William of Tyre, *Translatio Imperii*, and the Genesis of the First Crusade: Or, the Challenges of Writing History

---

ANDREW D. BUCK

Royal Holloway, University of London

Abstract

The article offers a contribution to wider dialogues on history creation and the analytical superstructures that influence how authors use the past to construct and legitimise identities tied to conquest and settlement. It takes as its case study the twelfth-century *Chronicon* of the Jerusalemite writer William of Tyre, and his crafting of an account of the First Crusade that demonstrated the legal validity of the new Latin polities created in the Levant and Syria (the so-called crusader states). It demonstrates his use of *translatio imperii* (translation of empire) to frame settlement as a continuation of Christian authority in the East. This work also marks the changing purpose of his writing away from a solely Eastern Latin audience towards promoting crusading from Europe. In paying attention to this shift, this article demonstrates how subsequent edits he made to his work(s), led to narrative dilemmas and discontinuities that spoke to the fragmented social and political value of crusading between the Latin East and Latin West. In other words, this article offers an important window onto not only the historians' craft, but also the value of incorporating pre-modern works into modern historiographical debates, especially those surrounding notions of European settler identities.

I

The *Chronicon* of Archbishop William of Tyre (d. *c.* 1184/6), an account of the First Crusade (1095–99) and the crusader states written in Latin-held Jerusalem in the second half of the twelfth century, is a source of great significance. This is true not only for medievalists concerned primarily with the crusades and the Latin East – the collective term, alongside crusader states and Outremer, for the four polities created at Jerusalem, Antioch, Edessa, and Tripoli in the wake of the First Crusade – and/or the explosion of historical writing witnessed in Latin Christendom during the so-called

'long' twelfth century, but also for those interested more generally in the historian's craft.[1] Indeed, the recent push towards achieving a better understanding of the analytical superstructures that have long defined approaches to history creation has much to gain from examining how pre-modern authors constructed the past; particularly, in this instance, given the recent strides made in recognising crusading's long-standing and enduring legacy over colonialist dialogues.[2] Consequently, there

---

A version of this article was given to the 'Understanding the Sources for the Crusades: New Approaches' conference in January 2022 and Leeds IMC July 2022. I would like to thank the audience on those occasions for their thoughtful feedback; Susan Edgington, James Kane, Beth Spacey, Stephen Spencer, and Michael Staunton for their advice on the Latin and for reading drafts; the anonymous reviewers and editors at *History* for their generous support and guidance; and the Irish Research Council for the Government of Ireland Postdoctoral Fellowship during which this research was undertaken.

[1] On William's life and career, see generally P.W. Edbury and J.G. Rowe, *William of Tyre: Historian of the Latin East* (Cambridge, 1998). The literature on historical writing in medieval Europe is vast, but for important entry points, see N.F. Partner, *Serious Entertainments: The Writing of History on Twelfth-Century England* (Chicago, 1977); P. Damian-Grint, *The New Historians of the Twelfth-Century Renaissance* (Woodbridge, 1999); C.F. Briggs, 'History, story, and community: representing the past in Latin Christendom, 1050–1400', in S. Foot and C.F. Robinson (eds), *The Oxford History of Historical Writing Volume 2: 400–1400* (Oxford, 2012), pp. 391–413; Michael Staunton, *The Historians of Angevin England* (Oxford, 2017); B. Weiler, 'Historical writing in Europe, *c.* 1100–1300', in D. Guy, O.W. Jones, G. Henley, and R. Thomas (eds), *The Chronicles of Medieval Wales and the March: New Contexts, Studies and Texts* (Turnhout, 2020), pp. 33–67.

[2] An early proponent of a long durée model can be found in Marc Bloch's *The Historian's Craft* (New York, 1953), while an attempt to chart the role of the middle ages in shaping dialogues around race can be found in Geraldine Heng's *The Invention of Race in the European Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 2018). On the ever-expanding field of post-medieval legacies of crusading, including regarding colonial dialogues, see for example R. Ellenblum, *Crusader Castles and Modern Histories*

are important reasons for exploring the narrative programming behind William's *Chronicon*. First, William's account of the Latin conquest and settlement of the Levant and Syria is the primary local witness to events in the Latin East for nearly six decades, that is after Fulcher of Chartres' *Historia Hierosolimitana* was brought to a close in 1127. Scholars have argued that it was composed between *c.* 1170 and *c.* 1184, and that it became focused on promoting Western aid for the Holy Land following the author's participation in the Third Lateran Council in 1179.[3] What is not in doubt, however, is that it is the 'indispensable rhythm track' for all empirical reconstructions of the crusading East for these years.[4] It is also our premier source for understanding the crusader states' written cultures in the same period.[5] Moreover, like many of his authorial contemporaries, William was highly educated,

(Cambridge, 2007), pp. 1–83; C.J. Tyerman, *Debating the Crusades, 1099–2010* (Manchester, 2011); W.J. Purkis, '"Holy Christendom's new colony": the extraction of sacred matter and the colonial status of the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem', *The Haskins Society Journal*, 30 (2018), 177–212; M. Horswell and J. Phillips (eds), *Perceptions of the Crusades from the Nineteenth to the Twenty-First Century: Engaging the Crusades, Volume One* (Abingdon, 2021); M. Horswell and A.N. Awan, *The Crusades in the Modern World: Engaging the Crusades, Volume Two* (Abingdon, 2021).

[3] Edbury and Rowe, *William of Tyre*, pp. 24–31; B.Z. Kedar, 'Some new light on the composition process of William of Tyre's *Historia*', in S.B. Edgington and H.J. Nicholson (eds), *Deeds Done Beyond the Sea: Essays on William of Tyre, Cyprus and the Military Orders presented to Peter Edbury* (Farnham, 2014), pp. 3–12.

[4] I am here borrowing terminology deployed in another context by Marcus Bull in *Eyewitness and Crusade Narrative: Perception and Narration in Accounts of the Second, Third and Fourth Crusades* (Woodbridge, 2018), p. 260.

[5] See now J. Yolles, *Making the East Latin: The Latin Literature of the Levant in the Era of the Crusades* (Cambridge, MA, 2022).

spending almost two decades in the schools of Paris, Orléans, and Bologna.[6] His writing thus responds to, and is greatly influenced by, scholastic developments in understanding classical, patristic, philosophical, and biblical literature. In other words, William's work deserves to be viewed alongside (and in the same context as) other major twelfth-century writers, like William of Malmesbury (d. 1143), Otto of Freising (d. 1158), and Gerald of Wales (d. 1223).[7] Finally, as an author involved in the literary attempt to construct and transmit the identities during a period of European settlement over non-Christian peoples, called colonisation by some, the means by which William sought to legitimise the crusader states can contribute to wider debates on settler and colonial histories.[8]

[6] R. B. C. Huygens, 'Guillaume de Tyr étudiant: Un chapitre (xix, 12) de son "Histoire" retrouvé', *Latomus*, 21 (1962), 811–29; R.C. Schwinges, *Kreuzzugsideologie und Toleranz: Studien zu Wilhelm von Tyrus* (Stuttgart, 1977), *passim*; Edbury and Rowe, *William of Tyre*, pp. 32–43; M. Doyle, *Peter Lombard and His Students* (Toronto, 2016), pp. 181–90.

[7] S.O. Sønnesyn, *William of Malmesbury and the Ethics of History* (Woodbridge, 2012); S. Bagge, 'Ideas and narrative in Otto of Freising's *Gesta Frederici*', *Journal of Medieval History*, 22/4 (1996), 345–77; Gerald of Wales, *De principis instructione*, ed. and trans. R. Bartlett (Oxford, 2018). More generally, see M. Kempshall, *Rhetoric and the Writing of History* (Manchester, 2011).

[8] On crusading and settler identities in the Latin East, see T. Kirschberger, *Erster Kreuzzug und Ethnogenese: In novam formam commutatus—Ethnogenetische Prozesse im Fürstentum Antiochia und im Königreich Jerusalem* (Göttingen, 2015); A.D. Buck, 'Settlement, identity, and memory in the Latin East: an examination of the term "crusader states"', *English Historical Review*, 135 (2020), pp. 271–302. For a general overview of colonial behaviours in medieval Europe and the means by which similar identity processes emerged around several other theatres of conquest and settlement, see R. Bartlett, *The Making of Europe: Conquest, Colonization and Cultural Change 950–1350* (London, 1993).

Yet, though it cannot be said that William has been overlooked entirely by modern scholarship, indeed the array of works devoted to the author and his text is too large to cover here, there remain a great many avenues for enquiry, not least from a literary and authorial standpoint.[9] Most especially, there has been a relative dearth of historiography aimed at considering William's account of the First Crusade: an element of the *Chronicon* which, though constituting nearly a third of the entire work, has often been overtly neglected for various reasons. For one, its distance from events means it is of little empirical value; the fact that it is demonstrably reliant on other sources for its main structure means it is classified as derivative and not a viable witness to William's authorial persona; and its Jerusalemite context ensures that it is also treated as separate to, and of less value for understanding, the literary crusading traditions of the Latin West.[10] There have been some recent moves to

[9] In terms of literary examinations of William's text, there are some notable exceptions. See T.S. Asbridge, 'William of Tyre and the first rulers of the Latin principality of Antioch', in S.B. Edgington and H.J. Nicholson (eds), *Deeds Done Beyond the Sea: Essays on William of Tyre, Cyprus and the Military Orders presented to Peter Edbury* (Farnham, 2014), pp. 35–42; A.D. Buck, 'William of Tyre, femininity, and the problem of the Antiochene princesses', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 70/4 (2019), pp. 731–49; B.C. Spacey, 'Refocusing the First Crusade: authorial self-fashioning and the miraculous in William of Tyre's *Historia Ierosolimitana*', *The Journal of Religious History, Literature and Culture*, 5/2 (2019), pp. 51–67; A.D. Buck, 'Between *Chronicon* and *Chanson*: William of Tyre, the First Crusade, and the art of storytelling', in A.D. Buck, J.H. Kane, and S.J. Spencer (eds), *Crusade, Settlement, and Historical Writing in the Latin East and Latin West* (Woodbridge, forthcoming).

