc. 3:357). He later says "Fancredus autem

Templum dominicum festino cursu ingressus, multum auri et argenti, lapidesque perionosos arripuit. Sed hoc restaurans, eadem cuncta vel eis appropriate loco sacrosancto remisit, licet in eo nihil tunc deicum ageretur, quum Saraceni legem suam idolatria superstitioso ritu exercent, qui etiam Christianum nullum in id ingredi sinebant." (c. 28, pp. 359–60).

The chronicle known as *Tudebodus imitatus et continuatus* tells us that Tancred entered the temple, where he saw a huge silver statue of Mahomet enthroned. Comparing the statue to a crucifix, he proclaimed that this was not Christ but Antichrist and ordered his men to destroy it and put the silver to good use. *Tudebodus imitatus et continuatus* c. 124 (RHC oc. 3:222–23).

51. On Raoul and his *Gesta Tancredi*, see Jean Charles Payen, "L'hégémonisme normande dans la *Chanson de Roland* et les *Gesta Tancredi*: De la Neustrie à la chrétienté, ou Turolool est-il nationaliste?," in *Romanic Epic: Essays on a Medieval Literary Genre*, ed., Hans-Erich Keller (Kalamazoo, 1987), 73–90; and Jean Charles Payen, "L'image du grec dans la chronique normande: sur un passage de Raoul de Caen," in *Images et signes de l'Orient dans l'Occident Médiéval* (Aix-en-Provence, 1982), 267–80.
52. Raoul de Caen, c. 129 (RHC oc. 3:695–696).
53. See, for example, the *Infancy Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew*, in *The Other Bible*, ed., Willis Barnstone (San Francisco, 1984), 397.

54. The *Chanson d'Antioche* was perhaps composed in the early years of the twelfth century by a crusader, Richard the Pilgrim, though the surviving version is a late twelfth-century reworking attributed to Graindor de Douai. Suzanne Duparc-Quioç argues for the traditional attribution to Richard le Pelerin and Graindor and attempts to distinguish between the two versions (Duparc-Quioç. *La Chanson d'Antioche: Etude critique*). Robert F. Cook argues against it in "*Chanson d'Antioche*," *chanson de geste: le cycle de la croisade est-il épique?* (Amsterdam, 1980), 15–27. The attribution has subsequently been defended by Lewis Sumburg, "Au confluent de l'histoire et du mythe: la *Chanson d'Antioche*, chronique en vers de la premier croisade," in *Les Epiques de la croisade*, ed. Karl-Heinz Bender (Stuttgart, 1987), 58–65, and Herman Kleber, "Graindor de Douai: remanieur-auteur-mecene?" Karl-Heinz Bender, ed., *Les Epiques de la croisade* (Stuttgart, 1987), 66–75. See also Flori, "Des chroniques à l'épopée."

55. *Chanson d'Antioche*, vv. 205–11 (pp. 27–28).
56. Robert Chazan, *European Jewry and the First Crusade* (Berkeley, 1987).
57. This is complicated, in the *Chanson d'Antioche*, by a subsequent passage (vv. 218–248, pp. 28–29) identifying the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus and Vespasian as vengeance for the crucifixion; this is standard Christian interpretation of the destruction of the temple of Jerusalem and the subsequent Jewish diaspora. What is far from standard, however, is that the *Chanson* presents Titus and Vespasian as *Christians*.

58. *Chanson d'Antioche*, vv. 4891ff. This passage is discussed by Alexandre Eckhardt, "Le Cercueil flottant de Mahomet," in *Mélanges de philologie romane et de littérature médiévale offerts à E. Hoepffner: Publications de la Faculté des*

Lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg, fasc. 113 (1949), 77–88.; Eckhardt (78–82) finds earlier legends of pagan statues held in the air by means of magnets, dating from the description of a floating idol of Serapis that, according to Rufinus de Aquileia, was in the Serapion of Alexandria.

59. "De Mieke briseront les murs et le palis,

Si traitront Mahomet de la forme u est mis,

Et les deus candelabres qu'iluec sont assis."

Chanson d'Antioche vv. 4968–70. Earlier in the epic, the poet had ex-

pressed the same prophecy in a slightly different form:

"Et briseront de Mecke le mur et le pali,

S'en traitront Mahomet et Appolin aussi,

S'en donront l'or a cels qui Jhesu ont servi.

Benoite soit li terre u il furent norri!"

Chanson d'Antioche, vv. 3447–3450.

60. "Irosqu'el regne de Perse irai por conquerer,

N'i larai boric ne vile ne tor a craventer

Vostre amiral Soudan i ferai encroer

U a un gros takele les iex del chief forer;

Par Mahomet de Mieque m'en vaurai retourner

Por les.II. candelabres qu'en ferai apporter,

Tres devant le Sepucure puis le ferai poser."

Chanson d'Antioche vv. 9242–48, p. 454.

In the *Chanson de Jérusalem*, Godfrey of Bouillon swears that he will conquer Mecca and take the golden candelabra that stand before the idol of Mahon:

"Dusqu'à Mieque le vielle ne lairai en estant

Tor ne palais de marbre ne voise cravenant,

Et les grans candelabres devant Mahon ardent

Merai el Sepucure u Dex fu suscitant

Et Mahon Gomefin, en qui il sont creant,

Livrai as ribals qu'i feront lor talant—

Les bras et les costés li ierent peçoiant

Si en traitront les pierres et l'or arrabiant.

Et l'amiral meisme, s'il ne laist Tervagant,

Jo li ferai forer le.II. iex par devant,

U le chief li taurai a m'espee trencant.

Jou nel pri ne ne l'aim le monte d'un bezant."

La Chanson de Jérusalem vv. 7276–7287, *The Old French Crusade Cycle*, vol. 6, ed., Nigel Thorpe (Tuscaloosa, Alabama, 1992).

61. The similarities between this section of the *Chanson* and sections of *Passion of Thimo* may indicate that the author of the *Passion* was familiar with the *Chanson* or vice versa. This section is probably one of the passages added by Graindor de Douai in the late twelfth century (Duparc-Quioic, 105). Later writers, including Marco Polo, also tell of the legendary three brother-kings (see *Chanson d'Antioche*, 269n).

62. *Chanson d'Antioche*, vv. 5310–12.

63. *Chanson d'Antioche*, vv. 5323–47.

64. *Chanson d'Antioche*, vv. 6620–21.

65. She appears three times in the *Chanson d'Antioche*, where her name is Calabre: vv. 766–73, 5252–68, 6838–6956. Duparc-Quioic (105–06) says that the first episode is an addition by Graindor de Douai, while the second was probably part of the original by Richard le Pelerin.

66. *Chanson d'Antioche*, vv. 9111–16, p. 448.

67. Duparc-Quioic, 57, n. 48.