[10] A.V. Murray, 'Biblical quotations and formulaic language in the Chronicle of William of Tyre', in S.B. Edgington and H.J. Nicholson (eds), *Deeds Done Beyond the Sea: Essays on William of Tyre, Cyprus and the Military Orders presented to Peter Edbury* (Farnham, 2014), pp. 25–34; A.E. Zimo, 'Us and them: identity in William of Tyre's *Chronicon*', *Crusades*, 18 (2020), pp. 1–19. Note also that neither of

address this, but on the whole, as a non-participant Latin narrative written in Outremer six decades or more after the events in question, William's account of the First Crusade has come to inhabit something of a liminal space as regards both modern studies on the *Chronicon* and wider historiographical re-examinations into the significance and nature of how the crusade's story was told.[11]

It is my contention, however, that these elements of William's text offer the most valuable window onto his authorial processes, for we can trace in close detail what sources he had at his disposal and how exactly he brought them together to create his own version of events. Indeed, given the time William spent in the major learning centres of Europe, as well as his access to the royal and ecclesiastical libraries of the kingdom of Jerusalem, he was likely aware of a larger corpus of written and oral traditions for the First Crusade than any other twelfth-century chronicler, and so how he chose to use these is of great interest to historians.[12]

---

the books dedicated solely to William include sections dedicated to an in-depth study of the *Chronicon*'s account of the First Crusade. See Schwinges, *Kreuzzugsideologie und Toleranz*; Edbury and Rowe, *William of Tyre*.

[11] Spacey, 'Refocusing the First Crusade', pp. 51–67; D. Crispin, *Ihr Gott kämpft jeden Tag für sie: Krieg, Gewalt und religiöse Vorstellungen in der Frühzeit der Kreuzzüge (1095–1187)* (Leiden, 2019), pp. 184–204; Buck, 'Between *Chronicon* and *Chanson*'. For a useful entry point into the debates surrounding the literary flourishing around the First Crusade, one which also confirms William's absence from such discussions, see the essays contained in M. Bull and D. Kempf (eds), *Writing the Early Crusades: Text, Transmission and Memory* (Woodbridge, 2014).

[12] In the modern critical edition to the text it was suggested that William utilised the crusade accounts of the *Gesta Francorum* (or a similar text), Raymond of Aguilers, Albert of Aachen, Fulcher of Chartres, and Baldric of Bourgueil. This, however, has proven to be an overly conservative list and overlooks the many similarities or borrowings that can be identified with several other Latin texts as

Moreover, he was writing in Jerusalem at a time of growing fear over the future and legitimacy of the Latin presence in the Holy Land, as the power of the Islamic rulers of nearby Egypt and Syria, particularly Nūr al-Dīn (d. 1174) and his successor Saladin (d. 1193), threatened the borders of the crusader states – a concern only exacerbated by the Frankish polities' descent into dangerous factionalism resulting from a succession crisis triggered by the leprosy of King Baldwin IV of Jerusalem (d. 1185).[13] The composition of William's textual construction of these polities' foundational moments will thus have served distinct social and political functions – particularly for a settler society in which the crusade acted as a crucial moment of identity formation – that warrant closer scrutiny.[14]

It is the aim of this article, therefore, to present some thoughts on the form and function of William's account of the genesis of the First Crusade, starting with the visit to Jerusalem of the venture's 'unofficial' preacher, Peter the Hermit, prior to the expedition and culminating in Pope Urban II's Clermont sermon that officially launched the crusade in November 1095. These elements, I argue, offer an important window onto the multi-faceted literary aims of the *Chronicon*'s author as he balanced the demands of appealing to various audiences, as well as the processes

---

well as oral and vernacular traditions. Compare William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, ed. R. B. C. Huygens, H.E. Mayer, and G. Rösch, 2 vols (Turnhout, 1986), 1: pp. 93–94; and Buck, 'Between Chronicon and Chanson'.

[13] B. Hamilton, *The Leper King and His Heirs: Baldwin IV and the Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem* (Cambridge, 2000); M. Barber, *The Crusader States* (New Haven, NY, 2012), pp. 174–323.

[14] For the significance of the First Crusade to the identities of the Latin communities of Outremer, see Kirschberger, *Erster Kreuzzug und Ethnogenese*, *passim*; Buck, 'Settlement, Identity, and Memory in the Latin East', pp. 271–302.

by which the final text came into being. They also reveal something of the tensions William faced when seeking to compose an account of a venture for which there were many competing versions and which had become highly politicised over the course of its subsequent memorialisation across Latin Christendom.[15] Consequently, we find here evidence of competing and fragmented narratives surrounding why and by whom the crusade was called; strands which even an author as sophisticated as William of Tyre found hard to reconcile when seeking to appeal to audiences in both the Latin East and the Latin West. By tracing this, much can be learned about the medieval (and wider) craft of history writing; for, at its core, this article offers an exploration of the dilemmas faced by historians, and their responses to them, especially regarding the creation of imagined pasts that respond to political crisis and/or seek to construct and transmit the identities of settler communities.[16]

[15] On the politics behind the crusade's memorialisation, see for example N.L. Paul, *To Follow in Their Footsteps: The Crusades and Family Memory in the High Middle Ages* (Ithaca, NY, 2012); M. Bull, 'The historiographical construction of a Northern French First Crusade', *Haskins Society Journal*, 25 (2013), pp. 35–56; J. Naus, *Constructing Kingship: The Capetian Monarchs of France and the Early Crusades* (Manchester, 2016).

[16] For comparative secondary literature on historical reactions to, or during, social and political change in this period, see for example K.A. Fenton, *Gender, Nation, and Conquest in the Works of William of Malmesbury* (Woodbridge, 2008); E.A. Winkler, *Royal Responsibility in Anglo-Norman Historical Writing* (Oxford, 2017); Staunton, *The Historians of Angevin England*, esp. pp. 153–366; J. Rubenstein, 'Tolerance for the Armies of Antichrist: Life on the Frontiers of Twelfth-Century Outremer', in J. Bird (ed.), *Papacy, Crusade, and Christian-Muslim Relations* (Amsterdam, 2018), pp. 81–96.

II

There are two main figures who medieval sources credit with the original impetus for the First Crusade. On the one hand, there is Pope Urban II, who is viewed as the main progenitor by the mainstay of medieval (and modern) authors, with his sermon at Clermont – recorded at some length in several texts – used as the vehicle to outline his, and the authors', apparent vision for the venture.[17] On the other, there is Peter the Hermit, who was described as the *primus auctor*, or first instigator, of the venture by Albert of Aachen, a German author writing *c.* 1103, after he carried back from Jerusalem a letter asking for aid sent by the Greek patriarch, a story also found in a handful of other texts, which he then brought to Urban. The pope's Clermont address is not detailed.[18] The reasons behind these differing emphases, and the question of which version of events is closest to the truth, have been long debated, and need not be rehearsed here.[19] Rather, this article is concerned with how William

[17] J. Riley-Smith, *The Crusades: A History*, 3rd edition (London, 2014), pp. 21–45; G. Strack, 'The Sermon of Urban II in Clermont and the Tradition of Papal Oratory', *Medieval Sermon Studies*, 56 (2012), pp. 30–45.

[18] Albert of Aachen, *Historia Hierosolimitana*, ed. and trans. S.B. Edgington (Oxford, 2007), pp. xxiv–xxv, 2–8, at p. 4. For an overview of the other sources that mention Peter's visit to Jerusalem, see E.O. Blake and C. Morris, 'A hermit goes to war: Peter and the origins of the First Crusade', in W.J. Shiels (ed.), *Monks, Hermits, and the Ascetic Tradition* (1985) pp. 79–107

[19] It would be impractical to cover all works produced that enter into this debate, so for useful entry points compare H.E.J. Cowdrey, 'Pope Urban II and the idea of Crusade', *Studi medievali*, 36 (1995), pp. 721–42; and Riley-Smith, *The Crusades*, pp. 21–45; with Blake and Morris, 'A Hermit Goes to War', pp. 79–107; J. Flori, *Pierre l'Ermite et la Première Croisade* (Paris, 1999), esp. pp. 67–90; and J. Rubenstein, 'How, or how much, to reevaluate Peter the Hermit', in S.J. Ridyard, *The Medieval Crusade* (Woodbridge, 2004), pp. 53–69.

of Tyre, who was aware of, and found value in, both narrative strands, sought to reconcile and combine them in pursuit of his own authorial goals. I will begin, then, with the account of Peter the Hermit's visit to Jerusalem in the *Chronicon*.

Unlike any other account of the First Crusade, William foregrounds the venture against centuries of history, starting with the rise of Muhammad and Islam during the reign of Emperor Heraklios (d. 641).[20] William then charts the growing power of Muslim rulers who he described asserting their authority through 'sword and violence' (*gladiis et violentia*), beginning with the Fātimids of Egypt and leading into the emergence of the Seljuk Turks in the Abbāsīd north and throughout the Near East, as well as the deteriorating fortunes of Christians living in the region.[21] Though William occasionally reserved some minor praise for certain caliphs, especially Hārūn al-Rashīd (d. 809), his opposition to Islam and the teachings of Muhammad, described as 'the first born son of Satan' (*primogeniti Sathane*) and peddler of 'pestilential doctrine' (*doctrina pestilens*) and (doctrinal) 'error' (*erroris*), is clear. He also noted more than once that, with Caliph 'Umar's capture of Jerusalem in 638, so began nearly five centuries of Christian suffering under the 'yoke of undue servitude'

[20] For William of Tyre's account of the crusade's genesis up to the Clermont sermon, see William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, I: 105–35.

[21] William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, I: 105–24. On William and the Turks, see Schwinges, *Kreuzzugsideologie und Toleranz*, pp. 157–58; A.V. Murray, 'William of Tyre and the Origin of the Turks: Observations on the Possible Sources of the *Gesta orientalium principum*', in M. Balard, B.Z. Kedar, and J. Riley-Smith (eds), *Dei gesta per Francos: Etudes sur les croisades dédiés à Jean Richard / Crusade Studies in Honour of Jean Richard* (Aldershot, 2001), pp. 217–29. More generally, see I. Wolsing, 'Horsemen of the apocalypse? Turkish alterity from the Latin East, 1099–1127', *Viator*, 51/2 (2020), pp. 189–228.

(*iugum indebite servitutis*).[22] Intermingled with this, perhaps unsurprisingly, is the story of growing Byzantine failure, as successive emperors, starting with Heraklios, showed themselves completely unable to defend the Christians of the Holy Land, a shortcoming redeemed only in part by grants of money for repairs to churches, especially the Holy Sepulchre.[23] Thus, the battle of Manzikert in 1071, where the Byzantine emperor, Romanos IV Diogenes, was heavily defeated by the Seljuks in Asia Minor and the empire placed under great strain, is situated by William in the wider context of centuries of imperial failure and the consequences of this for the Christian East.[24] As William noted, it was in the wake of this defeat that those in Jerusalem, who had long looked to the Greeks for help, now felt 'certain of perpetual servitude' (*de perpetua servitute securi*).[25] Conversely, the emperor who emerges from this section of the text with the greatest praise is Charlemagne (d. 814), who offered so much support and comfort to the Christians during the time of Hārūn al-Rashīd that William suggested 'they seemed to be living more under the rule of the

[22] William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, I: 105–24. For William's views of these caliphs and the Islamic faith, see Schwinges, *Kreuzzugsideologie und Toleranz*, esp. pp. 105–41, 155–57; K. Skottki, *Christen, Muslime und der Erste Kreuzzug: Die Macht der Berschreibung in der mittelalterlichen und modernen Historiographie* (Münster, 2015), pp. 149–64, esp. pp. 162–63; N. Morton, 'William of Tyre's attitude towards Islam: some historiographical reflections', in S.B. Edgington and H.J. Nicholson (eds), *Deeds Done Beyond the Sea: Essays on William of Tyre, Cyprus and the Military Orders presented to Peter Edbury* (Farnham, 2014), pp. 13–24.

[23] Wiliam of Tyre, *Chronicon*, I: 105–24.

[24] William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, I: 119–24.

[25] William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, I: 122.

Emperor Charles than under [Hārūn]'.[26] Time and again, William emphasises that the Christians of the Holy Land had long endured cruel bondage and suffering as the Lord turned away from their cries. Eventually, though, God's mind was changed and he looked upon them with pity. 'In this present work', William noted, 'we propose to write down [how this was done] for the perpetual memory of Christ's faithful'.[27]

This comment is the direct segue into Peter the Hermit's visit to Jerusalem, a city placed under great molestation, after he was drawn there 'for the sake of prayer and the purpose of devotion'.[28] Upon arrival and the payment of a tax to enter, Peter was taken in by a local Christian, who revealed to him the community's great tribulations, which became clearer upon an inspection of the city with his own faithful eyes (*fides oculata*).[29] He thus came before the Greek Patriarch, Symeon, and, in William of Tyre's account, with tears of grief listened intently to the prelate's descriptions of his people's plight. During this, Symeon addressed Peter directly:

> Peter, the just and merciful Lord, having shackled [us] for our sins, refuses to hear our tears, groans, and sighs. For, our iniquity is not yet fully purged, hence the scourges are not yet at rest. But, if your people – true worshippers of God, whose strength is still intact through the superabundant mercy of the Lord, and whose authority, terrifying to our enemies, truly still flourishes far and wide – might be willing to suffer with us at brotherly love's prompt, and to

[26] William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, I: 107–109, at p. 108: 'ita ut magis sub imperatore Karolo quam sub dicto principe degere viderentur'.

[27] William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, I: 122–24, at p. 124: 'hoc presenti opere ad Christi fidelium perpetuam memoriam scribere proposuimus'.

[28] William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, I: 124: 'orationis gratia et causa devotionis'.

[29] William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, I: 124–25.

> administer a remedy to those disasters which oppress us, or at least to intercede on our behalf with Christ, it would be our hope that our affliction were about to end. For, we have no hope henceforward, as on other occasions, of any consolation from the empire of the Greeks, although they might be nearer to us by blood relation and territory, and they might have much greater wealth. For they are barely sufficient for themselves and all of their strength has withered away, as your brotherhood is likely to have heard, such that within a few years they will have lost more than half of the empire.[30]

Having heard these words, Peter implored the patriarch to write a letter to the Roman Church and the princes of the West (*ecclesia Romana et Occidentis principes*), which he promised to deliver.[31] Although William has Peter doubt his ability to fulfil this duty, a vision of Christ, who came before him while he slept in the Holy Sepulchre, wiped away any apprehension.[32] Consequently, Peter departed for the West, first meeting with Urban near Bari and securing his promise of help, before

[30] William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, I: 125–26: 'Petre, lacrimas nostras, gemitus et suspiria peccatis nostris prepedientibus exaudire dedignatur iustus et misericors dominus: nondum enim ad plenum purgata est nostra iniquitas, unde necdum flagella quiescunt. Sed si vester verus dei cultor populus, cuius per superhabundantem domini misericordiam vires sunt adhuc integre et nostris hostibus formidabile longe lateque floret imperium, presentibus fraterna caritate compati vellet et remedium procurare his que nos premunt calamitatibus aut saltem pro nobis apud Christum vellet intercedere, spes esset nobis afflictionem nostram in proximo finiri. Nam de Grecorum imperio, licet et consanguinitate et loco nobis sint propinquiores et divitiis habundent amplius, nulla nobis spes est de cetero ut inde nobis aliquam habeamus consolationem. Sibi ipsis enim vix sufficiunt omnisque eorum, ut audisse potest vestra fraternitas, virtus emarcuit, ita ut infra paucos annos plusquam dimidium amiserint imperii'.

[31] William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, I: 126.

[32] William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, I: 126–27.

crossing the Alps to convince the people, from the princes to the lowest in society, to join the venture. In doing so, Peter

> anxiously urged, rebuked, charged, and, by advising with the aid of divine grace, persuaded some of them that they should not delay to bring aid to the brothers placed in such great affliction and that they should not allow the holy places which the Lord deigned to glorify by His own presence to be profaned [any] longer by the filthiness of the infidels.[33]

By preparing the minds of the faithful to obedience in this way, Peter is described as performing the office not of *primus auctor*, as Albert had it, but of forerunner, or *precursor*. Such a lexical choice offers more than one potential biblical allusion: Jesus is described as the *precursor* for all who may receive salvation in Hebrews 6.20, while such wording also echoes the description of how John the Baptist would precede (*praeibis*) Christ in Luke 1.76–77 – the latter perhaps being the most likely for it offers a scenario in which Peter is John the Baptist and Urban II is Christ.[34]

As Peter Edbury and John Rowe have recognised, the sections here on Byzantine weakness and inadequacy set the scene for the First Crusade, but they believed that this was little more than a dispassionate discussion of how the Greeks, through no fault of their own, had become incapable of defending the Holy Land.[35]

---

[33] William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, I: 129: 'instat sollicitus, increpat, arguit atque cooperante divina gratia monendo quibusdam persuadet ut fratribus in tanta afflictione positis subvenire non differant et loca sancta, que dominus propria dignatus est illustrare presentia, infidelium spurciciis diutius prophanari non permittant'.

[34] William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, I: 127, 129–30.

[35] Edbury and Rowe, *William of Tyre*, pp. 131–34.

Ernest Blake and Colin Morris, meanwhile, proposed that William had access to a local Jerusalemite source that was simply more accurate regarding Peter's involvement.[36] Going slightly further, David Crispin has suggested that William's focus is on the crusaders as a tool of heavenly work, and so the wider foregrounding of the venture against the longer-term treatment of Eastern Christians functions to contribute to the motif of the pollution of the holy places; and Timo Kirschberger has noted how William's use of biblical framings helps to present the crusaders as the chosen people of God.[37] However, it is my contention that William provides an account of the crusade's genesis that deliberately situates the Holy Land's need for help, and its subsequent gaining of this, in the specific context of the motif of *translatio imperii*, or the translation of empire.

This motif finds its roots in the Old Testament Book of Daniel, which details the dream of the four kingdoms that would culminate in the kingdom of God (which would continue until the Last Days), experienced by the Babylonian king, Nebuchadnezzar.[38] *Translatio imperii* is thus centred on the notion of the decline and fall of empires and their subsequent replacement by more worthy groups.[39] Such a

[36] Blake and Morris, 'A hermit goes to war', pp. 94–95.

[37] Crispin, *Ihr Gott kämpft jeden Tag für sie*, pp. 190–91; Kirschberger, *Erster Kreuzzug und Ethnogenese*, pp. 166–69.

[38] The most thorough treatment of the *translatio imperii* motif remains W. Goez, *Translatio imperii: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Geschichtsdenkens und der politischen Theorien im Mittelalter und in der frühen Neuzeit* (Tübingen, 1985), esp. pp. 1–156. See also A. Assmann, *Zeit und Tradition: Kulturelle Strategien der Dauer* (Köln, 1999), pp. 110–15; J.G.A. Pocock, *Barbarism and Religion Volume Three: The First Decline and Fall* (Cambridge, 2003), esp. pp. 77–152.

[39] Goez, *Translatio imperii*, pp. 4–16; J. Rubenstein, *Nebuchadnezzar's Dream: The Crusades, Apocalyptic Prophecy, and the End of History* (Oxford, 2019), pp. 3–6.

narrative of decline and renewal appealed to authors, like Orosius (d. 420) in his *Historiae adversus paganos* (Histories Against the Pagans) and Saint Augustine (d. 430) in his *De civitate Dei contra paganos* (On the City of God Against the Pagans), who sought to explain the 'fall' of Rome in the West and the passage of sacred time.[40] In the twelfth century, it found particular traction with the rise of scholasticism and a greater interest in the knowledge of the classical and late antique periods – as can be seen, for example, in the works of the theologian Hugh of Saint Victor (d. 1141), whose ideas were highly influential in the schools of Paris and whose likely pupil, Peter Lombard, even taught William.[41] Perhaps the most famous contemporary to consider *translatio imperii* was the German chronicler Otto of Freising, who used it to legitimise the Hohenstaufen as the new emperors of Rome in his *Historia de duabus civitatis* (*The History of the Two Cities*). Likewise trained in Paris, Otto traced the movement of empires from East to West and, like William, attached great significance to Charlemagne, with his imperial crowning in 800 presented as a key moment of transition before the Last Days.[42] It need not be problematic that William's conception of *translatio imperii* differs somewhat from

[40] Goez, *Translatio imperii*, pp. 37–61; Pocock, *Barbarism and Religion*, pp. 77–97; Rubenstein, *Nebuchadnezzar's Dream*, pp. 7–63.

[41] On William and Peter Lombard, see William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, II: 880; Doyle, *Peter Lombard and His Students*, pp. 38–40, 181–90. On Hugh and *translatio imperii*, see Goez, *Translatio imperii*, pp. 104–36; C. Rudolph, 'The City of the Great King: Jerusalem in Hugh of Saint Victor's *Mystic Ark*', in B. Kühnel, G. Noga-Banai, and H. Vorholt (eds), *Visual Cultures of Jerusalem* (Turnhout, 2014), pp. 343–52; Rubenstein, *Nebuchadnezzar's Dream*, pp. 7–63.

[42] It should be noted, though, that Otto saw the Last Days as beginning with the Investiture Controversy. On this, see Goez, *Translatio imperii*, pp. 104–36; Pocock, *Barbarism and Religion*, pp. 98–126; Rubenstein, *Nebuchadnezzar's Dream*, pp. 123–42.

Otto's, particularly in the subversion of the East to West paradigm and the inclusion of Islamic rulers, and that he resisted incorporating contemporary efforts to present Charlemagne as the proto-crusading saviour of Jerusalem, who personally visited the city at the request of its patriarch and the emperor in Constantinople, for it was a motif with a level of plasticity – that is it could be wielded in divergent ways depending on authorial need.[43]

The focus for William, then, was on other key thematic underpinnings of the motif, starting with the failing rule of Byzantium, emphasised through successive military defeats to Muslim powers, as well as comments on the withering of the empire and the locals' acceptance that no help would come from the Greeks. From here, he turned to the rise of a new, divinely ordained people in the Latins, whose power was recognised not just by Patriarch Symeon, but by the Muslim themselves – with divine approval, communicated through biblical allusion, also a particularly prominent aspect of *translatio* narratives that involved a conquest between the two 'empires' (achieved here through the rise of Islam). Finally, he emphasised the naturality of the succession.[44] In other words, whereas for Otto, as well as other contemporaries interested in Charlemagne and his successors, *translatio imperii* was

[43] On Charlemagne as a proto-crusader, see M. Gabriele, *An Empire of Memory: The Legend of Charlemagne, the Franks, and Jerusalem before the First Crusade* (Oxford, 2011), esp. pp. 41–72; A.A. Latowsky, *Emperor of the World: Charlemagne and the Construction of Imperial Authority, 800–1229* (Ithaca, NY, 2013), pp. 215–50; J. Stuckey, 'The *Vita Karoli* and the Making of a Royal Saint', in W.J. Purkis and M. Gabriele (eds), *The Charlemagne Legend in Medieval Latin Texts* (Cambridge, 2016), pp. 33–58.

[44] For a useful overview of the motif's themes, see G. Dunphy, 'Translatio Imperii', in G. Dunphy (ed), *Encyclopedia of the Medieval Chronicle* (Leiden, 2010), pp. 1438–40.

a means through which the rise of the German emperors could be legitimised, for William, as will be discussed further below, it offered the chance to explain how the creation of 'new' Latin polities in the East, even if they were not necessarily the 'new Rome', still served as a continuation of centuries of Christian rule. William did nevertheless maintain some semantic associations with the traditional *translatio imperii* motif, however, by couching events in the context of both Augustine's notion of the 'two cities', of Babylon and Rome, through Byzantium and the Fatimids; as well as his concept of the path to the city of God, that is Jerusalem.[45]

The concept of decline and renewal, as well as the East/West dichotomy, was not absent from other crusading narratives.[46] For example, the *Historia* of Fulcher of Chartres was infused with such ideas; various accounts of the First Crusade presented participants as the New Israelites, as God's chosen people; while the Flemish author, Lambert of Saint Omer, in his Orosian *Liber Floridus* (finished *c.* 1120), saw the First Crusade as heralding the final age of the world.[47] However, none can be said to have wielded the motif of *translatio imperii* in quite the same way as William. Significantly, the placing of Peter the Hermit's legation as the key turning point in support of a *translatio imperii* narrative is not found in Albert of Aachen's

[45] On the notion of the Two Cities and its relationship to narratives of the First Crusade and the Latin East (albeit not William's), see K.A. Smith, *The Bible and Crusade Narrative in the Twelfth Century* (Woodbridge, 2020), pp. 155–210; A.D. Buck, 'Remembering Outremer in the West: the *secunda pars historiae iherosolimitane* and the crisis of crusading in mid-twelfth-century France', *Speculum*, 97/2 (2022), pp. 377–414.

[46] For a good introduction to this, see E. Lapina, *Warfare and the Miraculous in the Chronicles of the First Crusade* (University Park, PA, 2015), pp. 122–42.

[47] Kirschberger, *Erster Kreuzzug und Ethnogenese*, pp. 66–72 and *passim*; Smith, *The Bible and Crusade Narrative*, pp. 112–27; Rubenstein, *Nebuchadnezzar's Dream*, pp. 7–63.

account, nor in any of the other sources that mention either the Hermit's pilgrimage or the patriarch's letter. Albert begins not with Heraklios, but with Peter; who, having seen the wicked deeds done in the Temple of the Lord, berates the Greek patriarch for allowing these insults. After the patriarch responds by arguing that aid is needed from the Christians, Peter is visited by Christ, who tells him to procure a letter from Symeon, which he duly brings home. Missing is any mention of the failing Greek empire or of the chosen nature of the Latins of the West.[48] The same is true of the so-called *Hystoria de via et recuperatione Antiochiae atque Ierosolymarum*, an anonymous text written at Montecassino by the 1140s, which mentions Islamic rule, notes Peter's horror at what he witnessed, and has Christ promise that the doors of the heavenly kingdom were open to all who participated, but omits entirely the meeting with the patriarch.[49] Likewise, the *Chanson d'Antioche*, an Old French epic of the crusade which largely follows Albert and eventually crystallised into a consistent form *c*. 1200, only offers some wider context through mention of Titus and Vespasian's sack of Jerusalem in 70CE.[50] Finally, while the so-called Charleville Poet, who composed additions to the *Historia vie Hierosolimitane* of Gilo of Paris (a French cleric who produced a versified account of the crusade *c*. 1120), does not

[48] Albert of Aachen, *Historia Hierosolimitana*, pp. 2–7. On the relationship between William of Tyre and Albert's *Historia*, see P. Knoch, *Studien zu Albert von Aachen* (Stuttgart, 1966), pp. 29–63; S.B. Edgington, 'The *Historia Iherosolimitana* of Albert of Aachen: A Critical Edition' (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of London, 1991), pp. 17–30.

[49] *Hystoria de via et recuperatione Antiochiae atque Ierosolmarum (olim tudebodus imitatus et continuatus): i Normanni d'Italia alla prima crociata in una cronaca cassinese*, ed. E. d'Angelo (Firenze, 2009), pp. 3–4.

[50] *The Chanson d'Antioche: An Old French Account of the First Crusade*, trans. S.B. Edgington and C. Sweetenham (Farnham, 2011), pp. 15–18, 107–11.

mention Peter, he does go into some detail about the Muslim mistreatment of the Christians in the Holy Land and an eventual request for aid through a legation sent by the Greek Patriarch. Yet, this was in pursuit of gold, not physical support.[51]

Outside of the Peter/patriarchal letter corpus, the Benedictine Baldric of Bourgueil, writing *c.* 1105, also mentions Titus and Vespasian, and how the people and holy places of Jerusalem were held captive, being so poorly treated under the rule of Babylon that they would often come to Europe seeking aid. Importantly, though, he does not comment upon Peter's legation nor on the decline of imperial rule.[52] Another Benedictine, Guibert of Nogent, writing *c.* 1108, opens his account of the crusade by tracing the passage of history, mentioning many names or places linked to the ages or kingdoms of man, including Alexander the Great, as well as the fate of the Roman Empire from the time of Constantine, albeit with less of an emphasis on military and political affairs and more on the rise of heretical schismatic beliefs, including Islam. Yet, while Guibert comments on a letter sent by Emperor Alexios I Komnenos (d. 1118) to Count Robert II of Flanders (d. 1111) asking the Franks to aid Byzantium, no mention is made of Peter's Jerusalem pilgrimage or how this information relates to the invention of Latin rule in the East. In fact, Guibert

[51] Gilo of Paris, *The Historia vie Hiersolimitane of Gilo of Paris and a Second, Anonymous Author*, ed. and trans. C.W. Grocock and E. Siberry (Oxford, 1997), pp. xxiv, pp. 4–7. Interestingly, an account of a personal legation by the Orthodox Patriarch to seek financial support for the Holy Land is also found in William of Tyre, albeit it is directed at Cyprus, not the Latin West. See William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, I: 375, 416.

[52] Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, ed. S.J. Biddlecombe (Woodbridge, 2014), pp. xxiv–xxx, pp. 5–6.

stressed just how little the crusade had to do with any form of landholding.[53] Lastly, in his *Tancredus*, written in Jerusalem in the late 1110s, Ralph of Caen noted that the venture 'restored to our mother, Jerusalem, her inheritance', a point re-emphasised a few lines later by a description of participants as the sons of Jerusalem, but likewise fails to couch the crusade in the context of an earlier visit made to the Holy City.[54]

It suffices to say, therefore, that although thematic similarities can be found between William's *Chronicon* and other accounts of the crusade that both include and exclude Peter's legation, as well as the patriarch's letter, the employment of the motif of *translatio imperii* is of the author's own devising and serves a distinct narrative purpose. Importantly, this runs contrary to Crispin's belief in William's close reliance on earlier traditions, as well as Edbury and Rowe's insistence that 'there is no hint … that William subscribed to an apocalyptic view of history', most especially the ages of man that found their origins in the Book of Daniel.[55] Indeed, the use of *translatio imperii* is an original and significant component of William's narrative arc for the crusade's genesis – one that presents the venture, by use of the familiar trope

[53] Guibert of Nogent, *Dei gesta per Francos et cinq autre textes*, ed. R.B.C. Huygens (Turnhout, 1996), pp. 51–56, 85–106.

[54] Ralph of Caen, *Tancredus*, ed. E. d'Angelo (Turnhout, 2011), pp. v–x, 3, at p. 3: 'qui matri nostrae Hierusalem hereditatem suam restituit'.

[55] Indeed, Crispin describes William account of the crusade as an 'old message in a new guise' (*Alte Botschaft in neuem Gewand*) and does not overtly recognise the important differences with Albert's account of Peter the Hermit's legation. See Crispin, *Ihr Gott kämpft jeden Tag für sie*, pp. 189–91; Edbury and Rowe, *William of Tyre*, pp. 40–41.

of decline and renewal, as the vehicle for the divine and legally predetermined transfer of power in the Holy Land.[56]

III

Turning now to Urban II, it is of interest that William also chose – unlike Albert – to detail in some depth the role played by the pope. Imbedded within the same chapters that carry the motif of *translatio imperii*, therefore, is another, different narrative strand. Just prior to describing Romanos Diogenes' defeat at Manzikert in 1071, William notes how the afflictions suffered by the Christians of the Holy Land were not the result of their own sins, but rather God's anger at the behaviour of those in Europe, who lived lives of violence and greed. In a chapter deeply imbued with biblical and apocalyptic significance, William explains how 'in the West … belief had failed and fear of the Lord was taken away from their midst', such that 'the world truly seemed to be declining toward eventide and the second coming of the Son of Man [Matthew 24.27] appeared to be near at hand'.[57] Beset by internecine warfare, ecclesiastical buildings were pillaged, 'for the sacrilegious hand did not distinguish the sacred from the profane', and 'here there and everywhere, and without shame

[56] The validity of this argument is supported by the fact that Julian Yolles has also noticed an influence of *translatio imperii* in the *Chronicon*, albeit solely in the context of the use of Einhard's *Vita Karoli Magni* over depictions of Frankish kingship, and not in relation to the crusade's genesis. See J. Yolles, 'Latin Literature and Frankish Culture in the Crusader States (1098–1187)' (unpublished PhD Thesis, Harvard University, 2015), pp. 310–17.

[57] William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, I: 117–18: 'in Occidente … fides defecerat et domini timor erat de medio sublatus', 'videbatur sane mundus declinasse ad vesperam et Filii hominis secundus adventus fore vicinior'.

[Ruth 2.16], fornication of whatever type was practised as if lawful'.[58] Even members of the church were not free from blame, as they committed many sins, including simony.[59] Peter the Hermit's preaching tour across Europe, meanwhile, is foregrounded by a discussion of the Investiture Controversy, with Emperor Henry IV (d. 1106) deeply criticised for breaking ecclesiastical law, raising an anti-pope, stealing church goods, imprisoning prelates, and pushing Europe, already wracked by sin and conflict, into further schism. The situation of the papacy was thus shown to be highly fragile, as not even the support of the Italo-Norman adventurer Robert Guiscard (d. 1085) could prevent successive popes from seeking sanctuary in the castles of their few allies.[60] Furthermore, despite the great success of the Hermit's call to arms, for God 'gazing upon the merit of his faith, had bestowed that man with such grace that seldom ever did he call together the people without reward', William describes how Urban found it necessary to preside over a council at Piacenza 'to correct the excesses of the people' (*ad corrigendos excessus hominum*).[61] Moreover, when he entered France, the pope saw with his own eyes that which he had earlier heard:

> divine admonition to have been trodden everywhere underfoot, the doctrine of the Gospel soiled, faith perished, [and] charity and every virtue endangered.

[58] William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, I: 118–119, at p. 118: 'non distinguebat sacrum a prophano manus sacrilega', 'fornicationum etiam genus quodlibet quasi res licita passim et sine rubore exercebatur impune'

[59] William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, I: 117–20.

[60] William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, I: 127–29.

[61] William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, I: 129–30, at p. 129: 'Cui tantam gratiam, eius fidei meritum respiciens, contulerat … ut raro unquam sine fructu populos conveniret'.

> By contrast, however, [he found] the kingdom of the adverse power and Prince of Darkness to be spread exceedingly far and wide.[62]

It was for this reason that Urban was anxious to discover a way to counteract the many monstrous vices and sins which had sprung up and 'had enveloped the whole world' (*orbem involverant universam*). In response, he called together the council at Clermont at which he delivered his famous sermon announcing the crusade.[63]

To explain and foreground Urban's intervention, therefore, William paints the picture of a sinful and diabolical West, one so ridden with bad behaviour that God was forced to scourge the Holy Land and punish it with servitude under Islamic rule. Like Peter's legation, this is not demonstrably lifted from a particular source, although there are some distinct similarities with other texts. Most notably, Fulcher of Chartres' *Historia* describes Henry IV as the 'so-called' (*dicto*) emperor, and how Urban called the council at Clermont because he saw the faith of Christendom trampled upon by the clergy and laity and Europe engulfed by war. Not only this, but violence and theft were rife, and even the holy places were violated. The pope's sermon thus aimed at quelling the tempests of the raging the world (*de mundi fluctuantis tempestatibus tantimodis*) and convincing the people to overcome the machinations of the devil (*diaboli machinationes*).[64] Mention is also made of the German-backed anti-pope, Guibert of Ravenna (otherwise called Clement III), and

[62] William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, I: 130: 'divina passim conculcari monita, doctrinam evangelii sordere, fidem perisse, caritatem et omnem periclitari virtutem, econtrario autem adverse potestatis et principis tenebrarum longe lateque nimis patere imperium'.

[63] William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, I: 130.

[64] Fulcher of Chartres, *Historia Hierosolimitana*, ed. H. Hagenmeyer (Heidelberg, 1913), pp. 119–23.

the threat he posed.[65] However, beyond Fulcher, of whose text William was evidently aware, we rarely find such direct and broad-ranging comments on Europe's sinful nature on the eve of the crusade – though Guibert of Nogent observes how Urban was motivated to come to France both by a desire to combat Muslim attacks on Christian territories and seek support against the Germans.[66]

It is worth noting that these portions of William's text do very little to sustain the alternative narrative thread of *translatio imperii*. Indeed, they undermine the motif's thematic underpinning of divine and natural suitability to rule, and distract from the discussion of how Latin Christian authority came to replace that of the failing Byzantine empire in the East, the latter of which is afforded a great deal more narrative space. It could be argued that William's novel suggestion at a direct causal relationship between the sins of the Latin West and the punishment of the Christian East, including the defeats of the Byzantine emperors, acts as something of a confirmation that the divine apportioning of authority away from the Greeks had already occurred – for it situates the moral heart of Christendom firmly within Europe. It is also interesting that William refers to the Second Coming, as well as the eventide of the world, given the interplay between *translatio imperii* and Apocalypse. This could indicate that William sought to reference the all-important stages of man motif to link back to *translatio*, but there is perhaps less of a sense that the crusade was a vehicle for transitioning into the End Times when compared, for example, with Otto of Freising's aforementioned presentation of Charlemagne's coronation. Moreover, the heavy emphasis laid upon the sinfulness of Western Christians,

[65] Fulcher of Chartres, *Historia Hierosolimitana*, pp. 143–53.

[66] Guibert of Nogent, *Dei gesta per Francos*, pp. 107–10.

particularly the notion that their sins were so great as to not only need personal purification through crusade, but also that they caused the longer-term scourging of the Holy Land, strikes an uneasy chord with the description of Peter the Hermit's legation and the notion that, in response to Byzantine failures, the Latins had become God's chosen heirs prior to the crusade's calling.

IV

It was perhaps in response to the apparent narrative disconnect between *translatio imperii* and Western sin that William sought to use his version of Urban's Clermont address to bring together these two threads and explain why the crusade was necessary and legitimate. Indeed, several key themes, along with original biblical framings, are interwoven into Urban's reported speech. Two of the most prominent are Christian brotherhood, particularly the notion of aiding one's fraternal kin, and the suffering of the Christians in the Holy Land, but also included are the impurity of Muslims and of Islamic rule over Jerusalem, the notion of Christ's inheritance needing to be recovered by those in Europe, and the need to atone for sin through self-sacrifice, chiefly for those in the West.

Thus, Urban is said to have declared that 'the impious race of the Saracens and followers of foul traditions' had conquered the faithful and condemned them to servitude (*in servitutem dampnatis*), and that 'for a great many years past now they have oppressed with violent tyranny the holy places in which stood the feet of the

Lord [Psalm 131.7]'.[67] Moreover, Urban decried that 'this cradle of salvation, the *patria* of the Lord, the mother of religion' was under enemy rule, while

> dogs have entered into the holy places [Matthew 7.6], the sanctuary is profaned [Psalm 88.40], the people who worship God are humiliated, the chosen people endures underserved suffering; the royal priesthood [1 Peter 2.9] serves in mud and bricks [Judith 5.10], the city of God, the prince of provinces, is placed under tribute.[68]

From here, the pope asked of his audience 'whose soul is not melted [Songs 5.6], whose vitals not shrivelled? Who can hear these things with dry eyes, dearest brothers?'[69] Urban commands 'be armed with the zeal of God' (*armamini zelo dei*), and

[67] William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, I: 132: 'Sarracenorum enim gens impia et inmundarum sectatrix traditionum', 'loca sancta, in quibus steterunt pedes domini, iam a multis retro temporibus violenta premit tyrannide'.

[68] William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, I: 132: 'hec … nostre salutis incunabula, domini patriam, religionis matrem', 'Ingressi sunt canes in sancta, prophanatum est sanctuarium, humiliatus est cultor dei populus, angarias patitur indignas genus electum, servit in luto et latere regale sacerdotium, princeps provinciarum facta est sub tributo civitas dei'.

[69] William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, I: 132: 'Cuius non liquefiat anima, cuius non tabescant precordia … ? Quis hec siccis oculis audire potest, fratres karissimi?'

> each one of you be girded mightily with your sword upon your thigh; gird yourselves and be valiant sons. For, it is better to die in battle than to see the evils of our people and of the holy places [1 Maccabees 3.58–59].[70]

'If anyone of you has the zeal of God's law [1 Maccabees 2.27]', Urban continued, 'let him join himself to us', and 'let us bring aid to our brothers; let us break their chains and cast away their yoke from them [Psalm 2.3]'.[71] As something of a crescendo, Urban brings together many of these themes with the following instruction:

> march out, and the Lord shall be with you; turn the arms which are illicitly stained from killing one another [Judges 7.22] against the enemies of the faith and in the Christian name. Those who commit theft, arson, rapine, murder, and other crimes of whatever kind, shall not possess the kingdom of God [1 Corinthians 6.9] … We warn, therefore, and exhort you in the Lord, and enjoin [upon you] for the remission of sins, that, by suffering hardships and labours with your brothers and joint heirs of the Kingdom of Heaven – for we are all members of one another [Ephesians 4.25]: heirs, indeed, of God, and joint heirs of Christ [Romans 8.17] – who live in Jerusalem and within its borders, you should restrain with due attention the insolence of the infidels, who have endeavoured to subject to themselves the kingdoms, principalities, and powers, and oppose with all [your] strength those who have proposed to

[70] William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, I: 134: 'accingimini unusquisque gladio suo super femur suum potentissime, accingimini et estote filii potentes: melius est enim mori in bello quam videre mala gentis nostre et sanctorum'.

[71] William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, I: 134: 'Siquis zelum legis dei habet, adiungat se nobis: subveniamus fratribus nostris, dirumpamus vincula eorum et proiciamus ab eis iugum ipsorum'.

> erase the Christian name. Otherwise, it will come about in the near future that the Church of God, enduring the unjust yoke of servitude, will experience a loss of faith, with the superstition of the Gentiles prevailing.[72]

William even hints at a role for Peter the Hermit, for it is commented how he felt due responsibility for the words entrusted to him in Jerusalem and so suggested that the measures put forth at Clermont might restore peace, 'which had perished from matters' (*que de rebus perierat*), while Urban even promised to show Peter's letter to any doubters.[73]

Though these are just a small selection of quotes from a much longer account, they are enough to demonstrate that traces of both narrative threads can be found encoded within the sermon. Regarding *translatio imperii*, we see the need for the natural and legitimate heirs of the Holy Land to travel east and save their imperilled neighbours, who suffered under the pollution of Islamic rule and whom it was their duty to protect (with the assumption that no others, such as Byzantium, would do so), while in opposition we find a sinful Europe, one so in need of salvation

---

[72] William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, I: 134–35: 'Egredimini, et dominus erit vobiscum, arma, que cede mutua illicite cruentastis, in hostes fidei et nominis christiani convertite, furta, incendia, rapinas, homicidia et cetera, qualia qui agunt regnum dei non possidebunt … Monemus igitur et exhortamur in domino, et in remissionem peccatorum iniungimus, ut fratribus vestris et celestis regni coheredibus – omnes enim sumus invicem membra, heredes quidem dei, coheredes autem Christi – qui Ierosolimis et in finibus eius habitant, afflictioni et laboribus compatientes, infidelium insolentiam, qui sibi regna, principatus et potestates subicere contendunt, debita compescatis animadversione et illis totis viribus occurratis, quibus est propositum nomen delere Christianum: alioquin futurum est ut in proximo ecclesia dei, iugum indebite perferens servitutis, fidei sentiat dispendium, prevalente gentilium supersticione'.

[73] William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, I: 130, 135.

that only an act of extreme physical penance could save them.[74] We should note here that although William offers his own version of the sermon, and there are rarely, if ever, any moments either of direct textual borrowing or the simple repurposing of others' biblical framings, it is evident that he took some inspiration from elsewhere.[75]

Baldric of Bourgueil, for example, includes the notion of servitude (*servitutibus*) under Islamic rule, as well as the desecration of the holy sites, with a particular and developed focus on the Holy Sepulchre; while he also emphasises the violent sins of European knights in terms similar to William's, in that they are told to turn their swords away from each other and to gird themselves instead against the Muslim enemy in order to wipe away divine punishment for their transgressions. In doing so, they are asked to emulate the Israelites, who 'inhabited an earthly Jerusalem, in the likeness of the heavenly Jerusalem'.[76] Yet, although Baldric has Urban talk of inheritance, he does so in regard to how the Eastern Christians had been exiled from theirs, a point later emphasised with reference to Psalm 78.1, *O God, the heathens are come into thy inheritance*. These Christians are also described as the Latins' 'own full brothers' (*germani fratres vestri*), but the notion of being the heirs of Christ refers only to churchmen, not to secular crusaders.[77] Guibert of Nogent, too, offers thematic similarities, as he describes the Holy Land as

[74] For historiographical analysis of William's Clermont sermon, see Crispin, *Ihr Gott kämpft jeden Tag für sie*, pp. 191–94; Doyle, *Peter Lombard and His Students*, pp. 185–86.

[75] On how others framed Clermont in a biblical context, see Smith, *The Bible and Crusade Narrative*, pp. 68–81.

[76] Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, pp. 6–10, at p. 8: 'instar Ierusalem celestis, Ierusalem terrenam incoluerunt'.

[77] Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, pp. 6, 8, 10.

God's inheritance (*dei hereditas*), the pollution of the pagans (*gentilium*), and the need for the Franks, like the Old Testament Maccabees, to rise up in defence of their country (*patriae*) instead of turning their weapons on each other.[78] More so than William, he utilises these themes in support of an underlying narrative thread of overt apocalypticism and belief in the Last Battle against the Anti-Christ. In particular, after drawing on Isaiah 43.5, *I will bring your seed from the East, and gather you from the West*, Guibert has Urban order that the Westerners (*Occidentales*) 'restore Jerusalem's losses' (*Iherosolimitana dampna restaurat*), and thus the crusade serves as a potential vehicle for the renewal of 'the empire of Christianity' (*Christianitatis imperium*).[79]

In his *Historia*, Fulcher of Chartres' version of the sermon, which includes an initial address calling on churchmen to amend their behaviour, is steeped in rhetoric surrounding the consequences of sin, as well as the need for the warrior classes to wage war on Muslims and not their fellow Christians.[80] He also mentions 'your brothers in the East' (*confratribus vestris in Orientali*) who are suffering from the incursions of the Turks, described as a vile and degenerate race enslaved by demons, in 'our lands' (*regionibus nostrorum*); albeit this appears to refer more to the fate of Byzantine interests in Asia Minor than the specific sufferings of those in the Holy Land, which are not outlined in any detail.[81] The notion of inheritance is not included. By contrast, in the other main Benedictine account, that of Robert the Monk

[78] Guibert of Nogent, *Dei gesta per Francos*, pp. 111–13, 116–17.

[79] Guibert of Nogent, *Dei gesta per Francos*, pp. 114–16. See also Rubenstein, 'How, or how much, to reevaluate Peter the Hermit', pp. 57–69; and Idem, *Nebuchadnezzar's Dream*, pp. 46–47.

[80] Fulcher of Chartres, *Historia Hierosolimitana*, pp. 123–30, pp. 134–37.

[81] Fulcher of Chartres, *Historia Hierosolimitana*, pp. 132–36.

(*c*. 1108), the danger to both the Christians of Jerusalem and Constantinople is mentioned and emphasised through vivid and shocking descriptions of the violence and pollution of Islamic rule over the regions they placed under servitude (*ancillatur*).[82] Yet, like Fulcher, there is no direct mention of inheritance; rather, Robert emphasises that God has granted the Franks a superiority of arms and strength over other nations which should be turned against the Muslims in emulation of earlier rulers, like Charlemagne and Louis the Pious: a sentiment undoubtedly linked to efforts to tie the crusade to the French ruling family.[83] Through this, then, the crusaders were to subject (*subicite*) to themselves the Holy Land – described as 'the land which was given in possession by God to the sons of Israel, "which", as is said in scripture, "flows with milk and honey (Exodus 3.8)"'.[84] Robert thus draws on the theme of the crusaders as the new Israelites, and there is an air of divine prophecy being fulfilled across the *Historia*, but his notion of the Franks' claim to the lands of the East relies more on the notion of right of conquest than William's overt sense of pre-determined legal inheritance.[85]

William's version of Clermont is, therefore, like all the others, of a familiar flavour while being uniquely wrapped. Nevertheless, it is also true that his wielding of

[82] Robert the Monk, *The Historia Iherosolimitana*, ed. D. Kempf and M. Bull (Woodbridge, 2013), pp. 5–7. See also T. Asbridge, 'An experiment in extremity: the portrayal of violence in Robert the Monk's narrative of the First Crusade', *History: Journal of the Historical Association*, 105/368 (2020), pp. 719–50, at p. 745.

[83] Bull, 'The Historiographical Construction', pp. 35–56; Naus, *Constructing Kingship*, pp. 15–58.

[84] Robert the Monk, *Historia Iherosolimitana*, pp. 6–7, at p. 6: 'Terra illa filiis Israel a Deo in possessionem data fuit, sicut Scriptura dicit *que lacte et melle fluit*'.

[85] M. Gabriele, 'From prophecy to apocalypse: the verb tenses of Jerusalem in Robert the Monk's *Historia* of the First Crusade', *Journal of Medieval History*, 42/3 (2016), pp. 304–16.

the themes of physical and spiritual salvation, of the need by the Holy Land's natural and legal heirs to protect the place and its people, serve divergent narrative purposes. Indeed, any similarities which occur take on new meaning in the *Chronicon* through their deployment in a wider narrative arc of decline and renewal, that of *translatio imperii*.

V

In spite of William's careful authorial planning, the question remains: was this enough to bring order to his text? For David Crispin, who has also recognised these competing narrative strands, albeit not the context of *translatio imperii*, the answer is yes; for, although William incorporates both the 'Lorraine' (that is Albert) and papal versions of the crusade's genesis, these rely mutually on the role of God, with Peter and Urban mere conduits for heavenly communication.[86] Yet, once one delves beneath the surface, there remains a distinct narrative incompatibility between *translatio imperii*, a motif that presents the Latins as the rightful heirs to the Holy Land after the failure of Byzantium, and the notion that they were so sinful as to be the cause of the East's divine punishment and so in need of papal intervention as to require the salvific novelty that was the crusade. Even for an author as skilled and as well-informed as William of Tyre, then, it was difficult to bring clarity and coherence to the competing versions of the crusade's genesis. Nevertheless, he found something important in both strands that he hoped would speak to his audience(s).

[86] Crispin, *Ihr Gott kämpft jeden Tag für sie*, p. 194.

In light of this, it is worth restating how the motif of *translatio imperii* does an especially good job of couching the crusade in the context of the legitimate transfer of power; it also emphasises the Latin East's independence from Western (read papal) influence by undermining the role played by Urban II in determining the crusade's genesis. Such a thread might best be viewed in the context of tensions – of which William, as a native of the crusader states who spent two decades in Europe *c.* 1145–65, would have been only too aware – that emerged across the twelfth century between the Latin West and the ruling institutions of the Latin East. In the early years, this centred on debates with the papacy over jurisdiction of William's own see at Tyre, the primacy of Rome over the Jerusalemite and Antiochene patriarchates, and the notion of whether a secular kingdom should exist in the Holy Land. However, there later emerged growing criticism of the conduct of settler powers, most especially following the disastrous Second Crusade (1146–49), after which accusations were levelled that a siege of Damascus was undermined by local Latin collusion with Muslim defenders.[87] In William's account, *translatio imperii* frames the crusaders, but particularly the eventual settlers, the descendants of whom would initially have been the text's primary audience, as God's divinely chosen people, already designated as natural heirs to the East following the failure

[87] On the papacy and the Latin East, see B. Hamilton, *The Latin Church in the Crusader States: The Secular Church* (London: Variorum, 1980), pp. 18–158; M.R. Tessera, *Orientalis ecclesia: Papato, Chiesa e regno latino di Gerusalemme (1099–1187)* (Milan, 2010); S. John, 'The papacy and the establishment of the kingdoms of Jerusalem, Sicily and Portugal: twelfth-century papal political thought on incipient kingship', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 68/2 (2017), pp. 223–59. For views of the political activities of the Latin East, see J.P. Phillips, *Defenders of the Holy Land: Relations between the Latin East and Latin West, 1119–1187* (Oxford, 1996); Idem, *The Second Crusade: Extending the Frontiers of Christendom* (New Haven, NY, 2007), pp. 207–27, pp. 269–79.

of Byzantium, before Urban had even called the crusade. They were selected not just by God, but rather they were picked out by the Eastern Christians to rule over them. In the case of Jerusalem and the crusade's genesis, therefore, the *Chronicon* deploys this motif by emphasising the long-term decline of Byzantium and using the patriarch's entreaty to state that only the Latins of the West had the power to protect the Christians of the Holy Land.

Importantly, we find similar underlying narrative threads in William's subsequent account of the captures of Antioch, Edessa, and Jerusalem. Consider, for example, the fall of Antioch to the crusaders on the night of 2–3 June 1098, owing to an agreement made between the Italo-Norman crusader Bohemond of Taranto and an Antiochene traitor called Firuz. The latter, who in other texts is Muslim, is described by William as having an ancient Christian bloodline and familial rights to Antioch, while he physically hands control of the city, described as his *patria*, to Bohemond through a ceremonial embrace that echoes rituals surrounding the transfer of royal power and the confirmation of charters.[88] Regarding Edessa, it is the Christian populace who first invite the northern French crusader Baldwin of Bourcq to save them from the nearby Turks and then appoint him as ruler atop a wave of acclaim in late 1097.[89] William also returns to the notion of a yoke of servitude (*iugum servitutis*), noting that the Edessans believed Baldwin would free them from theirs, and draws on a quote from the *Vita Constantini* to present the crusader lord as a new Constantine. Thus, much as Emperor Constantine was the 'liberator of the city' (*liberator urbis*) and 'founder of peace' (*quietis fundator*) in Rome for Eusebius,

[88] William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, I: 285–302; Buck, 'Between *Chronicon* and *Chanson*'.

[89] For Baldwin as count of Edessa, see S.B. Edgington, *Baldwin I of Jerusalem, 1100–1118* (Abingdon, 2019), pp. 38–58.

Baldwin was the *liberator urbis* and *quietis fundator* in Edessa for William.[90] Finally, when discussing the 1099 conquest of Jerusalem, William adapts a miracle found in the *Liber* of Raymond of Aguilers, a southern French crusade participant writing *c.* 1101; that is the appearance of a saintly white figure atop the Mount of Olives who waves on the crusaders during their final assault of the city. Crafting a careful account that adopts a style similar to that of focalisation, a literary tool in which an author directs the narrative through the experiences, perceptions, ideas, motivations, and feelings of a particular individual, William emphasises that the vision was experienced not by the Occitan crusade leader, Raymond of Saint-Gilles, as his source had it, but by Godfrey of Bouillon, whose subsequent battle cry inspired those around him to attack.[91] This moment of revelation and divine justification, then, is reserved for, and serves to confirm, the man who would be the Holy City's first Latin ruler.[92] Given that the concept of the Last Emperor, which, as noted above, is

[90] William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, I: 234–39; J.M. Drijvers, 'Eusebius' *Vita Constantini* and the Construction of the Image of Maxentius', in H. Amirav and B. ter Haar Romeny (eds), *From Rome to Constantinople: Studies in Honour of Averil Cameron* (Louvain, 2007), pp. 11–28, esp. p. 26. On the importance of Constantine to the political and religious cultures of Outremer to which William would have been witness, see B. Dźwigała, 'Constantine, Heraclius and Helena in the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 72/1 (2021), pp. 18–35.

[91] Compare William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, I: 407–408; with Raymond of Aguilers, 'Historia Francorum qui ceperunt Iherusalem', in *Recueil des historiens des croisades: historiens occidentaux*, 5 vols (Paris, 1844–95), III: 235–309, at p. 299. On focalisation as a narrative device, particularly in a crusading context, see Bull, *Eyewitness and Crusade Narrative*, pp. 57–64. On the 'celestial knight' motif and its legitimising role in crusade texts, see B.C. Spacey, *The Miraculous and the Writing of Crusade Narrative* (Woodbridge, 2020), pp. 32–40.

[92] For Godfrey's reign, see S. John, *Godfrey of Bouillon, duke of Lower Lotharingia, Ruler of Latin Jerusalem, c. 1060–1100* (Abingdon, 2018), esp. pp. 157–218.

interlinked with *translatio imperii*, included a final battle with the Anti-Christ fought on the Mount of Olives, William's textual sleight-of-hand here takes on a particular potential significance.[93]

Throughout the *Chronicon*'s account of the First Crusade, therefore, we find an interest in presenting the invention of Latin rule in the East as a series of divinely inspired and legally binding transactions that were initiated long before Urban's Clermont address: a literary drive that also fits more broadly with William's long-acknowledged interest in law and rightful inheritance.[94] However, because much of crusading's validity as a repeatable act, one successive generations were expected to undertake at great expense and personal risk, was driven by the concept of papal power, as well as the continual need to seek salvation against sin, Urban's role could not simply be ignored and instead needed to be explained should William hope to inspire European audiences to provide much needed support for Outremer. To do this meant interspersing the motif of *translatio imperii* with ideas of Western sin and papal attempts to bring order to Europe, both of which undermined the thread of the legal transfer of power in pursuit of reminding the audience(s) of the enduring need for, and value in, crusading. This helps to reveal the problems that William faced in ensuring his text appealed to the various communities with a vested interest in crusading and its history. For those in the Latin East, *translatio imperii* carried more appeal, because it legitimised their presence in the Holy Land; while for those in the

[93] Rubenstein, *Nebuchadnezzar's Dream*, pp. 45–46, pp. 137–39. See also Idem, 'Godfrey of Bouillon versus Raymond of Saint-Gilles: how Carolingian kingship trumped millenarianism at the end of the First Crusade', in M. Gabriele and J. Stuckey (eds), *The Legend of Charlemagne in the Middle Ages: Power, Faith, and Crusade* (Basingstoke, 2008), pp. 59–76.

[94] Edbury and Rowe, *William of Tyre*, pp. 61–84.

Latin West, Urban's intervention and the crusade as a vehicle for salvation were almost certainly far more significant.

VI

It is also possible that we are seeing evidence of the staggered composition processes of the eventual text. Historians have long agreed that William's *Chronicon* was written and edited over an extended period, with general agreement that this began *c.* 1170, perhaps after earlier receiving encouragement, if not a royal commission, from King Amalric of Jerusalem (d. 1174), and continued until just before the author's death *c.* 1184/6.[95] Moreover, while William's attendance at the Third Lateran Council in 1179 is seen to have marked a shift in authorial emphasis towards marketing the *Chronicon* as a vehicle for promoting Western intervention in Outremer, and it is agreed that the text went through many stages of composition and editing, it has also been largely assumed that it was conceived of as a single work.[96] Much of this historiographical consensus relies, perhaps unsurprisingly, on

[95] There is some debate over the exact year of William's death, for there is no conclusive evidence beyond an obituary that lists the date as 29 September. Some argue this would have been in 1186, others 1185, and Edbury and Rowe suggest 1184 is the most likely. See Edbury and Rowe, *William of Tyre*, p. 22. There is no need to reopen this debate here, though the seemingly high intensity of writing and editing undertaken by William in this period (on which see below) would seem to lean towards a later year.

[96] It should be noted that D.W.T.C. Vessey argued that William had originally been tasked merely with writing an account of Amalric's reign, but this was refuted by Edbury and Rowe. See Edbury and Rowe, *William of Tyre*, pp. 24–31; Kedar, 'Some new light', pp. 3–12; D.W.T.C. Vessey, 'William of Tyre and the art of historiography', *Mediaeval Studies*, 35 (1973), pp. 433–55, at pp. 436–39.

William's own words. In his Prologue, composed at the end of his writing process, William presented the *Chronicon* as a single entity, the product of a consistent literary programme, written first at the command (*iussio*) of Amalric but sustained by other reasons that 'urged us on greatly' (*maxime nos impulit*).[97] This sentiment was echoed by remarks interspersed throughout the text, such as his comment that it was at Amalric's suggestion that 'we wrote the present monument of the deeds which occurred in the kingdom following its liberation from enemy hands' – albeit note here the potentially revealing comment that the text followed on *after* Jerusalem's liberation.[98]

Why, though, might have Amalric encouraged William to write a wider history of the Latin East? William was well educated, perhaps more so than nearly any of his contemporaries in the crusader states, which explains how he rose to prominence so quickly as tutor to Amalric's son (the future Baldwin IV), royal ambassador, archbishop of Tyre, and chancellor of the kingdom.[99] Yet, this would not have automatically made him suitable for, or amenable to, the task of historical writing. While developments in scholasticism had contributed to a wider explosion in such writing during this period, there remained debates regarding what exactly constituted *historia*, and there were even those who saw it as an inferior, literary-driven subject less suitable for highly-educated clerics than more religiously-focused pursuits.[100] It

[97] William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, I: 97–101.

[98] William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, II: 881–82, at 882: 'presens gestorum, que in regno acciderant ab eius de manu hostium liberatione, monimentum conscripsimus'. See also Idem, II: 957.

[99] Edbury and Rowe, *William of Tyre*, pp. 13–22.

[100] Damien-Grint, *The New Historians*, pp. 1–42; Kempshall, *Rhetoric and the Writing of History*, pp. 34–120.

is possible, therefore, that William was already at work on a historical project when it was suggested that he might turn his attention to the wider history of his *patria*. If this were the case, then the most likely scenario is that this was an account of the First Crusade – not only because of the aforementioned allusion to Amalric's hope for material that discussed the period *after* Jerusalem's capture, but also as the eight books dedicated to the crusade in the *Chronicon* are of a complexity and sophistication that the rest of the text, for all its qualities, cannot match. Indeed, the sheer breadth of source material that would have had to have been mastered to compose this version of the crusade suggests a man with a great deal more time to dedicate to reading and writing than would have been plausible for William's career from the early 1170s onwards. What eventually became the *Chronicon* thus probably began as a standalone account of the First Crusade that was then extended; or perhaps it was not envisaged that the two halves would form a single whole until a much later date.

It is at this point that we must turn to a complicating factor in this argument, for there are indications that at least some elements of Book 1, which contains all the material discussed above on the crusade's genesis, were composed in the early 1180s. For example, August Krey drew attention to a section of Book 1, Chapter 3, in which William commented that another of his works, a now-lost history of Islam known as the *Gesta Orientalium principum* (*The Deeds of the Eastern Princes*), had been composed up to the present day (*presentem diem*), 'which for us is the year of the Lord's incarnation 1182'.[101] Elements of this section of the text must therefore

[101] William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, I: 109: 'qui est nobis ab incarnatione domini millesimus centesimus octuagesimus secundus'.

date to this period, even if, as Krey admitted, much of the material in the first twelve books was probably composed before 1174.[102] More recently, Benjamin Kedar has examined William's use of the phrase *ecclesia Dominice* (or *sancta*) *Resurrectionis* in relation to the Holy Sepulchre, noting how its appearance in Books 1–8, and in the later elements of the *Chronicon*, indicate a period of editorial work, classified as a 'second redaction', that was likewise undertaken in the early 1180s; albeit Kedar accepts that such editorial work does not automatically mean the wider sections in which we find datable insertions were originally composed then. Indeed, Kedar recognises that we can date at least one part of Book 4 to the period before 1171, for it talks of the Fātimid Caliphate in the present tense, despite its abolition by Saladin in 1171.[103]

This latter concession is important, as it supports the thesis that it was during the later stages of William's authorial career that an independent account of the First Crusade was attached to a wider history of the crusader states that was yet to be fully completed, with the need to mesh together two texts offering the opportunity to make editorial changes. That William did not quite complete this process, and so failed to implement the use of *ecclesia Dominice* (or *sancta*) *Resurrectionis* throughout, is not problematic, for it would likely have been a painstaking task: one cut short by his untimely death. There are also other potential clues to the later incorporation and refinement of the First Crusade material. For example, the aforementioned insertion regarding the date at which the *Gesta Orientalium principum* finishes comes at the very end of a chapter and so could be a later

[102] A.C. Krey, 'William of Tyre: the making of an historian in the Middle Ages', *Speculum*, 16/2 (1941), pp. 149–66 (esp. pp. 154–55, pp. 159–60).

[103] William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, I: 267–68; Kedar, 'Some new light', pp. 1–7.

insertion rather than an original part of the text. The same is true of those sections which incorporate the Western sin aspects, which appear either at the very start or end of chapters or as standalone chapters.[104] Similarly, following the aforementioned passage regarding the vision of a celestial figure atop the Mount of Olives seen by Godfrey of Bouillon as he led the assault on Jerusalem in July 1099, there is a smaller, far more concise chapter in which it is noted that the figure was also witnessed by Raymond of Saint-Gilles – who, as already mentioned, was the original witness to the miracle as per Raymond of Aguilers – and his forces.[105] What makes this particularly noteworthy is not just that it interrupts William's wider narrative arc of the siege of the Holy City, which is focused near exclusively on Godfrey's forces, to the point where it almost seems as if there were only one single area of conflict, as opposed to the reality of various groups encamped before different parts of the walls, but also the comparative lengths of the two chapters. Whereas the chapter detailing Godfrey's experience of the vision covers forty lines in the modern edition, the one for Raymond is a mere eighteen, with the inclusion of the Provençals' experience of the vision given only a short note that it 'had vehemently kindled them and rendered them more confident of obtaining victory'.[106] This chapter thus fits uncomfortably into the wider account of Jerusalem's capture, and appears instead to fit the profile of a later insertion, one that perhaps related to the fact that, by the early 1180s, William's patron, and favourite to lead the kingdom during the crises of Baldwin IV's reign, was

[104] William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, I: 109, 117–20, 127–29.

[105] William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, I: 408.

[106] William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, I: 408: 'eos vehementer accenderat et reddiderat de optinenda victoria securiores'.

Count Raymond III of Tripoli, the great-great grandson of Raymond of Saint-Gilles.[107] Though this chapter lacked the same divine aggrandisement of that which described Godfrey's experience, it nevertheless directly linked Raymond's ancestor to the key foundational moment for the kingdom of Jerusalem and its ruling family.

Moreover, there is a significant, if easily missed, stylistic shift between William's account of the crusade and the material covering the Latin East. Throughout the first eight books, we find moments of analepsis and prolepsis, that is the signalling to the reader of events or details heard previously or which will appear in the future. Although there are many such examples, here we will consider two. First, when detailing how Edessa's populace were slowly turning against their lord, Thoros, in favour of Baldwin of Bourcq, William used prolepsis to allude to the eventual conclusion of the anger felt by the citizens, that is their deposal of Thoros, through his comment that 'the subsequent outcome of the matter was afterwards revealed most clearly'.[108] Likewise, he deployed analepsis when describing the presence of Arabic inscriptions on the Temple of the Lord during his coverage of Jerusalem's capture through his comment that

> at the beginning of this book, we have said that 'Umar, son of Khattab [al-Khattāb ibn Nufayl], who was the third successor of the error and of the kingdom from the seducer Muhammad, founded this building, and ancient

[107] Edbury and Rowe, *William of Tyre*, pp. 29–30. See also K.J. Lewis, *The Counts of Tripoli and Lebanon in the Twelfth Century: Sons of Saint-Gilles* (Abingdon, 2017), pp. 233–58.

[108] William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, I: 236–37: 'quod postmodum rei subsequens exitus evidentissime declaravit'.

> inscriptions of letters, composed both inside and outside the same building, declare this to be true.[109]

Though phrases such as *ut diximus* or other variants do not end with the First Crusade, on those rare occasions when William subsequently draws attention to that initial venture in the later elements of the text, he does not use such wording, and instead repeats details he might otherwise have simply signposted. For example, in Book 10, Chapter 9, William alludes to a dispute that had erupted between Tancred of Hauteville, later prince of Antioch, and Baldwin of Bourcq at the Cilician city of Tarsus in 1097 when discussing the pair's later relationship at the time of Baldwin's elevation as king of Jerusalem in 1100, but he does not indicate its earlier appearance in Book 3, Chapters 18–24.[110] The same is true of his commentary on the French nobleman Stephen of Blois' return to the East during the so-called '1101 Crusade', in which William goes into detail about his previous flight from the siege of Antioch in 1098 without any sense of its previous deployment.[111] Perhaps even more significant is the fact that, while William provided a signpost to the earlier elements of his text when discussing the Caliph 'Umar in Book 8, he does not employ the same literary tactic when going into detail about Muhammad, 'Umar, and the other

[109] William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, I: 386: 'Porro in principio huius voluminis huius edificii auctorem diximus Homar, filium Catap, qui tercius a seductore Mahumet erroris et regni successor extitit, et ita esse antiqua litterarum monimenta in eodem edificio intus scripta et deforis manifeste declarant'.

[110] Williiam of Tyre, *Chronicon*, I: 219–27, 463–64. See also Edgington, *Baldwin I*, pp. 24–30, 82–84.

[111] Williiam of Tyre, *Chronicon*, I: 465–66. See also C. Kostick, 'Courage and Cowardice on the First Crusade, 1096–1099', *War in History*, 20/1 (2013), pp. 32–49.

successive caliphs in Book 19, Chapter 21; instead, he directs the reader to the *Gesta Orientalium principum*.[112]

What this all leads to, then, is the strong possibility that William's original account of the First Crusade was conceived of as a separate, standalone narrative, one probably composed or begun very soon after his return to the East in the mid-1160s and likely aimed at a primarily Eastern Latin audience (hence the use of *translatio imperii*). At some point in the early 1180s, William returned to this text and incorporated it into a history of the Latin East to create what we now call the *Chronicon*. It is likely, moreover, that the standalone crusade account did not contain the Western sin motif, and might even have housed a variant account of Pope Urban's movements prior to Clermont and his sermon – one that was later adapted and edited in an attempt to bring coherence to competing narrative threads. It is perhaps unsurprising that this coincided with an apparent realisation by William that his writings might need to appeal, or be important, to a potential Western audience. In this context, it is possible that the comments on sin are, despite their threat to narrative consistency, a not-so-veiled criticism of those in the Latin West who had failed to provide aid to Outremer. While it might be thought that this would please an Eastern audience more, for it could limit their own sense of self-blame for the crusader states' deteriorating fortunes, equally, such a move at shaming knights into action tapped into wider and culturally significant notions of honour.[113] Furthermore, although William was not afraid to criticise the men of his homeland for their failings, and he became especially gloomy regarding the martial qualities of the Latin East's

[112] William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, II: 890–92.

[113] On crusading's intersection with concepts of honour and shame, see N. Hodgson, 'Honour, shame and the Fourth Crusade', *Journal of Medieval History*, 39/2 (2013), pp. 220–39.

ruling elites in the later stages of the *Chronicon*, it is not insignificant that the notion of Western sin causing the downfall of the East is unique to William in the context of the First Crusade.[114]

VII

This article has examined how a specific moment when narrative inconsistency crept into William of Tyre's *Chronicon* might serve as a window onto the nature of historical writing in the medieval period. In doing so, I have shown that such a moment reveals several of the issues that William, but also medieval authors more generally, faced when composing their texts, particularly when dealing with well-known and culturally significant events that underpinned social behaviours and identities. Through moments like William's attempt to reconcile competing traditions surrounding the genesis of the First Crusade, we can trace elements of editorial and narratorial development, as well as how the structure and purpose of the text we now call the *Chronicon* evolved into the final product. This article has shown how examining two opposing narrative arcs can shine a light onto the issues that emerged for William in reconciling competing accounts of the crusade into a coherent whole, as well as appealing to and addressing rival audiences for whom crusading and settlement was important. Thus, William's account of the Holy Land's misfortunes and Peter the Hermit's legation, which was underpinned by *translatio imperii*, a motif undoubtedly utilised to create the sense of a legitimate and divinely

[114] On William and the men of his time, see I. Wolsing, 'Othering the Self: William of Tyre, Orientalism, and the (De)construction of Latin Identity in Twelfth-Century Jerusalem', *Medieval Encounters* (forthcoming).

pre-determined transfer of power away from Byzantium and Islam and into hands of the Latins, the natural successors to the East, was almost certainly aimed at the settlers of Outremer. Conversely, the notion of Western sin and the role of the papacy was more evidently a concern of European audiences.

In considering the deployment of these alternate narrative strands alongside several underlying stylistic idiosyncrasies in William's writing, I have demonstrated that we can find evidence that in the early 1180s he likely superimposed and edited an earlier standalone account of the First Crusade onto a wider history of the Latin East, and from this emerged the *Chronicon.* What becomes clear above all else is that William's authorial activities were deeply influenced by the reality that the crusade held meaning and appealed to the Latins of the East in different ways than it did for audiences in the Latin West. In other words, creating history was – and indeed remains – a tricky business, one that can speak to the many concerns and forces at work in the societies from which such texts emerge. We can learn much about the historian's craft, therefore, by taking a closer look at the narrative and authorial dilemmas faced not only by recent historians, but also those of the distant past, as well as the analytical frameworks they deploy in response.